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DIMBULÁGALA: MÁRÁVIDÍYE CAVE INSCRIPTION.¹

By
H. C. P. BELL, c.c.s. (Retired.)

This is one of the few lithic Inscriptions—eight in all,² so far discovered—of the more or less disturbed period, a century and upwards, covering the reigns of Vijaya Bāhu I, and his immediate successors, Vikrama Bāhu I (son), Jaya Bāhu I (brother), and Gaja Bāhu II (grandson); or roughly speaking the latter half of the Eleventh Century and the first half of the Twelfth up to the accession of Parakrama Bāhu I.

Photographed and “eye-copied” by Mr. H. C. P. Bell, Archaeological Commissioner, in 1897, and again “eye-copied” by the specially trained Head Overseer of the Archaeological Survey (A. P. Siriwardhana) in 1903, the rock record has since thrice dealt with by two editors:

¹ For previous Papers on this Inscription, see “The Ceylon Antiquary,” 1917, III, pp. 1—12, Epigraphia Zealana, 1917: II, pp. 164-6, pp.190-202, 1924.
² Vijaya Bāhu I: (i) Ambaganuwa, C.P., (Sinhalese), 38th year; (ii) Polonnaruwa, N.C.P Tamul), 56th year; (iii) Jaya Bāhu: Budumuttāva, N.W.P., (Tamul), 8th year; (iv) Dimbulagala, N.C.P., (Sinhalese), 27th year; (v) Polonnaruwa, N.C.P., (Tamul), 28th year; (vi) Polonnaruwa, (Tamul) 38th year; (vii) Polonnaruwa, (Tamul) 16th year; (viii) Polonnaruwa (Tamul), undated; (ix) Kapuru Veda Oya, C.P., (Sinhalese), undated.
(i) In 1917 Mr. Don M. de Z. Wickremasinghe, Epigraphist to the Ceylon Government, issued text, transcript and translation (Epigraphia Zeylanica, 1917, Vol. II, Part 4, pp. 184-189), based upon (a) a “squeeze” (ink impression) and (b) a photograph.

(ii) The same year Mr. Bell (The Ceylon Antiquary, 1917, Vol. III, Part I, pp. 2-12) published variant text and translation, with (a) reproduction of his photograph taken from the rock inscription itself, and (b) photograph of his own “eye-copy,” both made in 1897.

Several notable divergencies exist between versions (i) and (ii)—the most important being Mr. Wickremasinghe’s mislection of “Vijaya Bahu,” as the name of the King in whose 27th regnal year the Inscription was cut, instead of the actual name on the rock, viz: “Jaya Bahu.”

For two years Mr. Wickremasinghe did not reply to Mr. Bell’s criticism. But in 1919 a fresh edition of the Inscription by the Professor was forwarded to the Ceylon Government from England, and referred to Mr. Bell for his observations.

Abridged extract from Mr. Bell’s report of March 15th, 1919, appears below:—

A revised edition of the Dimbulagala Cave panel Inscription is certainly advisable. But not yet; nor in the form Mr. Wickremasinghe at present contemplates issuing it.

What is wanted (in the interests alike of epigraphical and historical truth) is—not a manifestly unconvincing rejoinder to Mr. Bell’s Paper in “The Ceylon Antiquary,” such as this provisional effort of Mr. Wickremasingha, based, as it is, on doubtful readings from a treacherous “squeeze” and “squeeze photograph,” but—finality.

As Mr. Wickremasinghe is disinclined to accept Mr. Bell’s and Siritwardhana’s independent “eye-copy” versions of the text in “The Ceylon Antiquary” (obvious clerical and printer’s errors, of course, eliminated), supported by the direct photographs, as published by Mr. Bell, he should apply to the Ceylon Government to depute some competent “third party” to make a careful letter-for-letter “eye-copy” of the record, as well as—if considered necessary—a fresh photograph of it, and fresh “squeeze.”

3. These are (a) three lapesi calami in copying Sinhalese vowels, dinsu (Bell, 1897) for dinesi Kalanga, dema (Sirwardhana, 1903) for Kalenga, dams; (b) two quite excusable printer’s errors, abhinavadi, Dambula gala for abhinavadi, Dambula gala, as actually eye-copied (C.A., III, Plate VI); (c) accidental and very obvious, omission of “at Dimbulagala” after “great Sun Cave” in the English translation, the Sinhalese text giving the word distinctly (C.A., loc. cit. pp. 7-8).
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On account of the manifestly inchoate form of Mr. Wickremasinghe’s second edition of the Dimbulágala record, now advanced, it is most desirable that he should place himself in a really sound position to bring out a final revision.

Mr. Wickremasinghe already admits the main issue of Mr. Bell’s Paper in “The Ceylon Antiquary”—“Jaya Bāhu,” not “Vijaya Bāhu,” as the name of the King in whose regnal year the Inscription was granted.

Leaving aside fairly debatable arguments on minor side issues (which Mr. Wickremasinghe urges with perspicacity), the greater part of this revised version of his rest its strength for disputed readings of the text itself on the evidence of “squeezes”—those too frequently elusive imaginis umbras “shadows without substance”—as opposed to “eye-copies” (two, and independent: Mr. Bell, 1897; Siriwardhana, 1903), and a photograph taken by Mr. Bell of the panel record on the Cave’s rock roof.

An entirely fresh “eye-copy” by an impartial expert (with possibly further photograph and “squeeze”), as suggested, should carry conviction; and for this essential light Mr. Wickremasinghe will no doubt be content to wait before publishing any revised edition of the Inscription. It is not, needless to say, a question of Wickremasinghe v. Bell, but of relative value of observed facts versus presumed theories, which Epigraphical students have the right to count on.

Finally, Mr. Wickremasinghe would, it is submitted, do well to re-write much of his “Preamble,” eliminating all recrimination, as unworthy, undignified, and quite out of place in a staid Government Publication.”

(iii) After the lapse of a further period of five years—or seven years in all since 1917—Mr. Wickremasinghe has just issued (Epigraphia Zeylanica, 1924, Vol. II, Part 3, pp. 194-202), a second edition of the Dimbulágala Inscription, which is virtually the same as that put forward in manuscript in 1919, save that—doubtless as the result of judicious pressure in England—the letter-press has been rightly purged of the unjust insinuations and jarring tone which marred it originally.

Quem deus vult perdere—the learned Professor can no doubt supply the aposiopesis.

Mr. Wickremasinghe has most assuredly been unwise (to put it mildly) in not acting on the salutary, and friendly, advice tendered him from Ceylon in 1919. In pertusum ingerimus dicta dolium. He elects to stand to very uncertain guns, unsupported, as they are, by that valuable independent aid which he had but to seek from the Ceylon Government to have readily accorded him.

Mr. Bell has no intention of prolonging the well-intentioned
but undesirable, controversy with his erstwhile colleague in the Archaeological Survey of Ceylon.  

It is far better that entirely "fresh blood"—some admittedly well-qualified scholar thoroughly steeped in the History and Epigraphy of the Island—should be infused into the final struggle with this unique Inscription, so that it may be disposed of once for all—a consummation devoutly to be wished by all Ceylon Epigraphists.

Towards this end, it may prove of service to such future investigator to summarise here succinctly the position as it stands today, by :-

(1) Tabulating the points of divergence in the Text between (i) (iii), Mr. Wickremasinghe’s two versions, and (ii) Mr. Bell’s and Siriwardhana’s original readings, which stand advisedly unaltered

(2) Adding adequate supplementary evidence regarding the disputed rendering of one all-important term (kusalān.)

(3) Offering brief tentative remarks in regard to Mr. Wickremasinghe’s startling chronological solecism—the attribution of a posthumous regnal date to Jaya Bāhu, the King to whom (in the commonly understood sense) the Inscription properly belongs, though executed by Sundara Maha Devi, widowed Queen of Vikrama Bāhu I.  

A. Variant Readings.  

Line 2  A. (Wickremasinghe, 1917) lāda voṭunu me (........n)

4. Mr. Wickremasinghe (educated at Richmond College, Galle), joined the Colombo Museum as Assistant Librarian in 1887. Transferred as Native Assistant to the Archaeological Commissioner from March 1st, 1891, he served with the Archaeological Survey until February 28th, 1892; when he severed his connection in order to proceed to Erlangen University to “fit himself for advanced philological research.” From Germany he passed to England filling the post of Secretary to the Indian Institute at Oxford for some time, with Professorships in Sinhalese and Tamil. Appointed Epigraphist to the Ceylon Government from January 1st, 1899, Mr. Wickremasinghe has in the intervening quarter of a century issued eleven parts of the Epigrapha Ceylonica:—Vol. I, Parts 1-6 (1904-1912), Vol. II, Parts 1-5 1912-1924).

6. “No one after reading it on the rock panel would attempt to rob the Royal Lady (Sundara Maha Devi) of her just rights in the record: clearly she is the authoress, as self declared. But it is no less true that the Inscription as surely ‘belongs’ to the reign of ‘Jaya Bāhu voṭamuṣq, 27th year’.” (Bell, C.A., III, p. 10, 1917).

8. Mr. Bell sees no justification whatever in 1924 for amending his and Siriwardhana’s “eye-copy” readings made in 1897 and 1903 respectively, and printed in C.A. 1917, III, p. 7 the above specified pen and printer’s errors necessarily excepted.

Of the seven variant readings here given, Mr. Wickremasinghe has now (1924) accepted Mr. Bell’s version, wholly or for the most part, in four cases: in three he abides by his own view.
1. අපාය සැකසන්නේ පිහිටි වර්තමානයේ ගැටලුකම් විසින් ම පිළිතුරුන් තුළ කිරීමක් නික්ෂීමක්

2. ඏලියුම ශිලා කොළඹ නිලත්තා මෙම දැන්න පැහැදිලි ගැටලුකම් විසින් ම පිළිතුරුන් තුළ පිළිතුරුන් තුළකිරීමක් නික්ෂීමක්

3. දෙවිය විසදී ඉදිවරයින් ඇතිව දැන්න සැකසකම් යන ඉදිරිපත්eny ගැටලුකම් විසින් ම පිළිතුරුන් තුළ පිළිතුරුන් තුළකිරීමක් නික්ෂීමක්

4. එක්සත්ව පිළිතුරුන් තුළ කොළඹ විසින් මෙම දැන්න පැහැදිලි ගැටලුකම් විසින් ම පිළිතුරුන් තුළ පිළිතුරුන් තුළකිරීමක් නික්ෂීමක්

5. මෙම ගැටලුකම් කොළඹ නිලත්තා මෙම දැන්න විසින් ම පිළිතුරුන් තුළ පිළිතුරුන් තුළකිරීමක් නික්ෂීමක්

6. එක්සත්ව පිළිතුරුන් තුළ මෙක නිලත්තා මෙම දැන්න විසින් ම පිළිතුරුන් තුළ පිළිසන්නවා

7. එක්සත්ව පිළිතුරුන් තුළ මෙක නිලත්තා මෙම දැන්න විසීන් ම පිළිතුරුන් තුළ පිළිතුරුන් තුළකිරීමක් නික්ෂීමක්

Cave Inscription
B. (Bell, 1897, 1917; Siriwardhana, 1903) de voṭunu mende upan.
C. (Wickremasinghe, 1924) de voṭunu mende upan

Line 2
A. (Wickremasinghe, 1917) (vedū)
B. (Bell, 1897, 1917; Siriwardhana, 1903) lada.
C. (Wickremasinghe, 1924) vedū.

Line 4
A. (Wickremasinghe, 1917) hiru
B. (Bell, 1897, 1917; Siriwardhana, 1903) hiri
C. (Wickremasinghe, 1924) hiri

Line, 4, 5
A. (Wickremasinghe, 1917) maṅga (duṇu evu a .... rem bu) n (vedū) kebaligal (hasvā) maṅga pavat koṭa.
B. (Bell, 1897, 1917; Siriwardhana, 1903) maṅga dana eva damavalī yana miniṣunge duka balā gal hasvā pavat koṭa.
C. (Wickremasinghe, 1924) maṅga (or maṅge) duṇu ev (or evu) dana eli yana miniṣunge duka balā gal hasvā maṅga pavat koṭa.

Line 5
A. (Wickremasinghe, 1917) leṇa
B. (Bell, 1897, 1917; Siriwardhana, 1903) leṇa
C. (Wickremasinghe, 1924) leṇe

Line 5, 6
A. (Wickremasinghe, 1917) (Kalīṅgu le) na yā (dānavat Vi) jaya Bāhu.
B. (Bell, 1897, 1917; Siriwardhana, 1903) Kalīṅga leṇayeṣ nam tabā Jaya Bāhu.
C. (Wickremasinghe, 1924) Kalīṅgu leṇayeṣ nam tabā Jaya Bāhu.

Line 7
A. (Wickremasinghe, 1917) De (maḷe pehe siri kusalān) karavā yā bat pudanu koṭa (lov) pavatā.
B. (Bell, 1897, 1917; Siriwardhana, 1903) Demalē ve- hesara kusalān karavā yā bat pudanu koṭa leṇa pavatā.
C. (Wickremasinghe, 1924) De(maḷe pehe siri kusalān) karavā yā bat pudanu koṭa (lov) pavatā.

Line 7
A. (Wickremasinghe, 1917) Devimē.
B. (Bell, 1897, 1917; Siriwardhana, 1903) Devimā
C. (Wickremasinghe, 1924) Devimu (or Devimha).
B. Kusalan.

Reading "siri kusalán karavá" in the Inscription (line 7), Mr. Wickremasinghe translates: (Epigraphia Zeylanica, 1917, Vol. II, p. 189.) "Caused the construction of sacred kusalán (vessels?)"

Mr. Bell (The Ceylon Antiquary, 1917, Vol. III, p. 8), finding no siri preceding kusalán on the rock, rendered the two words kusalán karavá, "dedicated for the sake of religious merit"; adding in a footnote. "In modern Sinhalese pin gamak karavá 'making (it) a village dedicated for the sake of religious merit.' The expression occurs not unfrequently in inscriptions, e.g. Nalagane Viháré, N.W. Province (where it is used several times); Balalu-vewa, N. C. Province, kusalánata pidi."

On this Mr. Wickremasinghe (Epigraphia Zeylanica, 1924, Vol. II p. 189), now comments:—

"As to what a kusalána is I am still uncertain. According to Clough's Sinhalese Dictionary and the Piyummala it means 'a drinking vessel.' Mr. Bell thinks that it is a pin-gama (Skt. punya gráma), a village dedicated for the sake of acquiring merit; but he gives no authority for his interpretation. His quotation kusalánata pidi gives him no help, but supports my interpretation. Besides, if Mr. Bell's view is accepted, the clause 'daru kusalán mañga kusalán para paridden tabá' in the Galpota record at Polonnaruwa (E.Z., 1917, Vol. II, p. 111) would be difficult of explanation."

Misreading the clause in the Galpota Inscription (lines 23, 24). as "devádána daru kusalán mañga kusalán para paridden tabá dī," Mr. Wickremasinghe naturally flounders in his translation—"re-established offerings to gods, daru kusalán, and mañga kusalán, as existed in the past." Regarding the phrases left untranslated, he footnotes: "Probably 'drinking vessels for children' and 'drinking vessels on the roadside for travellers'."

The excellent "squeeze" photograph of the record reproduced by the Professor should alone have sufficed to steer him clear of the bog into which sheer carelessness has landed him. For the actual reading of the words on the "stone-book" is plainly 'daru kusalán maha kusalán'; and the real meaning "meritorious benefactions small and great."

7. Daru gěsi maha gěsi. Common present-day Sinhalese term for small and large coconut and other fruits.
Mr. Wickremasinghe—not infrequently weighted by unfortunate mislection⁸ incumbus—sinks still further into the mire when he meets kusalán again in the Ambagamuwa Inscription he has just published (Epigraphia Zeylonica, 1924, Vol. II, Part 5, pp. 202-218.)

After stating that Viyaya Bâhu I—to quote the Professor’s own words (p. 217)—“dedicated (to the sacred footprint) all the properties (situated) therein (viz. at Vilbá),” consisting of a garden, koṭaveli and their arecanut produce, in several districts and divisions, that record proceeds: “me tuvāk ten kusalán botā koṭa.”

This sentence Mr. Wickremasinghe reads correctly until he reaches botā (end of line 43), which his evil genius has led him to twist into bol(pā); and to translate the whole sentence: “In all these places he set up kusalán and bol(pā)”; footnoting ingenuous-ly: “The exact meaning of kusalán is still uncertain. Cf. daru kusalán and maṅga kusalán of the Galpota Inscription. Bol(pā) may be a derivative of P. bodhi-pāda ‘the sacred Bodhi tree’ or more likely bodhi-patta ‘bowl for the Bodhi tree.’”

Botā (derived seemingly from Sanskrit bhāt “maintain”) is quite clear on the rook; was so read by Mr. Bell when he first copied the Inscription in 1891⁹; as by his Head Overseer Sirivardhana in 1906; and has been again checked very recently (1924). The combined sentence “kusalán botā koṭa” bears the appropriate signification “having made (koṭa) a meritorious benefaction (kusalán) to be (ever) maintained (botā) at all these places (me tuvāk ten).”

Mr. Wickremasinghe desires “authority” for “Mr. Bell’s view” that the true signification of kusalán, in these ancient liothic grants to Buddhist monasteries, is “religious benefaction for the sake of merit.” There is “authority” galore.

First, as to derivation. The word kusalán (“drinking-vessel” only in its secondary sense) is derived from Sanskrit kusa “water,” lāna (Skt. lana) “giving” or “receiving” (strictly “placing”), and signifies literally “a benefaction given and received by the pouring of water.”


9. Mr. Wickremasinghe (E.Z., 1924, loc. cit., p. 202) unwittingly errs in stating “some 12 or 15 years ago”; for Mr. Bell had copied the Ambagamuwa inscription as far back as 1891 when Archaeological Commissioner. It was briefly alluded to in 1893 by Dr. S. Müller Ceylon Inscriptions p. 72 (169).
The Professor will find distinct reference to this arcaic religious ceremony in the *Mahāvaṃsa* (Ch. XV, 24-25), where it is recorded a notice of the quaint formalities observed by King Devanampiya Tissa in bestowing the Mahāmegha Uyana upon the monks at Anurādhapura.

"'It is well,' said the King, and taking a splendid vase he poured water, in (token of) giving, over the hand of the Thēra Mahinda, with the words, 'This Mahāmegha-park do I give to the brotherhood.'" (Geiger)

An illuminating passage in regard to the word *kusalān* occurs in the *Maitri Varnanāva*: "kusalān gaśū kevoda......ē Maitri Budun dekkā nehekmaya."10

How universally recognised the expression "'kusalān' in the sense of "religious benefaction" became many lithic records sufficiently attest, e.g., Ambagamuwa (C. P.); Dimbulāgala (N. C. P.); Polonmaruwa, Galpota (N. C. P.); Batala-goda (N. W. P.); and Nākolagane Vihārē (N. W. P.).

The full text of the first three of these Inscriptions has already been published*(E. Z., 1915-1924 II; C. A., 1917, III., 1918, IV.)* besides allusion to the fifth, and to a short record at Balaḷu-vēwa (N. C. P.).

The record of the Batala-goda and Nākolagane Vihārē Inscriptions11 is now added, so that the oft reiterated use of the term, unmistakable in its technical signification, may be duly emphasised.

**Batala-goda.**

(15) ....Vihārayat̄a kusalān karanu kēmēti (ve pe) re kusalān....

(16) ....Me kusalānāta hasarānayak kaḷa ekēm ētnam kevudū bēlu bat kēyek bālu....(17.).....ata ma)ha narakayēdī ḍuk pēsunoyā Me apa kaḷa kusala matuvannavun taman kaḷā sē(veyi).

10. For this reference, and other elaborate and valuable suggestions, hearty acknowledgment is due to the learned monk Pandit Mābopīṭhīya Medhankara, Vice-Principal, Sangarāja Pīrvana, Kandy.

11. Copied by the Archl. Survey in 1895, and recopied in 1909. The record measures 4 ft 7 in. by 2 ft 7 in., and consists of 13 lines of writing. Categorically stated *(Archl. Survey, Annual Report, 1895, pp. 10, 13)* to belong to Parasākrama Bāhu I, the clear-cut date (B. V. 2101) and character fix lines 14 onwards to the 16th Century.

Regarding "Bandāra-pota Pirinābām Vīga-saṅva," the "Ayusma" of the Mahācānta (LXXX, 32, 38) See C.A., IV., 1918, p. 30.)

With "Kusalā Dīpīṭhiya" of "Kusalānā Malal," a hill in the E. P. with Buddhist ruins and very ancient inscriptions. *(C. A. IV, 1918, p. 113).*
"Being desirous of making a charitable gift (kusalán) of...... to the Viháré......(the former) charitable gift......Should any one cause harm to this benefaction, he will become like one who eats the rice (left for) dogs and crows, and will suffer woe in the Eight Great Hells. May the merit (kusala) of this action which we have performed accrue to others in the future, as though done by them." (C. A. IV. p. 31.)

**Nakalagane.**

(1) Vijaya Bhaññárapotun ambu Sumédhá (2) Deví praveñín vañandá á Seriyá (3) vyavasthañáta báda tenín Nágalátá (4) kusalán koññe pídú Señamáñádalas (5) say In pañaváná dañkuru digín (6) pasamunyék vataná pasayᵃᵃyí (7) Siñavínēn Kusalán Dikpiñiyí (8) Mekun put Patkrama Atvāra Mind Atvāra (9) denna praveñín vyavastha koña vañandá á (10) Nágalátá vataná pasayᵃᵃyí pídú Mūññáñayí (11) Paññalugó Panjis-yále báda Valvasárín (12) Giriññáñúsá Kumārayan Nágalátá kusalán (13) koññe pídú Kuďa Mugaláña Maha Mugalánayí (14) Buddhá varesa deñás eksiyā ekayi Udúuer (15) iye Chuttí Malbyá (nē)ñígíni mekun mëhe (nī) (16) n saminñoiva Nágalátá kusaláná koña pídú Kurú (17) goďa idiriña dañsumña kusaláná pasamunyá vataná (18) pasayᵃᵃyá ......

(At side). Nágalá Bambigas-veva pasamunyá kusalánayí.

"From the place (called) Seriyá continuously possessed as ancestral property, according to decree, by (his) wife Sumédhá Deví, Vijaya Baññára Potun donated Señamáñalasssa, as a charitable benefaction (kusalán koña) to Nágalá (Viháré).

"The existing boundaries (of the land) are (as follows):—Southwards (the land) of five amunãs set apart for the needs of the priesthood ; (West) from Siñavínēn (the land called) Kusalán Dikpiñiyí; (North), (the land called) Mugayína, continuously possessed as ancestral property, according to decree, by their two sons Parákrāma Atvāra and Mind Atvāra, set apart for the needs of the priesthood at Nágalá (Viháré); (East), (the lands called) Kuďa Mugaláña and Maha Mugaláña, from Valvasarā belonging to Pan-tis-yále (lit. thirty-five yálas) at Paññalugó gifted to Nágalá (Viháré), as charitable benefaction, by Giriññá Kumārayá in the year 2101 of the Buddhist era. (A. C. 1557-8).

"Of the ten kusalán amunãs (of land) opposite Kurugóda five amunãs are donated, as charitable gift, to Nágalá Viháré by Malbayá of Udúveriyá, jointly with his sister and mother, for the
needs of the priesthood....Five amunams of Bambigas-vēva at Nāgala (are granted as a) meritorious benefaction."

Upon such evidence will any well-advised Sinhalese scholar be rash enough to descend to the bathos and hopeless error of rendering kusalān, in the particular connection—repeated as it is, again and again—by "drinking vessels"?

Even at this day, the correct use of "kusalān" in the sense of "religious benefaction" is familiar enough among the better-read Buddhist fraternity in Ceylon. The modern expression "koholammu" for "tenants of vihārē property" may derive from kusalān through the medium of Sinhalese koholan "tenement of vihārē."

C. Chronology.

If there be one point more marked than others in regard to the history of the period which intervened between the death of Mahāju Vijaya Bāhu I and the accession of his grandson Mahāju Parakrama Bāhu I, it is the disagreement in the several Chronicles touching the lengths of the reigns of Vikrama Bāhu, Jaya Bāhu and Gaja Bāhu.

Here is the tale of regnal years in all its confusion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHRONICLE</th>
<th>VIKRAMA BĀHU</th>
<th>JAYA BĀHU</th>
<th>GAJA BĀHU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mahāwaṇṣa</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pūjāwaliya</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājāwaliya^13</td>
<td>28, 21</td>
<td>3, 1, 14</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narendra-Charitāva-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lōkana-pradipikāva</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yet in the face of this notable variance, Mr. Wickremasinghe would persistently reject a record inscribed on stone which still survives (litera scripta manet), to juggle with doubtful figures and haphazard assumptions from those figures, in order to bolster up an astounding theory, viz: that, despite their decease, Sinhalese Kings' regnal years could be considered as still current,

---


13. Rājānālaḷiya. Seven copies consulted: for Vikrama Bāhu's reign, six give 28 years; one 21; or Jaya Bāhu's reign, four give 3 years; two, 1 year; one, 14 years.
and lithic records deliberately dated under such fiction. *Credat Judaeus Apella.*

Given such glorious latitude, easy were it indeed for the happy Epigraphist to solve such cruses to his own complete satisfaction.

With strange fatuity Mr. Wickremasinghe ventures (*E. Z.* 1924, II., p. 200) on the categorical assertion that “Jaya Báhu was no longer living at the time when the (Dimbulágala) Inscription was indited.”

Nathless Mr. Wickremasinghe has to admit naively that “this anomaly of dating from the coronation of a deceased king, the first of its kind yet known in Sinhalese Chronology, requires explanation.” Verily does it—much explanation; and will still remain utterly untenable.

The grounds upon which Mr. Wickremasinghe (*E. Z.*, 1924, II, pp. 200-1) rests his case would appear to be these:—.....

(i) Jaya Báhu could not reasonably have been “more than fifteen years” younger than his “uterine” brother Viyaya Báhu; consequently “at the time of his coronation he must have been at least 59”; and, therefore, “86” and “97” respectively when the records were out in the cave at Dimbulágala and on the pillar at Polonnaruwa in the 27th and 38th years of his reign.

(ii) “If we follow the sequence of events as narrated in the *Mahávamsa* (LXI. and LXII), we are bound to come to the conclusion that Jaya Báhu’s death took place in Rohaṇa during the lifetime of Vikrama Báhu (LXII, 1—2), and long before the birth of Parákrama Báhu I.”

(iii) “It is stated (*Pujávaliya*) that he (Jaya Báhu) reigned for 14 years.”

Taking these allegations one by one.

(i) Here Mr. Wickremasinghe “begs” two questions—
(a) the exact relationship of Jaya Báhu to Viyaya Báhu, and
(b) his presumed age at his elder brother’s death.

So far from Jaya Báhu having been necessarily “uterine” brother of Viyaya Báhu, there is interesting indirect evidence in favour of both Víra Báhu and Jaya Báhu being that King’s
half-brothers, 14 sons of the same father Mogallána by a different mother and much later bed. 15 The Maháwansa (LIX, 31, 43) distinctly states that Vijaya Báhu married two of his daughters by Queen Tilakasundari, namely Subhadra and Sumitta, the one to Víra Báhu, the other to Jaya Báhu.

It would seem, therefore, more than probable that Víra Báhu and Jaya Báhu, though by birth half-uncles of their half-sister Mitta’s sons Mánábharana, Kittí Sirimegha, and Siri Vallabha, were of much their age; for those three brothers married the remaining three daughters of Vijaya Báhu and Tilakasundari.

After the deaths of Víra Báhu and Vijaya Báhu, and his own coronation, Jaya Báhu, in the prolonged civil war which ensued, sided with his half-sister, half-nephews, and half-nieces, and shared their fortunes in Southern Ceylon, being forced to abandon Polonnaruwa and the adjacent country to his half-nephew Vikrama Báhu, Vijaya Báhu’s son, who was never crowned.

This solution, if correct, at once simplifies matters; and fully explains Jaya Báhu having reigned in the South for at least thirty-eight years since the death of his much older half-brother Vijaya Báhu, and seventeen years after that of Vikrama Báhu; whose son Gaja Báhu reigned contemporaneously with Jaya Báhu at Polonnaruwa, as proved by the Tamil pillar record unearthed at that old Capital in 1900. 16

(ii) Pace Mr. Wickremasinghe, Jaya Báhu undoubtedly survived Vikrama Báhu. Further, the Maháwansa narrative of

---

14. Three alternatives offer, choice depending on their comparatively probability:—

(i) Mogallána and Lokhitá (Maháwansa, LVII, 42) had four children, Kittí (Vijaya Báhu I) Mitta, Mahinda, Rakhtita. The last two are not mentioned again under those names. If identical with Víra Báhu and Jaya Báhu (who married two of the daughters of their older brother Vijaya Báhu, the other three being wedded to their cousins, Mitta’s sons) it seems reasonable to assume that they were considerably younger, being born to Lokhitá after a long interval and very late in her child-bearing life.

(ii) Mr. John Still (Index to Mahásasna, Table, p. 83, 1907) and Mr. Wickremasinghe (E.Z., 1915, II. Table, p. 58) differentiate between Mahinda and Rakhtita and Víra Báhu and Jaya Báhu, but allot all six children to Mogallána and Lokhitá.

(iii) As Jaya Báhu lived at least 38 years after Vijaya Báhu’s death at 73, he and Víra Báhu may have been not unlikely sons by a later separate bed; and, therefore, only half-brothers of Vikrama Báhu and Mitta.

In this Paper the third alternative is adopted—for the nonce at any rate—as perhaps the most probable in all the circumstances.

15. The Maldive definition of such relationship is expressive, viz:—de-badu eb-badá (“two wombs, one father”). Oriental Rulers, to whom plurality of wives was the rule rather than the exception, often carried their uxorioussness into late life. Thus, to quote but one instance, the Maldive Sultan Iskandar Isábímm (A.C.1656-1693) begot Kuda Muhammad, the boy who succeeded him, at the age of 62.
events runs quite smoothly in this respect from Vijaya Bahu’s death to Parakrama Bahu’s accession in A.C. 1153, with one solitary hitch—at first blush apparently clashing with our present certain knowledge from lithic records discovered of late years, but easily explainable.

For the “sequence” of Chapters LXI and LXII, and their context, are rudely broken by the interpolation of Verse I, obviously irrelevant, at the head of Chapter LXII. Manifestly it is quite out of place here, and in reality belongs to Chapter LXIII; wherein it would find fit setting after Verse 37.

The Pali stanza in question (Ch. LXII, I) reads:—

Rohane nivasitva va Jaya Bahu mahipati
Mittavah rajañicheva tadā kalamakanou te.

“That King Jaya Bahu and Mitta, the Queen, died while they dwelt at Rohana.”$^{17}$

(iii) The value attaching to regnal years in the Sinhalese Chronicles for this stormy period has been assessed above for what it is actually worth.

Civil war, followed by years of hollowly patched-up peace between Jaya Bahu and his half-nephews on the one side, and first Vikrama Bahu, and later his son Gaja Bahu, on the other, would offer conditions very far from conducive to the thoroughly reliable entry in palm-leaf manuscripts, not contemporary, of historical dates. Not till the accession of Parakrama Bahu I, and his long reign, ushered in an era more or less settled temporarily can such perishable chronological data be deemed at all trustworthy.

Mr. Wickremasinghe sets great store by the Pujavaliya as a safe guide for fixing Jaya Bahu’s reign at but 14 years in all. To be consistent should he not equally adopt the same Chronicle’s recorded period of 28 years for Vikrama Bahu, instead of the 21 years allotted by the Mahawansa, which he utilises to fit in with his theories?

In conclusion. This Paper has been drawn up in the hope of aiding any fresh scholar who may care to renew attack upon the panel Inscription at the Maravidiya Caves on Dimbulagala

17. The Mahawansa Editors have imported into their Sinhalese Text “(sagati)” before “rajinii,” as though inclined to understand by “Mitta,” Jaya Bahu’s sister (or half-sister) daughter of Mogallana and Lokhitā, instead of his wife Sumitta, daughter of Vilaya Bahu I and Tilakasundari.
("Gunner's Quoin") in Tamankaduwa, and be glad of all the light at present available.

The photo-lithographed print of the Inscription from Mr. Bell's negative of 1897 appearing in "The Ceylon Antiquary" (Vol. III, Plate V, 1917) being rather indistinct, an enlargement is here given on Plates I, II. Further, in Plate III appears a photo-lithograph of an accurate tracing of Siriwardhana's "eye-copy" made in 1903. This can now be compared with Mr. Bell's "eye-copy" reproduced as Plate VI, and his Sinhalese text as printed, in C.A., 1917.
NOW when we examine the Aryan Vernaculars of India, we are struck with the remarkable manner in which what is here foreshadowed has actually come to pass and is there reflected in realized concrete manifestation. There we find the dative to be the case most in prominence, as widely popular as in Dravidian, and filling many a place which in Aryan some other case should occupy. To illustrate this last proposition, just two examples may be given from Sinhalese, the southernmost member of the group:—

- English: Go to the house.
- Sanskrit: House go (acc. of place).
- Tamil: To the house go (dat.)
- Sinhalese: To the house go (dat.)

- English: I have a book.
- Sanskrit: Of me there is a book.
- Tamil: To me there is a book.
- Sinhalese: To me there is a book.

The principle of declension, too, in Sinhalese is the very same as in Hindi. The terminal suffix of the dative case is derived from a true dative—the Sanskrit word arthāya, ‘for the sake of’, which as a suffix now appears in the attenuated form of ēta, a, and ē. Now, from a grammarian’s point of view, this suffix of the dative case appears in Sinhalese not only in its legitimate function to denote its own particular case, but also in extended functions to denote sometimes the accusative and genitive cases, as in the two examples already given.
The grammarian says that 'to the house' and 'to me,' in the two 'examples given, are in the accusative and genitive case respectively, for the reason that the verb concerned, governs such case in Sanskrit, as seen in the Sanskrit equivalents of the illustrations; and Sanskrit, he says, is the parent language. Whatever be the merits of the claim in favour of the parent language—and that is the very point we are after—we see that, as a matter of fact, the two expressions ('to the house' and 'to me') are in Sinhalese in the dative case with an undeniable dative suffix ('to the house - geṭa; to me - maṭa'), and that, being in the dative case, they conform in the illustrations not to the Aryan, but to the Dravidian standard. It follows then that where the accusative, dative, and the genitive are identical in Sinhalese, from the point of view of Sanskrit grammar, their identity is due from a broader point of view, to the aggression of the dative case, under Dravidian influence, and that the extension, if any, is in direction from the dative to the other two cases, and not vice versa.

We started with the postulate—a postulate drawn from the results of scientific research (Imperial Gazetteer of India, pp. 351-2 already quoted)—that the same Dravidian influence was at work in the evolution of the Indian Vernaculars of the family. If, therefore, the same feature appears in the Hindi noun, we are certain that the process of extension was the same too, i.e., from the dative to the other two cases both in regard to function and to form. Therefore, of the Aryan apologists, only Trumpp with his kṛṭē, which, despite of himself, we have recognised as dative, is now in court, the other two, with their accusative and locative origins of extension, being automatically out of court. Now, we have already seen elsewhere that the Sanskrit kṛṭē could not have been the origin of the dative suffix ko of Hindi; in fact, Trumpp himself does not contend for it; his contention is that kṛṭē is the origin of the accusative-dative suffix kē of Sindhi and kē of Bengali, and that the accusative-dative suffix ko of Hindi is from a Sanskrit accusative kriam.

According to the direction of extension we have seen above he, too, like the others, is thus out of court, apart from the question of merits already discussed; and thus we have only one theory left as the only possible alternative within the range of scientific probability, and that is the theory of Caldwell. He suggested that ko, the dative-accusative suffix in Hindi, and ḱā, ki, kē, the suffixes
of the genitive and the different variations of these in other languages of the group, are of Dravidian origin, being connected with the suffix of the dative case appearing in Tamil as ku. That theory was assailed at the time, and with enough success to make Caldwell withdraw. But, though assailed, the theory has never been scientifically refuted, and today in the light of the evidence of science, it is entitled to step back again into its place of eminence and to prevail.

The Noun.

(6) I have already mentioned that in Sanskrit the noun has three numbers and that for each number the case suffixes are different. In other words, there are three sets of terminal suffixes in the declension of a Sanskrit noun. In Tamil, the terminal suffixes are all one set both for the singular and the plural number, the plurality of a noun under inflection being shewn by a suffix (non-terminal in the oblique cases) which to that extent changes the base, the rule being liable to idiomatic exceptions. The Aryan Vernaculars have but one set of terminals for both numbers of the noun, and in that great respect conforms to the Tamil system.

Here the advocates of Aryan structure can properly object that it was not so in the original Prakrit, nor in the Prakrit of the second stage as pictured in Jain Prakrit and Pāli, which were contemporaneous, and which, still preserving the synthetic inflection, do not show the moulding on Dravidian lines. We say in reply that if you go further back and back and settle on Aryan itself, you will be in a better position; that at the stage seen in the early Prakrits, the disappearance of the dual number already shews Dravidian influence; and that further changes under the same influence, continuously though unconsciously exerted by the masses with their patois, were but a question of time. When the vernaculars had fully evolved under such influence, we find them bearing on almost every feature the Dravidian stamp imprinted unmistakably.

On this Beames makes a flank attack in the shape of an observation which loses nothing in rhetorical effectiveness by being embellished with a beautiful figure of speech. He says:—

"In the Indian languages postpositions took the place of the European prepositions; but in other respects the process (‘of change from the synthetic to the analytic’) was precisely identical
in both. It is not pretended that the European languages were subjected to non-Aryan or any other external influence to make them undergo these changes; it is admitted that they grew naturally out of the course taken by the human tongue and the human mind. The flower of synthesis budded and opened, and when full blown, began, like all other flowers, to fade. Its petals, that is its inflections, dropped off, one by one; and in due course the fruit of analytical structure sprung up beneath it, and grew and ripened in its stead.” (Comp. Gr. Vol. i., p. 45).

Far be it from me to mar the effect of this fascinating picture. But with regard to the Indian vernaculars I have to observe that the appearance of the fruit of analytical structure is mere illusion, due to fancy, as regards the noun with which alone we are here concerned. For if postpositions are the same in character as prepositions, with only difference of place, then postpositions are significant words with an independent meaning and capable of independent existence. The same cannot be said of the apparatus, (ko and the other terminals), which help in the declension of the Indian noun; these are mere appendages with no independent existence, and, whatever the theories of their origin, they are true suffixes. That being so, the declension of the noun in these vernaculars is synthetic, and the fruit of analytic structure present in the European languages must be admired independently.

It may be urged that in Sinhalese, the dative suffix ta, coming as it does from arthāya (Sanskrit arthāya—Pali atthāya—Sinhalese aṭṭaya-aṭṭa) is evolved from a significant word, and thus has not only passed the analytic stage, but is now on the second synthetic stage. The contention must be allowed, but it must be pointed out, at the same time, that it amounts to nothing; for if it is claimed that it shews analytic inflection, then the same can be said in favour of the Tamil verb, in the inflection of which all the terminal suffixes, as will be shewn hereafter, are relics or reminders of pronouns, just the same as ta is a reminder of arthāya. But both sides take it as a cardinal fact that the Tamil verb is not analytic, and that is one of the bases of argument.

A More Formidable Objection.

Beames urges also a second and more formidable objection—more formidable in that it is more technical and combines the true and the fanciful in such a manner as to invest the whole with an air of reality. This is what he says:—
“Now it is very certain, as certain as anything can well be, that all the non-Aryan languages of India are still in the agglutinative stage. If, then, they exercised any influence on the structure of the Aryan speech, such influence would tend to make that also agglutinative; in other words, the Aryans would have had to go backwards, and try and find out what were the agglutinated particles from which their own inflectional terminations had arisen; and having found them, would have been led to use them no longer conveniently incorporated into their words, but disintegrated and separate. Thus, a vulgar Aryan who said homi for “I am,” would have had to re-construct out of his inner consciousness the older form bhavami, and, not content with that, to further resolve bhavami into its two component elements of bhū and āmi, and henceforth to use these two words adjacent to each other, but unincorporated. This we see at once is out of the question and absurd.” (Comp. Gr. vol. i. p. 46.)

Of course it is absurd; but the absurdity arises not from any weakness in the position attacked, but from the many errors into which the talented writer, in his warm advocacy, has fallen. In the first place, he again adjusts his glasses wrongly in supposing that the present Aryan vernaculars of India are an evolution from Aryan speech in the hands of Aryans. We have already seen what modern science has to say on the subject—that it evolved at the hands of Dravidian natives who handled incoming Aryan speech as a “pigeon,” i.e. on the principles of their own idiom. There is therefore no point in the suggestion that a vulgar Aryan would have had to make a philological analysis of his inflectional system and recast it first into an agglutinative and then an analytical form. In fact the Aryan dolt and his vulgarity of speech need scarcely count in the business at all, except as subsidiary to the Dravidian peasant.

It was the latter who was responsible with the millions of his kinsfolk, for a readjustment of his language to suit new conditions made a daily necessity by the aggressive influx of a new element causing a general unsettlement. He knew nothing of synthesis or analysis, but did his best according to his habits of thought and ingrained ideas, going in the old ways as far as he could, and making improvements and new departures where the main object, clearness, made it imperative. If in this latter process he sometimes stumbled upon ways and means which science has since called analytical inflection, it was only natural under the circumstances, since it was the same necessity for clearness that led to the same result appearing in the analytical languages of Europe. Like begets like, and the fancy of a general movement of the human
mind sweeping like a wave over a particular family of human speech, is scarcely necessary to account for similar phenomena in two distant parts of the world arising under the same law of necessity. The argument of absurdity thus turns out on close inspection to be a mere bogey.

Other Objections.

There are other objections brought forward by Beames, but they all have the same trend, due to the same cardinal error with regard to the true locus of evolution of these vernaculars. They therefore need no independent discussion after what has preceded. But there is one argument which should be reproduced if only to show the extent and magnitude of the strange fallacies which inspired the fervour of Beames as an Aryan champion, and indirectly gives us also an insight into the ideas current in his day among other champions of the cause—ideas still holding the field. Beames thus philosophises:—

"The ancient Indian languages are exact structural parallels to the ancient European languages, the modern are also precisely parallel to the modern of Europe; does it not seem to follow, as a logical consequence, that the method and process of their change, from the one stage to the other, was also parallel, and in both cases, due to internal rather than external influences?" (Comp. Gr. vol. i. p. 45.)

It must be owned that the ancient Indian languages (of the Aryan family, of course,) are exact structural parallels to the ancient languages of Europe (of the same family), but it must be flatly denied that the modern are also precisely parallel to the modern of Europe. Indeed, far from supporting the Aryan view, in the actual truth herein lies the full strength of the case on the non-Aryan side. In the modern languages of Europe which have become analytic, the noun is inflected by means of prepositions; in modern Indian the declension is by means of what these scholars choose to call postpositions, but which are found to be in reality true suffixes. The analysis that is claimed is not the same in kind or quality if it existed; but in India it is, as a matter of fact, non-existent.

To say that ghořē, the nom. plur. of ghořū, horse, or pōthiyām, the acc. plur. of pōthi, 'book,' is analytic, is as correct as saying that equity and libros are analytic. It would be the same if rājā-om-ko and its Latin equivalent reg-i-bus (dative) were called analytic expressions. Again, in the verb of the European languages,
the ancient structure remains intact whatever changes the body of the expression may have undergone by phonetic wear and tear and shrinkage. In the Indian verb as well as in other parts of speech, phonetic loss is phenomenal, resulting in the wholesale disappearance of consonants. I lay, however, no stress on this; let the difference be dismissed as one of degree rather than of quality; but there are other changes, and those of a vital character, which cannot be accounted for as attendant on the natural course of physical abrasion, since they have reference not to the outer but to inner life and function, and correspond exactly to Tamil analogues. Two of these will here be simply mentioned.

In Aryan languages, as exemplified by Latin, Greek, Sanskrit, the verb carried the power of expressing passivity as much as activity by mere synthetic inflection operating on the stem; and in all these languages, the perfect participle was always passive (except, in a few roots, the deponents). In the Dravidian verb, passivity is unknown; hence, in Dravidian languages, these two characteristics depending upon passivity are unknown; to convey passive sense, a periphrastic form of expression has to be adopted, in which passivity still resides only in the final effect, but not in a verb. Now, what happens when the Aryan verb goes through the Indian village mill and comes out as the verb in the modern vernaculars? Why, its inherent power of passive expression is only a memory kept alive by an obscure dialect here and there, and, as a prominent feature, conspicuously absent from the broad face of the vernaculars as a whole. That was a change on the negative side, corresponding to a want in the Dravidian verb. When we come to the perfect participle, we find the change there still more remarkable: whereas the perfect participle was, in the language of origin, passive (as *visus* in Latin), it now appears with a strongly developed active side to its functional life: thus Sanskrit *drato bhavāmi*, Pali *dīṭṭho hōmi* means *visus sum*; but Hindi *dēkhā hum*, which is identically the same in structure, to say nothing of the origin, means not ‘I have been seen,’ as in Aryan, but ‘I have seen’ after Dravidian. What led to the change, the action of the Indian village mill, is patent; but while that should be borne in mind, the point to be noted here is that Beames was very much mistaken when he spoke of exact parallels, precise parallels, etc., in such confident and emphatic language. He says indeed that he was ‘very imperfectly acquainted with the non-Aryan languages.’
How far he meant us to understand by that is not clear, but it would seem that he was not quite insensible to some of his outstanding difficulties in that direction, as the following confession shows:—

"It must therefore be always remembered that though the modern Aryan verb presents in its structure certain similarities to the Dravidian or Kol verb, and some analogies also with the Tibetan and Himalayan verb, as well as with the noun of both, yet this very similarity to two such widely sundered groups reduces us to the necessity of admitting that the connection is not one of family, but of stage. Tibetan and Dravidian alike are in the agglutinative stage; and, as mentioned before, the analytical stage, in which the modern Aryan languages are, resembles in many particulars the agglutinative stage, though the difference is generally to be detected by a close scrutiny." (Comp. Gr. Vol. i. p. 47.)

His facts here are more valuable to us than his explanation. On the facts then "the modern Aryan verb presents in its structure certain similarities to the Dravidian," and the similarity is to be accounted for on the ground not of family, but of stage, that is to say, as being due to the same stage. Yet, in the same breath, it is not due to the same stage! But let that pass. This is the question: Can the stage meant, whatever that may be, which, in any case, could only be concerned with the anatomy of a vocable, produce such a phenomenon as active functions from the passivity of a verb?

(7) In Sanskrit the singular and the plural forms of a noun are wide apart and never interchangeable. In Tamil, the singular may often be used for the plural, even though the objects be viewed in a state of detachment. Thus: oru kudirei, "one horse"; aindu kudirei vevverai vanginen, "I bought five horses separately." In most Aryan vernaculars, the Tamil idiom prevails. Thus ek ghória, "one horse"; pānc ghória, "five horses"; ṛṣikē vacan satya hōnge, "the words of the sage will become true." (Kellogg, 2nd ed. p. 396.)

(8) In Sanskrit, (and in the early Prakrits) the adjective was inflected for gender, number, and case, and, when used predicatively, such inflection was compulsory. In Tamil, the adjective is an indeclinable. In the Aryan Vernaculars, the Dravidian influence has so far affected the adjective, that it now halts between the Aryan and Dravidian, and sometimes entirely conforms to the Dravidian idiom. The following is an illustration of this full influence:—vah ati sundar thi, "she was very beautiful" (Kellogg, 2nd ed. p. 426) where the form sundar has no distinction of gender, number, or case.
(9) In Sanskrit the case of possession is the genitive. Thus: 'I have a book' is mama pustakan asti, 'of me there is a book.' In Tamil, it is the dative. Thus: enakkū pustakam irrukiradu, 'to me there is a book.' In the Aryan vernaculars, the idiom is the Tamil. Thus mujhkō pōthi hai, "to me there is a book"; hamem itnā jñān kahām, "to us where is so much wisdom?" (Kellogg, 2nd ed. p. 403.)

(10) In Sanskrit, verbs expressive of communication (such as say, tell, announce, etc.) may take either the accusative, the instrumental, the dative, the genitive, or even the locative, of the person addressed, there being sometimes an option between two or more of these cases, with the accusative of the thing (see Monier Williams, Sanskrit Dictionary, under roots kath, brú, vac, vad, etc.) But, in Tamil, the rule is different and rigorous, and stringently requires the person to be in the dative case. In the Aryan Vernaculars the Dravidian idiom rules. Ex: Sanskrit : satyam māṁ vada, "truth me say"; Hindi : satya mujhko bōl, "truth to me say." ('Mujhko,' though also an optional form of the accusative, is here dative; for, if accusative, its other form 'mujhe.' would also have been eligible here, which is not the case). Tamil : unmai enakkku (c) col, "truth to me say."

(11) In Sanskrit, verbs of obtaining take the nominative of the person and the objective of the thing obtained. In Tamil the idea is that the thing comes to the person, and while the thing takes the nominative, the person is in the dative case. Example, English : 'You will be getting money'; Tamil : 'To you money will be coming', ('unakkā (p) panam kideikkum'). In the Aryan vernaculars the idiom is Dravidian. Thus: Hindi tumko dhan miltā hai, 'to you money will be coming.' Sanskrit: dhanam tvam lapsyasi, 'money thou wilt get' or dhanam tvam prāpsyasi (same). Similarly Hindi: Unkō cārom padārtha mīlē haim 'to them the four blessings come,' i.e., they obtain the four blessings. (Kellogg, 2nd ed. p. 404).

12. On account of one set of terminals serving for both numbers in the inflection of the Tamil noun, the difference of number has to be shewn by an infix (or even two) between the stem and the terminal in the oblique cases, and in the nominative case by this infix itself which may then be called the primary suffix. The following two examples are in illustration:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Infix</th>
<th>Terminal</th>
<th>Stem.</th>
<th>Infix.</th>
<th>Terminal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom. Manicān</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Manicān</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>gal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc. Manicān</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>ej</td>
<td>Manicān</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>gal – ei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat. Manicān</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>(uk) ku</td>
<td>Manicān</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>gal – (uk) ku</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| Nom. Mara    | – m   | –       | Mara(m)  | –      | gal      |
| Acc. Mara-(t) t | –     | ei      | Mara(m)  | –      | gal – ei |
| Dat. Mara-(t) t | –     | (uk) ku | Maram(m) | –      | gal – (uk) ku |

In Sanskrit the terminal suffixes being different for the different numbers of the noun, they serve at the same time the purposes of shewing both number and case: hence in that noun such an expedient as infixes is both unnecessary and unknown. But in the Aryan vernaculars, declension is effected by means of infix and terminal. Example:

Noun: *Ghōrā*, horse, masc. Stem: *ghōr*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Infix</th>
<th>Terminal</th>
<th>Stem.</th>
<th>Infix.</th>
<th>Terminal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acc(1) ghōr</td>
<td>– ā</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>(1) ghōr –</td>
<td>ē</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ghōr</td>
<td>– ē</td>
<td>– kō</td>
<td>(2) ghōr –</td>
<td>ōm –  kō</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat. (Same as accusative in both numbers)</td>
<td>Ab. ghōr</td>
<td>– ē – sē</td>
<td>ghōr –</td>
<td>ōm – sē</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is plain the picture is purely Dravidian; and if we take the lineaments and not the canvas into account, the same is the picture presented by the noun in declension in almost every Aryan vernacular. In other words, the principles of declension in the Aryan vernaculars are from the Dravidian.

I have thus given a dozen fundamental principles to illustrate the wide jurisdiction of the Dravidian idiom in the handling of the noun in these so-called Aryan vernaculars. According to Max Muller’s opinion, the presence of a single fundamental piece of evidence is enough to determine the true class of a language. A round dozen, and that in the noun alone, ought to be considered, it is deemed, satisfactory even by the most exacting.

*(To be Continued)*
THE PETA-VATTHU.

Translated by
THE REV. HENRY SNYDER GEHRMAN, PH. D.

BOOK IV.

(Continued from Vol. IX, Part II. Page 91).

1. The Peta-Story of Ambasakkhara.

NOW comes the peta-story of Ambasakkhara. What is the origin of it? While the Blessed One was living at Jetavana, a Licchavin king called Ambasakkhara, who was a heretic and a skeptic, reigned in Vesāli. At that time there was in the city of Vesāli a swamp near the shop of a certain merchant. As they crossed there with leaps, many people became exhausted, and some they splashed with mud. At the sight of this the merchant thought, "These people shall not go through the mire." So he ordered a piece of fragrant sandal wood, which in colour resembled conch shells, to be brought and laid down. Now in disposition he was moral, free from anger, and of gentle speech, and to others he proclaimed virtue correctly. One day, in a spirit of jest, he hid the under-garment of a friend of his who was bathing and carelessly failed to keep his eye on it. Then, after he had vexed him, he returned it.

But his nephew stole goods from other people's houses and deposited them, to our surprise, in the shop of this uncle. The owners of the goods made an investigation and presented him and his nephew with the goods to the king. His Majesty commanded, "Cut off this fellow's head, but impale his nephew upon a stake." The king's men obeyed. After having died, the uncle was reborn among the terrestrial gods. For having made the causeway of sandal wood he received a celestial blood-horse, white in colour and quick as thought; on account of his golden words to the virtuous, a heavenly odour exhaled from his body; but, because he
hid the cloak, he was nude. After he had beheld the deed which he himself committed in his previous existence and thereupon had seen his own nephew raised upon a stake, urged by compassion he mounted his horse which was quick as thought and at midnight he arrived at the place where he was impaled. He stood afar off and continued saying day after day, "Living man, I say, life alone is happiness."

At that time, while King Ambasakkhara was comfortably riding on the back of an elephant and making a solemn procession around the city, he saw a lady looking at his royal splendour from an open window in a certain house. He was captivated, and to a man who was sitting near by, he made a sign meaning, "Investigate the house and that lady." In due course he entered the royal palace and sent for the man, saying: "Go, sir, and find out whether that lady be married or single." He went, and, upon learning that she had a husband, he told the king. The latter, after considering a means of taking possession of her, summoned her husband and said, "Come, sir, and wait on me." Although against his will, yet out of fear he agreed to serve His Majesty, thinking: "If I do not obey his word, the King may inflict upon me his royal punishment." Accordingly he came day after day to minister to the ruler. The monarch, on his part, had his board and wages given him, and, after the lapse of several days, he thus spoke to him as he came to his work early in the morning: "Come now, in such and such a place there is a lotus-pond; bring me from there some red earth and red lotuses. If you do not return this very day, you shall not live." When he was gone, he told his door-keeper: "To-day, exactly at sunset, all the gates must be closed."

Now the lotus-pond was three yojanas from Vesālī. And so this man, frightened by the fear of death, with wind-like speed came to the lotus-pond that same forenoon. In the first place he thought, "This lotus-pool is guarded by a demon," but, being quite without fear as far as this idea was concerned, he circumambulated the pond completely, thinking, "Well, here to be sure there is some danger." When the guardian of the pool, a demon who looked as though he had some conception of pity, came up in human form and saw him, he said, "Man, pray why have you come hither?" He told him the state of affairs. As the supernatural being showed his heavenly form, he disappeared with the
words, "If so, take what you need." Then he took some red earth and red lotuses and, exactly at sunset, arrived at the city gate. When the gate-keeper saw him, he closed the door on him in spite of his cries. When the portal was shut and he could not obtain admission, he addressed the man who was transfixed upon a pale near the gateway and made him his witness, saying: "These have closed the gate upon me, even though I got here exactly at sunset and I called out; I arrived in time; it is not my fault; let this be known by you also." When the convict saw him, he said: "Impaled upon a stake, I am facing death and about to die. How can I be your witness? But a peta who possesses supernatural power will come here into my presence; make him your witness." "But how am I to see him?" "Stay right here and you shall see for yourself." So he stood there, and in the middle watch he saw the peta coming whom he made his witness.

At dawn the king said to him: "You have transgressed my commandment; therefore I shall inflict upon you the royal punishment." He, however, replied: "Lord, I have not violated your order, since I arrived here at sunset." Then the king asked, "Who is your witness?" Then, pointing to the naked peta who came near the man impaled on the stake, he stated, "This one is my witness." In reply to the king's question, "How are we to believe this"? he said: "To-night you shall believe, send a man with me." When the king heard this, he himself in person went with him to the place and waited. But after the peta had come thither and said: "Living man, I say, life alone is happiness," he asked him with the five stanzas beginning with the line, "Here you have no bed or couch." But the first stanza which begins with the words, "There is a city of the Vajjins called Vesāḷī," was placed here by the redactors of the Holy Scriptures in order to show the connexion of these.

1. There is a city of the Vajjins called Vesāḷī; in that place lived Ambasakkhara, the Licchavin. When he saw the peta outside the city, he wished to know the cause and asked him on the spot:

2. "Here you have no bed or couch nor do you go forwards or backwards; you do not have the pleasure of clothes nor of enjoying food and drink. As regards a maid, that also is something which you do not have now.

3. "Your kinsmen and friends whom you had seen and of whom you had heard, who were compassionate to you in your
previous existence, now they do not have the opportunity even of seeing you. Alas you are forsaken by those people.

4. "There are no friends for him who has gone down. When companions see one in misery, they desert him; and while they see his prosperity, they throng about him. For him who has gone up, there are many friends.

5. "For having enjoyed all pleasures, it necessarily follows that one must have low purposes. His body shall be entirely destroyed and broken all around. Just as the clinging dew-drop, so to-day or to-morrow shall life be annihilated."

6. Him who was in this condition, frightened, and enduring the most intense agony at the pale of nimbo wood, he addressed with the following words, "Now, yakka, why did you say, 'Living man, I say, life alone is happiness'?

When the king had asked him, the peta declared his thoughts and spoke four stanzas:

7. "This man was my kinsman; I remember his previous existence. When I saw him, I felt pity for him, lest with his low morality he should fall down to hell.

8. "When, O Licchavini, this man will have departed from here, for having committed sinful deeds he will be reborn in hell, a place which is crowded with living beings; it is a dreadful-looking region, exceedingly hot, severe, and frightful.

9. "Even this stake with its various features is better than that hell. May he not fall down to the severe and frightful hell which is always horrible and has nothing but suffering.

10. "Now if this man hears this statement of mine, being brought to misery, he will depart from life. Therefore I do not say it in his presence, lest I be the one through whom he lose his life."

Thus the peta declared his purpose. But the king took occasion to ask for information about the peta and spoke this stanza:

11. "I understand this case of the man, but there is something else I desire to ask you. If you grant us permission, we shall put the question to you, but you must not become angry at us."

This stanza is the peta's reply to the king's speech:

12. "Truly then I got a proposition. It will not be a story by an unbeliever. Though it be against my will, I assert facts as utterances to be believed. Ask me what you like, and I shall reply as I am able."

Since the peta in these words had given an opportunity to ask questions, the king spoke the following stanza:

13. "Whatever I behold with mine eye, absolutely in all of it I shall have full faith. If I should not believe even when I have seen, then, yakka, you may make it mine own affair."

When the yakka had heard him, he spoke as follows:
14. "Let me have your faithful promise. When you have heard the Law, accept the faith; it is connected with knowledge and does not have a wicked thought. Whatever Law has been heard or even not heard by you, all I shall proclaim as knowledge."

King: 15 "Upon a decorated white horse you come hither to him who is impaled upon a stake. This is a means of going that is wonderful and worthy to be seen. Of what deed is this the consequence?"

Peta: 16. "In the middle of this city of Vesālī, in the path through the swamp there was a troublesome spot. One day, in a religious mood, I took some white sandal wood and laid it in the place that was hard to cross.

17. "As we placed our feet upon it, both others and I went across. This is a conveyance that is wonderful and worthy to be seen. Of that very deed is this the result."

King: 18. "Your countenance illuminates all the regions, and in all directions your fragrance is wafted. You possess the supernatural power of a yakkha and have great might, but you are naked. Of what is this the result?"

Peta: 19. "Free from anger and always of a believing mind, I approached the people with gentle words. Of that same deed is this the result; my divine countenance is continually resplendent.

20. "When I noticed the fame and renown of those who were firm in the Law, I proclaimed it with religious intent. Of that very deed is this the result; my heavenly perfume is continually wafted forth.

21. "While my companions were washing themselves in the bathing-place, I took their raiment and hid it on the land. I wished to play a joke and had no evil motive. On that account I am nude, and my condition is miserable.

22. "If any one commits evil in sport, such, they say, is the fruit of his deeds; but if one does it intentionally, what do they say is the result of his acts?

23. "Whatever men have wicked thoughts in the mind and are impure in word and deed, beyond a doubt at the dissolution of the body they enter hell as their future state.

24. "But others, hoping for happiness, find delight in charity and hold themselves in restraint; at the dissolution of the body, these beyond a doubt enter bliss as their future state."

When the peta had thus clearly distinguished and shown in a mere abstract the fruits of karma, the king, who did not believe what he heard, spoke this verse:

25. "Why, pray, should I really believe this: 'This is the fruit of virtue and of sin?' Or what have I seen that I should sincerely believe? Or who too could make me believe this?"

In reply the peta spoke these stanzas:

26. "When you have seen and heard, have a resolute faith; here you see the result of virtue and wickedness. If both virtue and wickedness are non-existent, would it be that beings are blessed or distressed?
27. "And if human beings did not commit virtuous and wicked deeds here in the world of men, not would people, the high and the low, be blessed or distressed in the world of men.

28. "And because human beings commit virtuous and wicked deeds in the world of men, therefore people, the high and low, are blessed or distressed in the world of men.

29. "Of two sorts, they say to-day, is the result of deeds; one must understand that of the blessed one and that of the one in trouble. The gods attend upon (the blessed ones), but the unconverted, those that do not see this twofold result, are tortured in hell."

He was asked the question: "But you who thus believe in the fruit of karma, why do you successively undergo such misery?"

In that connexion he spoke this stanza:

30. "I myself have not done any (good) deeds, and there is no one who in bestowing gifts would ascribe (to my credit) clothes and a bed besides food and drink. Therefore I am nude, and my condition is miserable."

When the king heard that he desired the advantage of clothes and other gifts, he spoke the following stanza:

31. "Now, verily there must be some means, O yakka, whereby you may obtain clothes. Tell me what is their source; we shall listen to a trustworthy statement of the wherewithal."

Then the peta, in telling him the means, replied in these stanzas:

32. "There is here a monk by the name of Kappitaka; he is meditative and moral, an emancipated saint; he restrains his senses, keeps his precepts secret, is calm, and has attained the highest doctrines.

33. "He is kind in speech, affable, meek, and pleasant, and his greeting is sincerely expressed. Peacefully he dwells in the region of virtue and deserves gifts from gods and men.

34. "He is tranquil and has dispelled the haze of wicked thoughts; he is free from suffering and lusts; he is emancipated and has rid himself of pangs. He is upright and without egotism; he is not attached to the conditions of renewed existence, and all his spiritual impediments have ceased. He has attained the threefold knowledge with majesty.

35. "Although they have seen him, he is little known and has few acquaintances; among the Vajjins they regard him as a sage. The yakkas know him as free from desire, a man of good principles, who dwells upon earth.

36. "If you give him in my name a pair of garments or a double set, and he accepts them, me also you will see furnished with garments."

Then the king asked him where the saint lived:

37. "In what place does the ascetic dwell? We shall go and see him now. He is the one who today can dispel from me doubt and uncertainty, the puppet-shows of heresy."

Then the peta said:
38. "He is seated in Kapinaccana, surrounded by many gods. He is delivering a sermon, doing justice to his name and earnest in his own abstinence from anger."

When the *peta* had thus informed him, the king was anxious to meet the saint without delay and spoke this stanza:

39. "Now I will go and do as you suggested. I will array the ascetic in a pair of garments, and he shall accept them. Then you too we shall see provided with clothes."

Now the elder was instructing the *petas* in religion. Therefore in this connexion in his advice about the proper time of approaching him, the *peta* spoke this stanza.

40. "I do not go to an ascetic at an inauspicious occasion. Very well! Licchavin, this is not a proper time for you. Visit him later on at a seasonable moment and find him sitting all alone in that very same place."

Upon this counsel of the *peta*, the king said, "All right!" and straightway returned home. When a fitting opportunity arrived, he took the eight pair of garments and went up to the elder. He took a seat near him and with a friendly greeting said: "Reverend sir, accept these eight pair of garments." Upon hearing him, for the sake of starting the conversation, the elder addressed him: "Great king, formerly you were not disposed to give and were inclined to injure the mendicant monks and the brahmans; how happens this desire of handing out excellent clothes?" In reply the king told him the affair and related to the elder his association with the *peta* and all that he had learned from him. Then he donated the clothes and ascribed to the *peta* the credit of the gift. In consequence of this celestial garments were presented to the *peta*. Adorned and dressed up, he appeared on horseback before the elder and the king. When the monarch saw him, he was pleased and delighted and in his joy and satisfaction he formed a friendship with the *peta* and said: "Verily with my own eyes I have seen the result of one's deeds; I will not give an inauspicious gift; just a meritorious one will I bestow." In reply the *peta* said: "O Licchavin king, if from now on you renounce wickedness and do nothing but practise righteousness, I shall become your friend and I shall visit you. Then quickly release from the stake the man who is impaled. Thus the latter will obtain life and in his exercise of righteousness will be freed from his misery. On the other hand you go to the elder from time to time, and having heard
religious instruction, perform worthy deeds.” Thereupon the pēta went his way.

Then the king saluted the elder, and upon his entrance into the city, he convoked the Licchavin assembly without delay. When he had asked their permission, he released the man from the pale and sent for a physician, saying, “Heal this man.” Thereupon he called on the elder and asked him: “Now, reverend sir, can one obtain release from a permanent abode in hell after having committed deeds which lead to perdition?” The elder responded: “It is possible, great king; if he performs eminent merit, he is released,” and he established the king in the refuges and the five moral precepts. Since he stood firm in these principles, he remained under the instruction of the elder and became a convert. Moreover the man who had been impaled, was cured, and being greatly moved, he became a monk. Only a little later he attained Arhatship. In explaining this matter, the redactors of the Holy Scriptures spoke these stanzas:

41. When he had spoken, the Licchavin, surrounded by his servants, went to that place. He approached the city and reached his house, his own abode.

42. And then in due course he performed his householder duties; he bathed and took a drink of water. Having chosen a fitting opportunity and having selected from a basket eight pair of garments, the Licchavin delivered them in company with his servants.

43. When he arrived at that place, he saw the ascetic of undisturbed thoughts who had returned from his meal. He was tranquil and sat on the root of a tree.

44. When he came up to him, he spoke to him in these words and asked him about his health and well-being: “I am a Licchavin from Vesālī, if you please, and I am known as Ambasakkhara, the Licchavin.

45. “Accept from me, reverend sir, these eight pair of excellent garments; I give them to you. Just for this purpose have I come hither that I might be happy.”

Ascetic: 46. “Even from afar the ascetics and the brāhmans avoid your dwelling. In your home the bowls are broken and also the monks’ cloaks are rent.

47. “Now others with low and wicked women made the ascetics fall head foremost; such annoyance the monks and the ascetics meet at your hands.

48. “Not even sesame oil with grass did you give them nor do you tell the road to him who has lost his way. From blind men you yourself take a stick. Such a man you are, niggardly and
unrestrained. Now just what have you seen and in what form will you make a distribution among us?"

King: 49. "Reverend sir, I acknowledge the truth of what you say. I injured the ascetics and the brāhmans. Fun was not my motive, and my thoughts were wicked; verily, your reverence, that offence of mine was nothing less than a sin.

50. "Verily he engendered wickedness in jest. Having imperfect happiness, he experiences pain. He is young and youthful, but he suffers nakedness of body. Now what is worse for him than this?

51. "Reverend sir, I saw him in terror and in sin; therefore I give a gift. Lord, accept eight pair of garments, and let these presents go to the credit of the yakkha."

Ascetic: 52. "Surely the gift in many ways is acceptable and may it have endless virtue for you, the giver. I accept from you the eight pair of garments; may these presents redound to the credit of the yakkha."

53. Then forsooth the Licchavin sipped water for purification and gave the elder the eight pair of garments, thinking, "May they be acceptable; behold the yakkha wearing clothes."

54. Then he saw him anointed with the essence of sandal wood, of good birth and of noble appearance. He was mounted on horseback and was adorned and wore excellent clothes. He was surrounded (by attendants) and had attained the supernatural power of a yakkha.

55. Joyfully and with gladness the king saw him. The monarch had happy thoughts and appeared agreeable and handsome; for he had seen his deed and its great result; he had beheld it in reality with his own eyes.

56. He went up to him and addressed him as follows: "I will give a gift to the ascetics and the brahmans; in fact I do not have anything which is not to be given away. You, yakkha, have been for me a great benefactor."

Peta: 57. "And you, Licchavin, have given me gifts, this portion which has not been in vain. I for my part shall form friendship with no one but you, I, the superhuman, with you, the human."

King: 58. "The way, a kinsman, a refuge, a friend you have been to me, yea also a deity to me. I beseech you with an amjali; yakkha, I desire to see you again."

Peta: 59. "If you become unbelieving, appear miserly, or entertain false opinions, and in that same state you are allowed to see me, even though I notice you, I will not talk to you.

60. "If you have respect for the Law, find delight in liberality, keep yourself restrained, and are a fountain of supply for the ascetics and the Brāhmans, and if you in that condition have the opportunity to see me and I take notice of you, I shall speak kindly to you."
61. "Quickly free this man from the pale, since through this event we have formed intimate relations. I am thinking of the tortures of the man transfixed upon the stake; we have here made a mutual friendship.

62. "And if this man is quickly released from the stake, he will zealously practise virtuous deeds and be freed from this veritable hell. One may have merit without having to make it known.

63. "Go to Kapitaka and at the proper time share (some of your substance) with him. Take a seat before him and ask him yourself. He will tell you about this affair.

64. "Visit this same monk and ask him; he desires the good and does not have wicked thoughts. According to his knowledge he will explain what has not been heard by the common run of people, yea all of the Law he will proclaim."

(And thoughtfully he preached on the Law and on happiness.)

65. When he had conversed there in secret and formed a friendship with the superhuman being, he departed to the Licchavins; then he addressed the assembly which was in session:

King : 66. "Lords, listen to a word from me; I shall choose the better course; I shall obtain my desire. A man of covetous deeds has been fastened upon a stake. Punishment has been inflicted upon him, and he has gotten the appearance (of one in that torment).

67. "So far, for the space of twenty nights, since he has been impaled, he has been neither alive nor dead. Now I will release him so that the Church may forgive my intention."

Assembly : 68. "Both this one and another one quickly release. So let them act, wondering, 'Who might have declared this?' According to what is your enlightenment, so do, that the Church may forgive your intention."

69. He went up to the place and liberated without delay the man who was impaled. Then he said to him: "Friend, do not fear," and he provided him with physicians.

70. The Licchavin went into the presence of Kapitaka and in due course shared with him (a portion of his substance). He himself took a seat in front of him, and in wishing to find out the means, asked him with these very words:

King : 71. "A man of covetous deeds has been transfixed upon a stake. Punishment has been inflicted upon him, and his appearance shows the effects of torment. So far, for the space of twenty nights, since he has been impaled, he has been neither alive nor dead."

72. "Now I went and released him; for, reverend sir, it was the advice of this yakkha. Pray now, might there be some reason or other that he will not enter hell?

73. "Reverend sir, tell me if there is a way out; we shall listen to a trustworthy means from you. Is it not possible to
erased or remove those deeds, although we do not understand it here?"

Ascetic: 74. "If night and day, earnestly and zealously, he should perform good works, for that reason he would be freed even from hell; but his deed should be known elsewhere."

King: 75. "This affair of the man is not known. Now, reverend sir, pity me also. Teach me, admonish me, very learned one, that I may not enter hell."

Ascetic: 76. "Not later than to-day with a pious mind find refuge in the Buddha, the Law, and the Church and similarly take upon yourself the five moral precepts whole and unbroken.

77. "Refrain forthwith from the taking of life; reject in this world what is not given to you; do not indulge in strong drink, nor speak falsely; and be content with your own wife.

78. "And solemnly undertake this eightfold noble and excellent precept; it is good and leads to happy results.

79. "With a serene mind give to the upright their requisites, the Buddhist robe, the alms collected in the bowl, a dwelling-place, food and drink, solid food, raiment, and a bed and a chair.

80. "Refresh with food and drink the mendicant friars who abound in the moral precepts and are free from passion and erudite. A good deed always increases.

81. "And so by practising righteous acts earnestly and diligently night and day you may free yourself even from that hell. There may be merit that is to be known on another occasion."

King: 82. "To-day forsooth with a pious mind I find refuge in the Buddha, the Law, and the Church; similarly I take upon myself the five precepts whole and unbroken.

83. "I shall forthwith refrain from the taking of life; I shall reject that which is not given to me in this world; I will not indulge in liquor nor speak falsely; and I shall be content with my own wife.

84. "And I solemnly undertake this eightfold noble and excellent precept; it is good and leads to happy results.

85. "To the mendicant friars who abound in moral precepts and are free from passion and erudite, I shall give the requisites, the Buddhist robe, the alms collected in the bowl, a dwelling-place, food and drink, solid food, raiment, and a bed and a chair. Finding delight in the doctrine of the Buddhas, I shall not change (my intention)"

86. Such a man became Ambasakkharo, the Licchavin, and in him Vesālī had another layman. He was gentle and believing, and in performing services, he then zealously supported the monks and the Church.

87. When the man who had been impaled was healed, happily and of his own accord he entered the ascetic life and came to the monk Kappitakuttama. Both of them then attained the fruits of asceticism.
88. Heeding the pious is attended with such great reward for a hundred wise men. He who had been impaled attained the foremost reward, but a very small one was received by Ambasakkha.

The venerable Mahākappitaka, who had gone to Sāvatthi to pay homage to the Teacher, reported to the Blessed One the incident which had there been told to the king by the peta himself. The Teacher made the matter his theme and preached a sermon to the crowd that was present. This discourse was useful to many people.

(To be Continued.)
NOTES ON THE DAMBADENIYA DYNASTY.

By H. W. CODRINGTON, C.C.S.

IN Mr. W. A. de Silva’s note on “The Buddhist Era” (N. & Q. 1914, Part II, XXIX), the date of the coronation of Bhuvanaika Bāhu I. is given from the medical work Yogāṇava as follows:

In this Sūtra, the words known as the text are quoted in the following manner: ‘‘The Buddha, the Lord of the World, and the Equal of the Gods, having been ceterte in His body, etc.,’’ etc.

This may be translated:

“On the expiry of 1818 years from the first Enlightenment of our great Gautama the Tathāgata, moreover after the passing away of....kings, who have appeared in the Island of Śrī Laṅkā including King Vijaya, when our King Siri Sanga Bo Śrī Bhuvanaika Bāhu having conquered Laṅkā displayed himself at the festival of his coronation, (this work was written) by the Elder, the son of the Tathāgata, chief of the Mayurapāda College, who was imbued in every state with the desire to become a Tathāgata and who dwelt for a considerable time on the Vātagiri Hill, receiving the necessaries from him (the King) himself.”

(i) The year from the Enlightenment and (ii) the number of kings who had reigned appear in this and two other manuscripts thus:

(i) (a) षड़योगाधिनिगुणोपायसाद्विन्द्रज्ञानि
(b) षड़यः धिनिगुणोपायसाद्विन्द्रज्ञानि
(c) षड़यः धिनिगुणोपायसाद्विन्द्रज्ञानि

(ii) (a) षड़योगाधिनिगुणोपायसाद्विन्द्रज्ञानि
(b) षड़यः धिनिगुणोपायसाद्विन्द्रज्ञानि
(c) षड़यः धिनिगुणोपायसाद्विन्द्रज्ञानि
All these texts are corrupt but come from one original. Mr. de Silva's translation of (ii) as "192" cannot stand, and the date 1818 from the Enlightenment manifestly is incorrect, as we know from the *Attanagala Vansa* that Bhuvanaika Bahu's father Parakrama Bahu II. was crowned in 1824. The corruption, however, is of some standing, as the forged Padidora Samasa gives the same date (J.R.A.S., Ceylon Branch, Vol. XXII, No. 65, pages 275, 291 and errata.)

Now the author of the *Yogarnava* must be identical with or at least of the same school as "Mayurapada Parivenadhpati Buddhaputra Sthavira" who composed the *Pujavaliya* only a few years before the accession of Bhuvanaika Bahu I., and clues as to the correction of the text are to be found in the last mentioned work, where in the case of the number of kings we find:—

"King Māgha, Vijaya Bahu (III), Parākrama Bahu (II), that is 90 who reigned in the Suļuvaṇḍa, thus 153 kings have ruled over Śrī Laṅkā."

The emendation of *sva�mhuṃ* into *svaṃhunamaḥ* is obvious. *svaṃhunamaḥ* must be correct; we are left with *svehaṃhunamaḥ*. Now if Parākrama Bahu II. was the 153rd sovereign, his son Vijaya Bahu IV. was the 154th and the original text must have read *svaṃhaṃhunamaḥ*. In old and worn manuscripts the confusion of *svaṃhunamaḥ* is not uncommon as shown by the variant readings in the *Mahāvaṇṇa* of Mahānagakula,—sula,—hula. The substitution of *sula* for *hula*, therefore, is not impossible and the mediaeval form of *sula* in an abraded ola could well be read as *sula*. It is submitted that the text as written by Tathāgataputra Sthavira was *svaṃhaṃhunamaḥ*.

It will be observed that the *Pujavaliya* adopts the same mode of dating as the *Yogarnava*, the year in which it was composed being given at the beginning of chap. XXXIV. thus:

"From the attainment of the first Bodhi of our great Gautama Buddha to the end of this my thank-offering 1854 years have ex-
pried. Up to this time 153 kings, rulers of Sișhala, had worn the crown and reigned.”

As we have seen, the last of these kings was Parākrama Bāhu and the book must have been finished shortly after his abdication, which as stated later on in the same chapter occurred in his 34th year; the date is that given in the Nikāya Saṅgraha as A.B. 1809, apparently for the completion of the king’s reform of the Saṅgha. I assume that the 34th year coincided in part with 1854.

Parākrama Bāhu II.’s accession, therefore, must have taken place about 1821 (A.D. 1233/4); his first coronation was in 1824 and, if the Dambadeni Aṣna¹ is to be trusted, at the Vap Magula, that is on September 16, A.D. 1236. When did he die?

B. Gunaskara’s translation of the Pujāvaliya states that Parākrama Bāhu II. “entrusted the reins of government to the eldest prince Vijaya Bāhu, and went to heaven in the 33rd year of his reign.” The printed text of 1913, however, reads in place of the last sentence  "he reigned 32 years.” All manuscripts consulted agree with this, but have “33 years.”

The account of Parākrama’s reign in the Pujāvaliya is parallel with that in chapters LXXXII-LXXXVII of the Mahāvansa. But this work continues its history of the reign during the regency of Vijaya Bāhu IV in the two following chapters. In these we read of the restoration of Polonnaruwa and of the second coronation of the old king who “after he had placed the burden of government on his own son, and by him had performed a great amount of merit during a long period, departed for heaven in the five and thirtieth year of his reign.” It is clear, therefore, that Parākrama Bāhu did not die when he virtually abdicated in favour of his son in his 34th year. This is indirectly confirmed by the use of the expression "the first coronation festival” in the Pujāvaliya.

The death of Parākrama occurred, therefore, about 1855 or 1856. Vijaya Bāhu thereupon “reigned over the whole kingdom of Lańkā” (Mhv. XC., I), and was assassinated at the instigation of his general Mitta in the second year of his reign. According to the received chronology which dates the commencement of his father’s rule in 1824, this event took place in 1859 or 1860.

¹ The date A.B. 1824 in the Dambadeni Aṣna is an error for 1824 from the First Enlighten-
Now the आस्त of the Yogarnava cannot have been, I think, corrupted from any combination of अते "sixty" and the easiest emendation is आस्त, the last letter being the same as in आस्त and the top of the आ with the elapilla a conceivable corruption of the mediaeval आ. I take it then that the coronation of Bhu-
vanaika Bāhu I. took place in 1858. In Mahāvaśa, chap. XC, 4-11, it is stated that Bhuvanaika Bāhu, hearing of his brother's death, fled from Dambadeniya in a litter but was pursued and attacked by Mitta's partisans. He thereupon leapt out of the litter and fled on foot to Kāлагalla where he continued his flight on an elephant and made good his escape to Yapahu "after that he had crossed the great river Kolabhinnna (Kolamunu Oya), which was then in flood." The assassination of Vijaya Bāhu, therefore, took place during the rains of the South-West or North-East Monsoon.

To decide the period of the year we have to turn to the close of Bhuvanaika Bāhu's reign which lasted 11 years: he thus died in his twelfth year. The year 1858 began on May 7, A.D. 1270, and ended on April 25th, A.D. 1271. Thus the earliest possible dates for Bhuvanaika Bāhu's first and twelfth years are May 1270-April 1271, and May 1281-April 1282, while the latest possible dates for the same are approximately April 1271-April 1272, and April 1282-April 1283. The embassy despatched by this king to the Sultan of Egypt travelled by sea up to the head of the Persian Gulf and thence by land to Baghdad and so across the Syrian Desert, and was received in Cairo on 14 Muḥarram A.H. 682, that is in April A.D. 1283 (J.R.A.S., C.B., XXVIII, No. 72, p. 82). The voyage is given in detail and there is no record of undue delay. The passage from Ceylon to Basra in the North East monsoon is said to take from 15 to 18 days and it may be regarded as practically certain that Bhuvanaika Bāhu was alive in the early part of A.D. 1283; he must have died shortly after the despatch of the embassy, as otherwise he would have completed his 12th year. We therefore are obliged to consider the latest possible dates as nearer the truth than the earliest possible. This places the coronation at the end of 1858, that is early in A.D. 1271. Vijaya Bāhu IV., therefore, probably was murdered during the break of the North East Monsoon of the preceding year, say in or about October 1270, the intervening months being occupied by the usurpation of the general Mitta, and the intrigues between Bhuvanaika Bāhu and the Ārya
general Thakuraka described in *Mahāvamsa* XC, 12-25. The expression *කොළ සිදුකළයෙන*, "having conquered Launiká," in the *Yogarṇava* is thus justified.

We are now in a position to ascertain Vijaya Bāhu IV’s regnal years, in the second of which he died:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Earliest possible</th>
<th>Latest possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>c. Nov. 1268-1269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd year</td>
<td>c. Nov. 1269-1270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now the 35th year of Parākrama Bāhu II fell in part in 1855 from the first Bodhi, and so in its entirety at the earliest between April A.D. 1267 and April 1268, and at the latest between March 1268 and March 1269. We must place the accession of Vijaya Bāhu as sole king between November 1268 and March 1269, the average giving January 1269.

The above dates have been obtained by taking the 35th year of Parākrama Bāhu II. and the 2nd of Vijaya Bāhu IV. in our modern sense, that is, as the 34th and 1st expired. But there is reason to believe that the Sinhalese vulgarly reckoned otherwise. Taking one example out of many, Sena I. is said in the *Mahāvamsa* to have died in his 20th year; yet the *Pūjāvaliya* gives him a reign of 20 years. The conclusion is that in the mind of the author of this work the 20th year was the 20th year expired, that is, our 21st year. Now the *Mahāvamsa* itself at least in three places is of the same opinion. Thus Vatṭagāmanī fled in his fifth month, yet his first period of rule is reckoned as five months (*Mhv. XXXIII, 37, 102*); Silākāla is said to have governed 13 years and to have died in his thirteenth; and again Mahānāga is promised a reign of 3 years, yet died in his third (*ib. XLI, 27, 41; 84, 102*). The *Dipavamsa* also makes Buddha die 8 years after Ajātasattu’s coronation (කොළ සිදුකළයෙන සළකාර සළකාරාන්තයක්) and Vijaya to arrive in the eighth year from that event (කොළ සිදුකළයෙන, *Dpv. III, 60; XI, 8*); the death of Buddha and the landing of Vijaya, of course, are synchronized. The *Samantapāsādikā* states that Muṭasiva’s death and Tissa’s accession occurred in Asoka’s 17th year (කොළ සිදුකළයෙන සළකාර සළකාරාන්තයක්); in the *Dipavamsa*, XI, 13, 14, on the other hand Muṭasiva dies when 17 years have elapsed (කොළ සිදුකළයෙන සළකාර සළකාරාන්තයක් සාකච්ඡා සාකච්ඡා) and his successor is crowned when 17 years 6 months had passed. Here the 217th year clearly is
that year expired. In the tenth century the reckoning by expired years also accords better with the facts as the last year of Kassapa V., counted backwards from Mahinda V.’s capture about A.D. 1017, falls in A.D. 919, and his unlucky campaign in company with the Pândyan king is mentioned in an inscription of Parántaka I. dated A.D. 918/919. This calculation, therefore, is to be preferred. 2

According to this Parákráma Báhu II. died in what we should call his 36th year, and Vijaya Báhu IV. in his third. Therefore:—

Parákráma Báhu.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>35th year</th>
<th>Earliest possible.</th>
<th>Latest possible.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 1267-1268</td>
<td>do 1268-1269</td>
<td>do 1269-1270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vijaya Báhu.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st year</th>
<th>2nd do</th>
<th>3rd do</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. Nov. 1267-1268</td>
<td>do 1268-1269</td>
<td>do 1269-1270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Sept. 1268-1269</td>
<td>do 1269-1270</td>
<td>do 1270-1271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus the reign of Vijaya Báhu is reckoned from Parákráma Báhu’s abdication in A.D. 1267/8.

In the longer version of the Pújávaliya the great ordination festival held at Dahastóta is assigned to Parákráma Báhu’s 35th year (expired); his death is not mentioned, and some time must have been taken in writing the continuation of the original work, corresponding with chapters LXXXVIII and LXXXIX of the Mahávana. Parákráma Báhu, therefore, died some appreciable time after Vesak, perhaps at the end of A.D. 1269 or even early in 1270. The Mahávana, chap. XC, 1, 2, records nothing of Vijaya Báhu’s sole reign, and, if our reading of history is correct, the old king’s death left his son at the mercy of the discontented soldiery: That their pay was in arrears is fairly clear from Mahávana, XC, 15, 31, a state of affairs not to be wondered at in view of the royal fiscal policy described in chapter LXXXVII, 50. It does not follow that the discontent at once led to the plot which ended in the king’s murder.

Our results are as follows:—

Parákráma Báhu II.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accession</td>
<td>c. A.D. 1234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronation</td>
<td>A.D. 1236, Sept. 16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdication</td>
<td>c. A.D. 1276/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death</td>
<td>c. A.D. 1269 January, or A.D. 1269/70.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2. It does not follow that the reckoning by expired years was used in official documents e.g., the Ambagamuwa inscription, Ep. Zeyl. II, 35. But the employment of the expression “the year following such and such a year” shows a tendency to the vulgar reckoning.
Vijaya Bāhu IV.  Accession  c. A.D. 1269 January, or c. A.D. 1267/8
Death  A.D. 1270 about October.
Bhuvanaika Bāhu I.  Coronation  A.D. 1271 Jany-April.
Death  A.D. 1283 before full moon of April.

We are now in a position to proceed further. Vijaya Bāhu III., the father of Parākrama Bāhu II., reigned for 4 years only; his body was burnt at Attanagalla. The Pujāvalīya merely says that he was one of the Siri Sangabo race; the Attanagalu Vansa makes him a son of Vijaya Mallā narādhipā, descended from the princes who brought the Bo tree to Lāṅkā. Both documents date from his son’s reign. The later Daḍadā Pujāvalīya speaks of him as Vijaya Vathimi of Palābatgala. As an important establishment of hermits was founded here by Parākrama Bāhu, it is possible that his father was connected with the place; perhaps it was his headquarters before he came into power. The Dambadeni Asna calls him Nanbambara Kāliṅga Vijaya Bāhu, and his son Nanbambara Kalikāla Saṅgita Sāhiyīa Sarvagna Paṇḍita Parākrama Bāhu. Nanbambara is in Kalundawa village, not far from Dambadeniya, and was the birth place of Parākrama, who dignified it with the name of Śrīvardhana-pura; the current legend concerning these place-names is given in the Kalundā-patuna.3

The title “Kāliṅga Vijaya Bāhu,” also given to Vijaya Bāhu by the Rājaratnākaraya, appears as the name of Māgha in the Nikāya Saṅgraha, but the authority for this unique attribution is unknown and even the Kalundā-patuna makes its hero’s father a Kalinga king. It is worthy of notice that the termination of Vijaya Mallā’s name is the same as of those of Nissaṅka Mallā and Sāhaas Mallā, both of the Kalinga Dynasty, and it is possible that his son had Kalinga blood in his veins. The question is complicated by the claim of Parākrama Bāhu II. in his own poem the Kaviratnīya to be of the Lunar race, descended from king Paṇḍu. The reference to the rain miracle (Mhv. LXXXVII) in the colophon fixes the identity of the royal author; presumably he was a member of the Paṇḍyan branch of the Sinhalese royal family, to which Parākrama Bāhu I. had belonged.

At this period there were several such branches. The Gana-ve-
si and the Maha Pándi-vánsa appear in the colophon of the Pújá-
valiya: the first traced its descent from prince Sumitra, who ac-
companied the Bo tree and became Jaya Maha Le; the second pre-
sumably from the husband of Vijaya Báhu I.’s sister Mittá. A third,
the Kiling or Kálínga, is mentioned with the Gana-veṣi in the time
of Parákrama Báhu IV. and possibly had several sources, the prince
who brought the Tooth Relic, the queen of Mahinda IV., Tiloka-
sundari who married Vijaya Báhu I., or even later direct from
Kalinga. The branches contracted alliances with one another,
and we many suppose that Vijaya Báhu III. espoused a lady of
the Pándyan clan, and that his son preferred to trace his origin to
his mother’s family, “the pure race of the Moon, which is con-
dered by the whole world as the head of the generation of all kings”
(Mhv. LXII, 5).

Mágha’s reign is reckoned by the Mahávánsa as lasting 21 years
and by the Pújávaliya as 19 (२०००६६). The former account
is preferable being in verse and so less liable to corruption; accord-
ingly the reign lasted from c. 1215 to 1236, that is, the date of
Parákrama Báhu’s coronation. This must be taken as the
official Sinhalese reckoning of the reign, as we find Mágha at Polon-
naruwa some years later (Mhv. LXXXII, 27; LXXXIII, 15). Now Parákrama Báhu’s Katikávata, after rehearsing the reform
carried out in A.B. 1708, states that discipline declined during the
36 years following the death of Parákrama Báhu the Great, and then
passes on to the Convocation held under Saṅgharakkhita and the
two Medhaṅkaras in the reign of Vijaya Báhu III., and finally
to that held in his son’s time. Parákrama Báhu I. died about
A.D. 1186, and 36 years later brings us to A.D. 1222 in the
middle of Mágha’s reign.

This date presumably is that of Vijaya Báhu’s Convocation,
and, as the reform was carried out after he had placed the Relics
on Beligala and had built the Vijayasundaráráma, fell somewhere
in the middle of the reign, which we may fix provisionally between
1220 and 1224.

The dates so obtained can be checked by another calculation.
Vijaya Báhu came to the throne in his old age (Mhv. LXXXI,
65). At the end of his reign he took his elder son, “seated him
on his lap and poured kisses on the crown of his head” (ib. 73,74).
Parákrama Báhu can hardly have been more than 12 years of age
at the time, and both he and his brother were placed by their father under the guardianship of the priesthood (ib. 77). Now in Parākrama Bāhu’s eleventh ear (elapsed, c. A. D. 1245/6), Vīra Bāhu, his sister’s son, defeated the invader Chandrabhānu (Mhv. LXXXIII, 36). We are also told that this prince and his first cousin, afterwards Vijaya Bāhu IV., in their childhood played together in the sand (ib. LXXXVIII, 6); thus they were approximately of the same age. Now if Parākrama Bāhu II. succeeded immediately on his father’s death when he was about 12 years old, Vīra Bāhu could not have been of age to lead an army in 1245/6. If this prince had attained his majority and was 16 years old in that year, he and Vijaya Bāhu must have been born about 1229. Parākrama Bāhu, if he was 16 at his eldest son’s birth, was born about 1213 and was 57 years old at his death. And Vijaya Bāhu III.’s reign, at the end of which the heir apparent was 12 at the most, must fall between 1221 and 1225.

It may be contended that Vīra Bāhu was merely a nominal royal general in 1245/6 and was only 7 or 8 years old. If this be so, Parākrama Bāhu would have been born about 1221 and might have been 12 shortly before accession in 1234. But in this case, what event is signalized by the date 1222? The supposition that Vīra Bāhu was of age when he defeated Chandrabhānu seems to be the more probable.

The explanation of non—age does not suffice for the postponement of Parākrama Bāhu’s coronation for two years, as on our calculation he must have attained his majority before his accession in 1234. But such delay seems to have been not unusual; Parākrama Bāhu VI. waited 4 years to be crowned, and Kṛitiṣrī’s inauguration was celebrated in January, 1751, when he was 20 years of age, though he came to the throne in the middle of August, 1747.5

We still have to account for the interregnum between 1224/5 and 1234, and I would suggest very tentatively that this period of ten years is that of the usurpation of Vathamī. The legend embodied in the Kalundā-patuna seems to refer to our Pañdita Parākrama Bāhu; Śrīvardhana-pura and Nanbambara are mentioned, and it was at Dambadeniya that the king reigned. The poem of course gives fanciful details to explain place-names, but there seems to be no valid reason for doubting that the usurpation of Vathamī

4. This is not necessarily the younger sister’s son.
5. For Kṛitiṣrī’s age, see Memoir of Governor van Gollemsse.
actually occurred. The one difficulty is the location of the death of this prince at Kurunegala. But Parâkrama's brother, according to the longer Pûjâvaliya, lived at this place, and it or rather Vênaruva (Vápi-nagara) close by is mentioned in Mahâvamsa, LVIII, 43, in the time of Vijaya Bâhu I. The Kurunegala Viśalaraya, it is true, calls the father of Pañcita Parâkrama Bâhu of Dambadeniya and of Vathimi by the name of Vanni Bhuvanaika Bâhu. But this work is late and of no authority; its list of kings agrees with no reliable chronicle, and the legend seems to have been inserted with little reference to historical fact. It is of interest that at this time, according to the Tirivendipuram inscription of the 16th year of Râjarâja III. (A.D. 1231/2) a Parâkrama Bâhu king of Îlam and three of his officers lost their lives while fighting on the side of Kopperuñjinga, who had captured the Chola king, against the Hoysala king Narasipha II.  

Parâkrama Bâhu II's coronation was followed by three wars. The contemporary authorities give them as follows:—

*Attanugala Vâyasa.* The king defeated (1) and (2) the Chola-Kerals, who lived at Pulatthi and had their own king (चोलासंस्कृत); and (3) Chandrabhanu.

*Kâtikávata.* The (1) Dravida, (2) Kerala, (3) Yâvaka, and other wars were waged.

**Pûjâvaliya.** The king reduced the Siphala Maha Vannin, and began the second (සේෂාල මහා ද්වීපය, හිමිකාතුරුය) Dravida war. At that time the two Tamil kings Mâgha and Jaya Bâhu had been in power 40 years; they had built forts at various places and had a Tamil and Malala host of 40,000 men. In this war Polonnaruwa was recovered. In his twelfth year Chandrabhanu the Jâvaka was repulsed. The wars are summed up as "the Malala war, the Dravida war, the Jâvaka war and others."

*Mahâvamsa.* The king brought into subjection the princes of the Vanni of Sihala. He then attacked the Tamils. "At this time a host of 40,000 strong men of the Tamils and Kerals under the two Tamil kings Mâgha and Jaya Bâhu had dwelt for a long time in the land," and had built fortresses. Polonnaruwa was recovered and in the king's eleventh year Chandrabhanu was defeated.

The expression "second" in the Pûjâvaliya probably is used with reference to the first Dravida war in the time of Vijaya Bâhu III.

Mágha is said in the Mahávápsa to have brought with him to Ceylon a host of Kerals, to whom he gave the lands of the Sinhalese. These Kerals must be the Malalas of the Pújávaliya. The question is, who was Jaya Báhu? Was he Mágha's sub-king and successor, or was he an independent but allied prince? The definite mention of the two Malála and Dravida wars points to his independence; possibly he was a Chola, though the use of the word in the Attanugalé Vápsa as meaning anything more than "Tamil" should not be pressed.

The expulsion of the foreigners from Polonnaruwa took place before the eleventh year of the reign (A.D. 1245/6). They had been in power 40 years, perhaps a round number. The longer Pújávaliya relates that after the old king's abdication in 1267/8 Vijaya Báhu IV. began to restore Polonnaruwa, which had been recovered 26 years before, and further that the old Daladá-gé had been empty for 64 years, when the Tooth Relic was brought back some months later. The reconquest of the capital, therefore, took place about 1242, and the Relic had been removed therefrom about 1204, forty years from which time brings us to 1244. The period of 64 years includes the 40 of Tamil rule, and the balance obviously is the 26 years which had elapsed since the recovery. It is tempting to read பல்ல எல்லை in lieu of பல்ல், but as one manuscript out of three consulted has பல்ல், I am inclined to retain the number 26 and to emendபல்ல் into பல்லை. This, however, is not strictly necessary, if 40 is a round number. In any case Tamil rule must have been considered as beginning on the death of Sáhasa Malla about 1202, and as including the government of the various generals, "who were causing obstruction with the object of gaining personal power for themselves and so were not desiring to have kings that would be powerful enough both for granting rewards and for inflicting punishments, and that would protect the people and the religion" (Ep. Zeyl. II, 36, B. lines 3-6).

This period is called the arájitaya or Demala arájitaya, not as rendered by B. Gunasekara "the time when there were no Tamil princes", with scant regard for history, but "the Tamil anarchy," because there were no kings worthy of the name and Mágha was not a native sovereign, and because the Tamil mercenaries and later the Kerals dominated the country. At the very beginning of the "anarchy" we hear of "Kandavura" or Polonnaruwa being taken in a Tamil disturbance under Kalyánavatí (c. 1202-1208; Ep. Zeyl. II, 33).
It is convenient in this place to consider the origin of the independent kingdom of Jaffna. Its later mediaeval rulers styled themselves Árya Chakravarti and claimed to be of the Gaṅga vañsa and to be descended from two Brahmans appointed by Ráma to rule over Ramesvaram; their flag was a seated bull and their capital Siṅkai-nakarai (Siṅha-nagara). They were of mixed descent. De Queiroz (Conquista, I, 7) relates that one of the Brahmans of Ramesvaram, who were known as Arus (Áryas), married the daughter of the Jaffna king, and that his offspring succeeded to the throne. The Vaipava Málai, an eighteenth century medley compiled from older material, makes the first king a prince of the Choḷa dynasty; he was Siṅha Árya or Vijaya Kúḷankai, “maimed hand,” was brought over from Madura with a Páñdyan army, and settled at Nallûr. But the earlier Kailáya Málai makes no mention of his Choḷa descent and gives as his father Selíyasékarān of Madura, apparently of the Gaṅga-kula. Whether the first ruler was a Choḷa or not, it is certain that his successors in the later middle ages claimed Gaṅga and Brahman blood; the seated bull was the cognizance of the Gaṅgas of Kalinga and Siṅhapurura their royal city; shortly before our period a Kalinga dynasty had sat on the Sinhalese throne, and in the thirteenth century a Kalinga sovereign Mágha held Polomaruwa with at least two fortresses, Kuḍa Veligama and Húrátoṭa, in the Jaffna peninsula, unless indeed these were in the hands of his ally Jaya Báhu.

We know from an inscription at Nayinativu that Parákkrama Báhu I. was in possession of the extreme north. But Parákkrama Báhu II. clearly never recovered it and his northern frontier was entrusted to Vanniyars, in whose charge was Anuradhapura. So it is highly probable that Mágha or Jaya Báhu or both never lost the peninsula, and that the independent Jaffna kingdom came into being with their expulsion from the rest of Ceylon. The Gaṅga dynasty of Jaffna is accounted for by Mágha himself; the Choḷa Kúḷankai or Vijaya, if Choḷa he was, may be Jaya Báhu.

In the eleventh year of the reign (A.D. 1245/6) according to the Mahávañsa or the twelfth according to the Pájávaliya, occurred the Jávaka war. The invaders under Chandrabhánu undoubted-ly were Javanese: they used blow-pipes (nachchambo) and poisoned arrows, and pretended to be Buddhists. The Attanagalu
Vaṃsa says that Chandrabhānu was from Tambaliṅga, the name given in the Pūjāvalīya to the country Tambā, whence came the priest Dhammakitti (Mhv. LXXXIV. 12). The Saddharmarat-nākarava in the narrative of the Bo tree calls the port of Tāmralipti, 7 days, sail down the Ganges from Gaya, by the name of Tāmalingam-toṭa; the Daladā Siritaj also translates the Tāmralipti of the Dāthā-dhātu-vaṃsa by Tamalingomu. This identification is hardly probable in the case of Chandrabhānu, who seems to have been a Malay raja, a sea-robber or viking, frequenting the coasts of Southern India and Ceylon. Perhaps he may be the “Sāvaka,” whose crown and crowned head Jāṭāvarman Vīra Pāṇḍya boasts that he took in an inscription of his 10th year (A.D.) 1264/58. In this connection may be noted Chavakachcheri in the Jaffna peninsula and Jávakakotte, on the mainland, where according to the Kokila Sandesaya Sapumal Kumārayá defeated the Canarese.

The late Dambadeni Asna confuses Parākrama Bāhu’s wars. According to this work (1) a Tamil king from Kalinga, claiming the throne by inheritance, landed at Salāvatotoṭa, advanced on Dambadeniya, and was killed. (2) In the second year after this the Tāmalingamu king, hearing of this event, descended with Tamils on Tammennawa; Parākrama Bāhu made offerings to the Tooth Relic and the Tamil king was killed. (3) Jávankaré rāja invaded with a Tamil host: Parākrama Bāhu killed 12 kings in as many battles and gave land to their armies.

The expression in the Pūjāvalīya “and in various other wars,” following on the enumeration of those already mentioned, appears to conceal a serious invasion by the Pāṇḍyas. Jāṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I. (A.D. 1251-1280) in an inscription of his 9th year (April, 1259) styles himself “a second Rāma in plundering the Island of Ceylon”. In his Sidambaram inscription, undated but apparently of 1257, he states that he fought Perūṅinga of Sendamangalam after receiving tribute of elephants and gems from the king of Iḷam; these elephants were employed by him in his Koṅgu war. Jāṭāvarman Vīra Pāṇḍya II. (1254-1275) in record of his 10th year (1264/5) is described as “pleased to take the Chola country, Ceylon and the crown and the crowned head of the Sāvaka”; in one of his 11th year (1265/6) he boasts that he “killed one of the two kings of Ceylon, captured his army, chariots, treasures, throne, crown,
necklaces, bracelets, parasols, chauris, and other royal possession, planted the Pāṇḍya flag with the double fish at Kōṇamalai, and the high peaks of the Trikūṭagiri mountain, received elephants as tribute from the other king of Ceylon, and subdued the Kerala. The slain monarch must have been the king of Jaffna and the other Parākrama Bāhu. If all these records refer to one campaign, as seems probable, its date must fall between 1254 and 1257. On either side of the main entrance of Fort Frederick Trincomalee, may be seen the double Pāṇḍyan fish on carved stones taken from the old Kōṇēsār temple.

Of Parākrama Bāhu's 30th year is the Galapata Vihare inscription. The Demaḷa Adhikārī Keselāna bim Mahendra alias Kahambal-kula Mindal-nāvan cannot be Devapratirāja as contended in Ceylon Notes and Queries, July, 1914, as this minister according to the Attanagalu Vaṣsa was of the Dunukewatta family.

The Parākrama Bāhu Pirivena (Mhv. LXXXV, 57) is referred to in the Naranbedda inscription in Kegalla District. From the abdication of Parākrama Bāhu II. in his 34th year, history is continued not only by the Mahāvāṇsa, but also by the longer version of the Pūjāvaliya already mentioned. This is strictly parallel with chapters LXXXVIII and LXXXIX of the Mahāvāṇsa, and occasionally gives important information lacking in the Pali chronicle. Both seem to be from the same school. A critical edition of the last chapter of the Pūjāvaliya in its longer form is very desirable; at least three manuscripts exist in the Ratnapura District alone. I note below points of interest.

The prince Tribhuvanamalla, not Tilokamalla as in the Mahāvāṇsa, was given the army of the Dakunu-pasa or "Southern Country" with command from Dambadeniya to the sea coast, Mhv. LXXXVIII, 20-22). Bhuvanaika Bāhu was set over Yāpavugala, as the Tamils very often landed at Kuda Veligama (ib. 23-26) on the north.

The account of the fortification of Vātagiri (Wākirigala, ib. 43, 44) and of the deposit of the royal treasures is prefaced by the statement that Vijaya Bāhu IV. had heard that in former time Mahulu Vijaya Bāhu, being defeated in the Tamil war, had gone

9. Ind. Ant. XXI, p. 343; A.R.E., no. 421 of 1907; Sen-Tamil, IV.
to the same hill and placed his treasures there, the reference being to *Mahāvaṃsa* LVIII, 32; Vijaya Bāhu IV. now set the Māya-
dunu army in charge of the fortress. The Mahanetpāmula Sthavira, for whom he built a monastery on the top of the rock, was Buddha-
putra the writer of the *Pūjāvaliya*; he was of the Ganavēsi-
kula on the one side and of the Maha Pāṇḍi-vaṃsa on the other, and so presumably a relative of the king. His brother, Mahanet-
pāmula Sūmaṅgala, judging from the Nikāya Saṅghara, was a con-
temporary of Saṅgharakkhita and Vagīsvara, both of whom lived under Vijaya Bāhu III. and it is likely that he was dead when the Mayurapāda Pirivēna was founded at Vātagiri.

After fortifying Kurunegala (*Mhv. LXXXVIII*, 60), where his uncle Bhuvanaika Bāhu had lived, Vijaya Bāhu “built Badalal-
goḍa-ruvura, placed the people as a guard for that rock (scil. Kur-
unegala), and sent information thereof to the king his father.” This is the present Batalagoda and the Badalathalai of the *Mahāvaṃsa* LXV, 5. In addition to the *Mahāvaṃsa* story of Chandrabhānu’s second invasion, which was more than a mere raid as he overran a considerable tract of country, the *Pūjāvaliya* states that he brought a Sinhalese army when appearing before Yapahu. “The holy places such as Thūpārāma and others” (*Mhv. LXXXVIII*, 80) are given in detail as “Tubūrup, the Śri Bōdihi, the Lovāmahapāya, Ruvanveli-mālu, and other places;” Senānātha Pirivena is rendered by Senevirat Pirivena. The Maha Vannin in Pīhiṭi-rajaya were made guardians of Anuradhapura.

After *Mahāvaṃsa* LXXXVIII, 109, the *Pūjāvaliya* relates that Parākrama Bāhu sent 4000 soldiers, inhabitants of the country east of Dambadeniya, to protect his son Vijaya Bāhu at Polonnaruwa, and all those from Navayodun-raṭa to guard his nephew. The two princes began work “in the twenty sixth year of the king who entered Polonnaruwa.” As this is of importance for purposes of chronology it is advisable to give the texts, which differ among themselves: the sentence runs in one manuscript:—

1. सदृ ष्ट च देवसं देवसं देवसं देवसं देवसं देवसं देवसं देवसं देवसं देवसं देवसं देवसं देवसं देवसं देवसं देवसं देवसं देवसं

12. Of Kurunegala, the *Pūjāvaliya* has: *Sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhā ni sākhाँ

*Vasala*, therefore, in the thirteenth century, meant “gate-house” and not “palace,” as contended by some modern pundits.
In the others the wording of the crucial part is:—

2. ගොඩැසුර මොද මහා අග්නිභිංචීය මොද මහා අග්නිභිංචීය මොද මහා අග්නිභිංචීය

3. ගොඩැසුර මොද මහා අග්නිභිංචීය මොද මහා අග්නිභිංචීය මොද මහා අග්නිභිංචීය

With these should be compared the Ambagamuwa inscription: අම්බාගමුව කටයුතු මොද මොද මොද මොද (Ep. Zeyl. II, 4, line 50). I understand the meaning to be that the commencement of repairs took place in the 26th year from the recovery of the capital. In the part of the Pūjāvaliya corresponding with Mahāvamsa, LXXXVIII, 116-120, the Lankātīlaka is mentioned specifically: at this building, miscalled "Jetavanarama," there actually exists an inscription of Vijaya Bāhu IV. giving its true name and recording its restoration.13

Parākrama Bāhu, when handing over the government to his son, had bidden him to take "to Kandavuru the Tooth Relic, which had been brought to Māyā-ruṭa in the kingless time," and had announced his intention of being crowned there (Puj. = Mhv. LXXVII, 63-72). Accordingly his second coronation was celebrated in "Kandavuru-pura," and the Tooth Relic brought from Damba-deniya to "Kandavuru" and placed in "the old Daladā-ge," which had been vacant for 64 years. The Daladā Pūjāvaliya says that Vijaya Bāhu I. built "the old Daladā-ge in Kandavura," but the one mentioned here presumably is that of Niṣṣaṅka Malla.

The name "Kandavuru" seems to mean Polonnaruwa and this is made certain by the Sinhalese Atanagula Vāpsa (XI, 8) which, as pointed out by Mr. D. B. Jayatilaka, has: කාන්දවුණි මොද කාන්දවුණි මොද කාන්දවුණි මොද කාන්දවුණි මොද. We can now understand the statement of Kalyāṇavatī's Bopitiya inscription (Ep. Zeyl. II, 33) that "Kandavura" had been broken into during the Tamil disturbance (කන්දවුණි හෙවත් කන්දවුණි සෙරෙය). In this connection we may recall that the open country, in which Duṭu Geṭumu pitched his camp before Vijitana-gara, was called Khandhāvāra-piṭṭhi (Kandavuru-piṭṭiya); if the town then besieged was on the site of the branch city Vijīta (Mhv. LXXVIII, 91) as contended by Parker and Storey, the name "Kandavuru," applied to Polonnaruwa close by, is explained. But Monier Williams' Dictionary gives the meanings of Skhandhā-

vára as (1) an army or a division of it attached to the person of the king; (2) a royal capital, a royal residence; and (3) a camp. The second interpretation must apply here. It may be observed that Kalyánavati's general Áyasmanta was of the Khandávára family.¹⁴

There is no part in the Pújávaliya corresponding with Mahávaśsa, LXXXIX, 70; instead, we read:—

"The king his father hearing this speech, with joy arising therefrom, said, 'Just as Buddha could have laid claim to the virtues of (his son) Ráhula Thera, so I take to myself the services rendered by my son,' and participating therein sent divers precious gifts. Thus, having with Vijaya Báhu's ordination in this thirty fifth year carried out nine ordination festivals, he again continued at the same Jambudroni-pura seeing the prosperity enjoyed more and more by his sons, and again heaping up merit more and more enjoyed his royal state."

The usual colophon beginning with एमः एमः एमः and appearing on page 701 of the printed edition then follows. The poor manuscript followed in this is defective in the account of the author's descent.

(To be Concluded.)

¹⁴. Sri Ráhula was of the Maurya or Kandavuru family Vriśa Ratnákara Pañchika; Kávyasekhara, I, 23.)
Sinhalese Curries:

By the late Mr. J. P. Lewis, C.M.G

The following were the curries at a breakfast at Arambegama Walawwa, belonging to the Nugawela family, on 13th January 1910. I wonder whether they exhaust the list known to Sinhalese cookery:

1. Mun-ela
2. Kollu
3. Wamboṭu
4. Pol-mal
5. Labu-mada
6. Polos
7. Kos-ёмbul
8. Miris-ёмbul
9. Patol
10. Muwa-mas
11. Badulla-kola
12. Amba-ёмbul
13. Lūnu-kola
14. Kolluhodi
15. Bónchi
16. Tiyabará
17. Kékiri
18. Mékaral
19. Angunu-kola
20. Bilin
21. Alu-kesel
22. Kohowila

Green peas.
Brown peas.
Brinjal.
Coconut-flowers.
Water-pumpkin.
Young jak.
Mature jak.
Capsicum.
Snake gourd.
Dried venison.
Leaves of the badulla tree.
Mangoes.
Onion leaves.
Soup of brown peas.
Beans.
Cucumber (the native kind.)
Cucumber (dwarf.)
Beans (long)
Leaves of angunu creeper (bitter)
The fruit of that name.
Ash-plantain.
23. Bim-mal
24. Tampalá
25. Takkáli
26. Karawala
27. Niwitikola
28. Idalpalá
29. Hiritala-ćembul
30. Gówa-kola
31. Raṭala
32. Katurumurunga-mal
33. Katuwała-alá
34. Kaṭupuhul.
35. Polkiri-hodi

Mushrooms.
Tomatoes.
Dried Fish.
Spinage.
Leaves of a wild shrub.
Wild-yams.
Cabbage.
A kind of small yam, also called innala.
Leaves of the tree so called.
Yams of a kind of jungle creeper.
A concoction of ash pumpkin.
Coconut milk soup.

COW AND BUFFALO MILK.

By Muhandiram W. Daniel Fernando Waidyasekara.

THE following slokas (with translations) from our ancient Medicinal Books should interest readers of the Ceylon Antiquary who habitually or occasionally drink cow or buffalo milk:

Cow-milk.

1. Gavyan Pavitrancha rasayanancha pathyanancha hridayan bala-pushtidan syat
Ayuh pradan rakta vikara pitta tridosha hridaroga vishapahan syat.

Cow-milk has a purifying effect; it is savoury, wholesome, agreeable, vigour-giving, and nutritious; it prolongs life; removes derangement of blood produced by bile, also the three humours, heart-complaints and poison.

2. Nasastan lavana-ur-uktan kshirancha melnava punan
Karoti kushthan twagdoshan tasmanayiva hitan matam.

Cow-milk that is saline and sour brings on eruptions and cutaneous diseases. It is therefore unwholesome.
Cow-curd.

3. Amlan swadurasan grahi gurusahna vatarogajit
   Medah sukaramala slesma rakta-pittagni sopakrit.
   Cow-curd is sour and agreeable to the taste; it binds the
   bowels; it is heavy and heathy; it destroys windy complaints;
   and it produces fat, semen, phlegm, bile, appetite, and morbidness.

4. Snigdhan vipake vadhran dipanban bala-vardhanam
   Vata pahan pavitrancha dadhigavan gunapradam.
   It is also cooling; it contributes to digestion; it gives a glossy
   appearance (to the skin), and vigour; it destroys wind; and it
   has a purifying effect.

Cow-ghee.

5. Vipaka Madhuran vrishtyan vatapiita kapha paham
   Chakshushyan-bala krinmedhayam gavwan sarpi gunottamam.
   Cow-ghee has excellent qualities; it contributes to digestion,
   promotes sexual vigour, destroys wind, bile, and phlegm; and it is
   a power to the eye.

Buffalo-milk.

6. Snigdhan maruchchhita karanchatandra nidrakaran vrishyata-
   taman srnamaghamam.
   Balapradan pushtikaran kaphasya sanjivanan-mahi sam-
   yuchyate payah.
   Buffalo-milk is cooling; it produces wind, indolence, drowsi-
   ness, excellent sexual vigour; it destroys fatigue; it gives strength;
   and it is, in its relation to phlegm, called the life-restorer.

Buffalo-curd.

7. Ghanaan mahisa muddiishtan madhuran raktadosha krit
   Kapha sopha haran sastan pitta kritvata kopanam.
   Buffalo-curd is excellent. It is thick and delicious; it affects
   the blood; it destroys phlegm, and morbidness; and inflames wind.

CAPT. THOMAS ALDERSEY JONES.
By JOHN M. SENAVERATNA, F.R.H.S.

CAN any reader let me know who is now the possessor of the
Silver Cup which Messrs. M. & S. Lyon, Silversmiths, o
113, High Holborn, W.C. 1, had for sale in November, 1920, and
of which the following is a description:
Antique silver cup and cover chased with branches of berried foliage and partly fluted, on square pedestal stand, date 1819, 20½ inches high, weight 141 ozs. 3 dwt. Inscribed—

To the Widow of Capt. T. A. Jones
Whose Life was Exhausted
In the Laborious Exertions
Of a Campaigne
Among the Forests of Ceylon
His Brother Officers of H.M. XIX. Regiment
Who knew his Virtues & deplore his Loss
Present this Memorial of their
Affection for a Respected Beloved
Lamented Friend.
A.D. Mccccxviii.

* * *

This was Capt. Thomas Aldersey Jones, who died at Batticaloa on April 18th, 1818. He was the 3rd son of John Lloyd Jones, Esq., of Maesmawr in the County of Montgomery. He married on February 4th, 1813, Susan, 2nd daughter of Wil. Thornes, Rector of Cardeston and Vicar of Alberbury in the County of Salop. He had three children.

There are three memorials to him in Ceylon, two at Batticaloa, where he died, and one at St. Peter's Church, Colombo, which says that “when in the midst of the Kandyan rebellion he was attacked by his last illness at Katabowa in Wellassie, he refused to quit his post or remove to the sea-side until he had exhausted the last effort of his strength in the cause of his country.”

THE KANDY ROAD.
By J. C. van Sanden.

Those who have read the article on “The First Mail Coach in Asia,” which appeared in the Ceylon Antiquary some time ago, may find some interest in this note on the historic Kandy Road. It is difficult to say whether it is to the far-seeing and progressive policy of Sir Edward Barnes or the indomitable energy and engineering skill of that great pioneer, Major Skinner, falls the greater share of credit for the construction of the most important thoroughfare in the Island.
The late Mr. A. M. Ferguson of the *Colombo Observer*, in his *British Administration of Ceylon*, states that in those days it was considered a privilege to be selected for any particular undertaking by Sir Edward and well did Skinner rise up to expectations. It would be distracting from the merit of Skinner’s achievement if it was not stated that the Major had to contend with almost insuperable difficulties. There were first and foremost the ravages of the *anopheles* mosquito to guard against and, such a thing as an organised labour force was conspicuous by its absence. Leaving alone skilled labour, it is not difficult to imagine the trouble there must have been to recruit workmen from amongst the Kandyans who entertained superstitions that, when a certain rock was pierced, Sinhalese independence would be at an end.

Any notice of the Kandy Road, be it of the most casual nature, would be incomplete without mention of General Fraser and Captain Dawson of the R.E. under whose directions the work was carried out. The latter’s connection with this work is commemorated by the monument at Kadugannawa near the point where the main road and the railway track meet.

The first sod was cut in 1820 and by the following year the trace and other preliminaries were complete. Of course, the road could not be gravelled or metalled all in that short period. Yet it was opened for traffic, and this indicates the urgency there must have been for this line of communication with the Kandyian capital. It must have been when the road was in this incomplete state that Sir Hardinge Giffard had occasion to make use of it when performing a journey to the Hills to hold sessions there. “My Lord” must have been a bad traveller. He describes the agonies of the journey as follows:—

>“Marshes and quagmires, puddles, pools and swamps,  
Dark matted jungles and long plushy plains,  
Exhaling foetid airs and mortal damps,  
By Kandyian perfidy miscalled a Road,  
Through which the luckless traveller must wade,  
Uncheered by sight of man or man’s abode,”

To the late Mr. J. P. Lewis is due the credit of having saved these lines from oblivion.
A THRASHER'S SONG.
By H. Don Clement.

Jak! mak!—pita! pita!
Go fast, go slow.
Tread lightly, tread a bit hard,
Make the grain flow.

You good bulls, you strong bulls,
Do your task well;
The straw shall be yours, and
Each also a bell.

Now, stray not from the circle,
Watch the main pole;
Close to the rice stalks is
Close to the goal.

Now, take off the thrashed stalks,
Make haste, make haste.
The stuff unthrashed hand up.
Time, do not waste.

To the barn the thrashed rice
Take quickly away;
To the straw-shed the straw,
In the same way.

Now the day's work is over,
All things are done;
Thank we the Gods now, that
Day-light hath run.
THE FIRST CEYLON AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY.

By T. Petch.

The Ceylon Literary and Agricultural Society, which was founded in 1820, became moribund in 1826, and, after being resuscitated in 1830, succumbed in 1832. It was succeeded by the Ceylon Improvement Society, which appears to have been the former Society under another name, but this collapsed in 1834.

In 1838 and 1839, a Horticultural Society is recorded in the Ceylon Almanac, but no mention of it occurs in the Almanac for 1840. Presumably it was another Colombo institution.

In 1842, a Ceylon Agricultural Society was in existence, its headquarters being in Kandy. The late Mr. J. P. Lewis, in the Times of Ceylon, April 12th, 1922, wrote,

"A meeting was held at Kandy on 29th November, 1841, to start the Ceylon Agricultural Society there, and another on 8th January, 1842, to receive the report of the Committee appointed at the first meeting. Hew Stewart, afterwards editor of the Times, was present. It was prophesied that the Society would collapse, but a third meeting was held at the Kandy Library on 30th August, 1842, with Josias Lambert in the chair, and among others attended by some 16 members, including such well-known names as R. B. Tytler, R. D. Gerard, William Rudd, S. Northway, etc. But the Kandy branch must have gradually become inanimate, for on 1st December, 1855, a meeting was held there, for the purpose of starting the Kandy Agri-Horticultural Society."

The Kandy Society of 1842 was not a branch Society. It was the only Agricultural Society then existing. In the Ceylon Miscellany, (I, p. 223), there is a notice of a proposed Ceylon Agricultural Society, the meeting for its formation to be held in Kandy on January 1st, 1842. The Ceylon Almanac for 1843 records the Society, "established January 1st, 1842"; and the Proceedings of the Society contain the same statement. It con-
continued to be included in the *Ceylon Almanac* up to 1850, but it is omitted from the *Almanac* of 1851. Apparently, it ceased to exist in 1850.

The Society went to the expense of publishing its Proceedings. I have seen only one number of these, a small octavo volume of 84 pages, with three appendices, entitled "Proceedings of the Ceylon Agricultural Society for the half year ending the first of July 1843." The imprint is "Kandy: at the Baptist Mission Press." These are the Proceedings for the third half year: from the correspondence included with them it is evident that the Proceedings for the first half year had also been published.

The volume contains a "List of Subscribers," the "Third Half-yearly Report," short papers by various members, correspondence, report of the General Meeting held on July 31st, 1843, statements of cooly immigration, and registers of the "Thermometer and Pluviometer" at Madaweletenne and Kandy. The appendices are "Return of lands purchased from the Crown from May 1833 to May 1843 with the names of the purchasers and date of purchase, not including lots under fifty acres," and "A statistical account of estates under cultivation as far as returns have been received by the Committee." The third appendix, the Secretary's Balance Sheet, is missing. The "Half-year" was evidently somewhat elastic, as the correspondence runs from July, 1842, to September, 1843.

At the date of these Proceedings, the Governor, Lieut-General Sir Colin Campbell, was Patron of the Society, the Colonial Secretary, the Hon. Philip Anstruther, was president, the Hon. J. N. Mooyart and Mr. Josias Lambert, Vice-Presidents, and Mr. Charles Delegal, Secretary and Treasurer. The Subscribers, or Members, numbered 132, including 9 in London (some evidently temporarily), 2 in Calcutta, and 1 each in Liverpool, Glasgow, and Bombay, respectively. With about three exceptions, the members were Europeans.

The Report of the Committee deals with the immigration of Malabar coolies, the extension of the cooly shed for the accommodation of labourers arriving at and departing from Kandy, which was apparently maintained by the Society, the acquisition of land on which to erect an Agricultural Hall, the rates of pay of artisans in the Central Province, tolls on coolies travelling on foot "on the two lines of road thro' Kornegalle and Anaradja-
poora," the importation of garden seeds from India, America, and the Cape, etc. The balance in hand was £440-11-11, including arrears of £29 due by different members; but the Committee pointed out that the annual income of the Society was only £116, while the expenditure was £166. Reference was made to the fact that Government had included in the Estimates to be considered at the ensuing session, a sum of £200 which had been applied for by the Society. It is not clear how the Society had accumulated £440 as the annual subscription was only £1.

As regards the proposed Agricultural Hall, the Society had applied to Government for a free grant of a site in Kandy. Apparently the application had at first been favourably received, and a deed was drawn up, but the matter was brought to conclusion by the ruling of the Acting D.Q.A. (Queen's Advocate) that the Royal Instructions did not permit the Governor to make free grants of land to private parties. The Society then endeavoured to lease a plot of ground, opposite the Kandy Library, belonging to the Temple, but with no success, and the Committee reported that they were unable to obtain any suitable spot in Kandy.

Further light is thrown on the foregoing by letters in the Peradeniya files. On March 26th, 1842, the Colonial Secretary wrote to the Secretary of the Agricultural Society, as follows,—

"I have submitted to the Governor your letter of the inst., and in reply I am directed to acquaint you that the Governor proposes to assign to the Agricultural Society a site facing the Esplanade for rooms. Some of the lots asked for on the other side of the lake are already advertised for sale, and considering the great difficulty in finding sites for houses and the considerable value of the property, the Governor is reluctant to appropriate any portion for Experimental Gardens, but he has no objection to a portion of the Botanic Gardens being set apart for such a purpose, and the cultivation may be conducted by the Superintendent in communication with you."

The Secretary of the Agricultural Society, in acknowledging the above (April 11th, 1842) wrote,

"The Committee of Management have likewise directed me to say that they thankfully accept the offer of a portion of the Botanic Gardens being set apart for their use, and request that the Superintendent be directed to carry into effect the plans of the Committee in its cultivation."

Evidently the Society had applied for land facing the Esplanade on which to erect an Agricultural Hall, and land on the opposite side of the lake for an experimental garden. The former request
was favourably entertained, but in lieu of the land on the other side of the lake, part of the Royal Botanic Gardens at Peradeniya was offered. As already stated, it was ruled that the grant of the site for a private building was contrary to the orders of the Home Government, but it is not clear why the reservation of a portion of the Botanic Gardens also fell through. No communications appear to have been received by the Superintendent of the Botanic Gardens from the Society.

In July 1843, the Government, having somehow come into possession of a number of scientific books, including Wallich’s Plantae Asiaticae, Lindley’s Sertum Orchidacearum, and Loudon’s Arboretum, presented these to the Agricultural Society, with a request that the Superintendent of the Botanic Gardens might be allowed to consult them when he pleased. It is difficult to imagine what could have prompted this decision, for, with the possible exception of the Rev. S. O. Glenie, none of the members would be capable of making any use of the botanical books. Moreover, Agricultural Societies in Ceylon are ephemeral; and when a Society has come to an end, its library has as a rule been scattered, and books which have been diverted from the permanent botanical and agricultural library of the Colony have disappeared altogether, to the lasting detriment of the latter.

The Peradeniya files supply a sequel to the above. Gardner, in 1844, asked that the copy of Wallich’s Plantae Rariores Asiaticae should be transferred to Peradeniya. He was then engaged in working out the flora of Ceylon, and might require to consult that book at any moment. But he was informed that he could consult it in Kandy when he wished.

The communications from members of the Society include one from J. A. Hume, of “Doombera Sugar Estate”, on the cultivation of the Sugar Cane; others from A. Reid, of “Madolkelle,” on pruning trees and on growing Swede turnips; from E. Rawdon Power, of “Kaigalle”, entitled Remarks on Guinea Grass; and from J. Armitage, Colombo, on the subject of native coffee. J. Capper, Colombo, suggested the immigration of British artisans; S. Northway, of Ganguruwa, proposed the institution of an experimental garden; and the Hon. J. N. Mooyart advised the vaccination of all estate coolies.

Correspondence was carried on with the East India and China Association concerning the cinnamon duties; with the Bombay
Agricultural Society, regarding the cost of draught cattle in India; with the Agricultural Society of Calcutta, concerning supplies of seeds; and with the Ceylon Government, on tolls on coolies travelling on foot from the north, on the Carrier's Ordinance, etc.,

The correspondence with the East India and China Association provides interesting information on the postal charges of that date. The Agricultural Society had forwarded to the former Association in London a copy of the Proceedings for the first half year, and had advised the despatch by letter. On this the Secretary of the Association remarks.

"I will now allude to the proceedings of your institution for the first six months of its existence. Being forwarded, as well as the letter, Overland, and not marked *Via Falmouth*, the letter was charged 2s. 8d., and the proceedings £1.5-6, which latter was in consequence returned to the Post Office." (The third half-yearly Proceedings weighs four and a half ounces).

"I must here mention that this Committee have corresponded almost monthly, with the three Chambers of Commerce in India, and those of Singapore, Penang, Ceylon, etc., and have borne the expense of postage both ways for seven years; and the Committee long since directed me (and with reluctance, too, since they are desirous to obtain as much statistical information as possible) to decline receiving Books and printed papers, unless the parties sending take care that they come to me free from charge. Even those sent by ship (except in special cases) are declined; the ship letter postage being also heavy, and the Post Office making no reduction unless I can prove that the parcel was not intended to be sent through the Post Office, which in most cases it is impossible I can do."

The Society, in 1843, offered several premiums. These included £1 for the best Indian corn, between one and ten acres, and £10 for an area over ten acres, and the same amounts for Guinea Corn or Millet; £5 for the best plot of potatoes, not less than one acre; £5 for Malabar Cardamoms; £5 for the best sample of Cotton not less than 1 cwt. clean; £5 for Tobacco fit for the European market, not less than 1 cwt; prizes for miscellaneous vegetables, pairs of cattle, for the greatest number of calves bred by one individual, for the greatest number of coast cattle imported, for the best essay on the cultivation of coffee, for the best report on the means of encouraging immigration of coolies, and for the cangany who shall have procured the immigration of the greatest number of coolies.

A Sub-committee of the Society considered the question of encouraging the immigration of artisans, and advised the advertise-
ment of the current Ceylon rates in papers in India and Penang, viz.-

Carpenters and Joiners Rs. 20 to 30 per month
Masons Rs. 18 to 25 ", ",
Sawyers (per set) Rs. 45 to 55 ", ",
Blacksmiths Rs. 20 to 30 ", ",
Coolies Rs. 7½ to 9 ", ",

In the "Return of lands purchased from the Crown, from May 1833 to May 1843, with the names of the purchasers and date of purchase; not including lots under fifty acres," the first entry is for the year 1836. Two lots were sold in that year, two in 1837, five in 1838, and one in 1839. In 1840, the number was 25, and in 1841, it rose to 63. In 1842, it dropped to 26, while for the first four months of 1843 it was 26. The Venerable Archdeacon Glenie bought 1970 acres in the Nuwara Eliya district, and J.M.S. Glenie and H.S. Glenic 736 acres in the same district, in 1841. The Hon. J. A. Stewart Mackenzie bought 1024 acres in the Ganga-boda pattu of the Western Province, and 1120 acres in Upper Bulatgama, Central Province, in 1840. The Hon'ble P. Anstruther was content with 1374 acres in Upper Bulatgama, purchased in 1841. The Kaderani Cinnamon Plantation, 309 acres, was sold to James Ouchterlony on Feb. 8th, 1842.

The "Statistical account of Estates under cultivation as far as returns have been received by the Committee" gives details of 59 estates, viz., the name of the estate, district, extent in bearing, extent in cultivation, total extent of the estate, date of opening, rate of wages, distance from main road, nature of road, average number of coolies, and price of rice. According to this list, the oldest estate was Gampola Estate in Udapalata opened in 1824, but it had only 100 acres under cultivation, out of a total of 1280. The date of opening of Gangaruwa, the next oldest, is given as 1826-7: this is a year later than the date given in the biography of Sir Edward Barnes in the Tropical Agriculturist, XIII, pp. 73-80. Kattebady, in Hewagam Korle, had 135 acres opened, all in sugar cane.

The prices given for rice vary from 4 shillings to 12 shillings per bushel, the majority being about 6 shillings. Pussellawa and Black Forest reported that rice was supplied on the estate at 6 shillings, while Oodawella stated that when rice rose about (?) above) 6 shillings in the bazaar the proprietors issued it at that rate to the coolies.
The question of roads gave occasion for grousing even in those days. Moorootie, in Gannattene, was 13 miles from the main road, and the approach road to the estate was "Amphibious, if I may use the expression, partaking largely of the goat, of the elk, or the alligator; but it is needless to attempt to describe it, for in my opinion it is irregular and resembles nothing else in nature." The Gallanodane road was "bad, owing to disappointment of Government trace." Gomeratenne, in Dumbara, was approached over 22 miles of "shockingly bad" road. The superintendent of Kattebady stated that a jungle path from Colombo to Ruanwella passed through the estate; "this path was the old road from Colombo to Kandy, viz., Hanwella, Situak, Ruanwella, and Utuan-Kandy, and has been neglected since the new Kandy road was opened."

From the Proceedings of the Society, it is evident that it had little in common with the Agricultural, or Agri-horticultural, Societies of later date. It was rather a Planters' Association; and it may perhaps be regarded as the forerunner of the Ceylon Planters' Association, which was established in 1854.
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THE TEMPLE RUINS AT MEDIRIGIRI:

TAMANKADUWA.

By Harry Storby.

With Memorandum by H. C. P. Bell, C.C.S. (Retired.)
(On Pillar No. 2.)

These very interesting ruins are situated on a bold outcrop of rock, about twenty miles north of Polonnaruwa and about three miles, as the crow flies, due east of the great Kavuduluvewa tank in the Tamankaduwa District of the North Central Province. Though now buried in dense jungle, there is every evidence to show that, in former days, this temple was in the midst of a large agricultural district; and the same may be said of practically all ruins of religious buildings throughout the country, no matter how remote from habitations they may now be. The ancient monks did not bury themselves in the jungle; their temples and caves were always within easy reach of cultivated areas.

The existing ruins at Medirigiri are described in the Annual Reports of the Archaeological Survey, 1897 and 1907. For the purpose of this Paper, it may be briefly said that they consist of a fair-sized dagaba in ruin on the summit of the main Rock; and not far from the dagaba, on a detached hump of rock, the remains of a beautiful circular temple with most of the well-cut octagonal
pillars still in place. In the case of the two taller and inner of
the three circles of pillars of this shrine, the exquisitely carved
capitals are nearly all intact. These inner pillars stand 16 feet
out of the ground; so, allowing 4 feet of rough base underground,
each pillar represents a twenty-foot monolith! As they are less
than a foot in diameter, it may be imagined what care was necessary
to cut, transport, and erect them.

There are no less than ten sedent figures of Buddha, still
roughly in place round the remains of the small central dagaba
within the temple. These figures probably were presented
by private individuals, according to their means, as they
are of all sizes, (varying from one of considerably more than life-
size, occupying a separate "chapel" facing the east, down to small
figures not more than two feet high), and all cut out of white cal-
careous limestone.

The stone slabs of the outer wall of this temple are carved,
in relief, in the post-and-rail pattern.

The main entrance to this building was through a fine stone
doorway, still in situ at the foot of the hump of rock, at the north
side of the temple, leading to a stone staircase within stone-built
retaining walls.

About fifty yards west of this building, on another part of
the same Rock, are the remains of a long building, of which nothing
can now be seen except that some of the stone pillars (uncarved and
rough) are still in position, and the shapeless mounds of displaced
side-wall brickwork. Several life-size upright figures of Buddha are
lying in and about this ruin; none of them intact.

Just outside the north-west corner of this temple lay prone
what looked like a rough monolith, seven feet long by two feet
square. During my last visit to these ruins in June, 1924, when
examining this stone, thanks to the burrowing of some small
animal underneath it, I was able to feel that the apparently solid
block was hollow. After an hour’s work digging and levering,
my men turned it over to find that it was a stone coffin, or sar-
cophagus. This is interesting as, so far as I know, the only other
instances are the two at Anuradhapura and the one at the foot of
Mihintale Kanda. There was no sign of the lid, but, presuming
that this sarcophagus originally lay within the building, exca-
vation may lead to its discovery. Should it be found it may bear
an inscription, as there is no such thing on the coffin itself. If this sarcophagus was made to fit its occupant he must have been nearly 6'6" in height, but very thin!¹

Still further west, along this Rock, are the remains of another building, of which the pillars only are to be seen, and fallen remains of two erect figures of Buddha, larger than life-size.

Some little distance east of the circular temple lies the entrance porch to the temple precincts; rows of pillars only remaining. This porch is approached by a short flight of steps leading from a long platform by the side of a small half-cut, half-banked, pokuna at the foot of the Rock at that side; and this platform also has a flight of steps leading up to it at its far end.

Near the porch, cut in the main Rock, is an oval shaped cave where doubtless the door-keeper dwelt. A stone-built boundary wall surrounds the temple precincts, enclosing about two acres of rock and low ground. In a hollow of the main rock just without, and north-west of, the temple’s liminary wall, a small tank, or pokuna, had been formed by an earth bank across the end of the hollow. This tank is now breached, but usually contains a puddle of water.

The bund of a fair-sized tank, also breached, starts from the north-west end of the northern portion of the rock and runs almost due south for about half a mile.

East and north of the Rock there are still about fifty or sixty acres of open grass plain, formerly paddy-fields, served by two or three very small tanks, the bunds of which are still visible. An ancient máwata (high road) led out of the north end of this open space, right through to the Kanthalai district; passing by various rock-outcrops on the way, on most of which are remains of buildings or small dágabas. There are various cup-shaped hollows on one part of the main Temple Rock, varying from the size of a small coffee cup to a pudding-basin—all no doubt scooped for use of some sort (grinding materials or tools possibly) by the masons who built the temple.

I made a rather interesting discovery, on the main Rock exactly facing the circular temple and a little below the dágaba, in the

---

¹ "Further up the Sacred Road (Anurádhapura) there is a curious stone sarcophagus, said by tradition to have been King Dutugemunu’s medicine bath; measuring 7 ft. 2 in. by 2 t. 6 in. wide" (Burrows' Buried Cities of Ceylon, 1905, p. 51).
shape of two bed-places cut side by side, similar to those often seen in formerly occupied caves. Near the beds there is a circular flat surface, about two feet in diameter, merely levelled out of the gently sloping rock, obviously to hold the begging-bowl. The local natives call it "the elephant's footprint." I like to think that these bed-places, right out in the open on the bare rock, were occupied by two holy men who vowed themselves to remain there until the beautiful circular temple was completed!

On another part of the Rock I found a small socket, cut a few inches deep and about four inches square—no doubt a mortice hole to take the tenon of some object.

Just outside the entrance porch—originally, without doubt, built into the boundary wall—lies, broken into three pieces, an inscribed pillar of Kassapa V. (980-990 A.D.)

The contents of the record have been published in the *Epigraphia Zeylanica* (Vol. II. 1912, pp. 25-33) from "squeezes" supplied by the Archaeological Survey; and consist of the grant of certain immunities to the "Međiligiri-Êtveher-Piyan-gala in Rantisa in the district of Bidervatu-kulîya." For modern purposes we may assume the places last mentioned to be equivalent to "Rantisa Korale" in "Bidervatukulîya Pattu."

This mention of "Rantisa" enables me to make what may be a satisfactory identification of the ancient name of one of the great tanks.

In the *Epigraphia Zeylanica*, Vol. II. 1915 p. 142, in the Rangkot Dâgaba Inscription of Nissanka Malla at Polonnaruwa, it is stated that security is given to all animals in "Rantisa, Minihoru, Gangatala and Padi." Professor Wickremasinghe identifies "Rantisa" with "Suvanna Tissa" tank built by Mahâ Sena in the third century A.D. and repaired by Parâkrama Bâhu I. in the twelfth century; the other places named being, of course, Minneriya, Kancheilai and Padawiyâ tanks—all tanks of the largest size. I venture, therefore, to identify "Rantisa" as the great breached tank Kavudulû-vêwa, which lies only a matter of about three miles almost due east of the ruins, and was no doubt named after the division in which it lies. The only known Irrigation

---

(2) This tank may have been in working order up to the late seventeenth century, as Pybus, in his mission to the King of Kandy in 1762, mentions that the villagers told him the "river" called Kowdalay broke its banks 70 or 80 years ago and had never been repaired—obviously referring to the tank.
Channel connected with Kavudulu-vewa started from an anicut on the Gal-Oya, about three miles below the tank, passes about two miles west of the Mēdirigiri ruins, and was carried for about ten miles through the formerly populous country north of Mēdirigiri.

There also lies, within the temple precincts, an Inscribed Slab which Professor Wickremasinghe considers to be of the eleventh century A.D. but too indistinct for publication. It seems to deal with rules and regulations for the temple hospital.

The following references to the Mēdirigiriya temple in the Mahāvamsa prove its antiquity and great sanctity:—

Kaṇiṭṭha Tissa (223-241 A. D. according to Geiger) constructed an upōsatha house.

During the reign of Aggabodhi IV (circa 721-737 A.D.; Epigraphia Zeylanica), the “Malaya Raja”, a man of exceeding great wealth, built a relic house.

Sēna II (866-901 A.D. according to Wijesinha in the Mahāvamsa) gave to the temple some of his own possessions.

Vijaya Báhu I. (circa 1055-1110 A.D. Epigraphia Zeylanica) made repairs.

King Gaja Báhu (circa 1133-1153 A. D., Epigraphia Zeylanica) after his strife with Parākrama Báhu, and during the latter’s war with Mānābharana, “went up to the Vihāra Mandalagiri and made a solemn declaration there, saying ‘I have given the King’s country to King Parākrama.’” And when he had caused this to be inscribed on a table of stone, he returned to Kanthalai (Gangātatāka) and there died of an incurable disease of long-standing.

King Niṣṣanka Malla (circa 1188-1197; Epigraphia Zeylanica), in an inscription at Polonnaruwa, also refers to this temple as one repaired by him.

I have very little doubt that this temple,—and practically all others throughout that part of the country, and the North Central Province in general,—were pillaged and utterly destroyed by the Tamil invader and usurper, Māgha, during his twenty years of ruthless destruction and terrorism in the thirteenth century A.D., and never afterwards restored; for the Capital, Polonnaruwa, was practically abandoned shortly after that time.

The Inscription of Gaja Báhu II has always fascinated me. Where is that slab? It has never been found; and yet such a
unique record is surely worth looking for. On the many occasions that I have passed over this Rock on my way into the shooting country north of it, and during other occasions when I have camped at the ruins, I have always had this inscription in mind; but thorough search is impossible without a large clearing gang, owing to the dense thorny undergrowth all over the temple precincts.

The only local inhabitants who know the ruins intimately are the villagers of Divulánkaḍawela, a small village six miles west of the ruins on the Gal Oya—Polonnaruwa minor road; and whenever I have used these men as carriers, I have always questioned them about inscriptions. During one of my expeditions about ten years ago, a man mentioned that some other man had once seen an inscribed pillar whilst honey-hunting in the jungle years before. I bore this in mind, but no suitable opportunity offered for a special exploration trip until June, 1924, when at last I was able to visit Divulánkaḍawela intent on finding the pillar. I “told my tale” to the assembled old men of the village (all of whom knew me well and had been with me on hunting trips in earlier days), with the result that one of them declared that he was the man who had seen the pillar, but that, as it was twenty years ago, he could not be sure of finding it again. The jungle villagers are curiously reticent about that sort of thing, whether due to superstition or mere indifference I know not, but later events led me to think that most of them knew of the existence of this pillar, all the time.

Collecting about a dozen of the villagers as carriers, including the man who knew of the pillar, we tramped to the ruins six miles away in the forest and camped there. The pillar was easily found the next day lying in the dense jungle about a quarter of a mile, more or less, due east of the Rock. The upper half of it lay broken off and the lower half lay over at a considerable angle. In excavating the iron-hard earth at the base for the purpose of straightening it up, which needed much water-soaking, we found two other pieces of the pillar, each about a foot long, buried in the hole; clearly proving that treasure-seeking vandals (probably Mágha’s myrmidons) had broken, and partly dug out, the pillar in search of imaginary wealth. I soon found I could not take an “eye-copy” of the inscription, as the exposed parts were far too weathered, so I returned home the next day.
An interesting point about the location of this pillar is that it stood undoubtedly in the centre of a large village connected with the temple, on slightly rising ground higher than the open ground east and north of the Rock. An unmistakeable mawata leads from the south-eastern end of the open bit of country, through what is now dense jungle, into the centre of this former gam gođa (village site); and, for some hundreds of yards around the locality of the pillar, I came across broken tiles, pottery and bricks, with here and there short stone pillars, supports for granaries; and, in one place, remains of a small temple and a dug-out pokuna.

Two or three weeks later, having borrowed paper and other essentials, and got instructions, from Mr. H. W. Codrington, as well as from Mr. B. C. Juriansz (formerly employed by the Archaeological Survey, and now Secretary of the Matale U.D.C.), I set off again, intent on taking a "squeeze." The Divulánkađawela men were greatly interested in this, and gave me ready assistance. We duly set the base more or less upright, washed and replaced the smaller broken portions (one of which, unfortunately, had the whole of one inscribed face missing—broken off), and washed the top portion which was too heavy to be replaced. I took "squeezes" more or less successfully, and returned home the next day.

Mr. Codrington, to whom I sent the papers, reported that the Inscription was a duplicate of the one on another pillar of Kasyapa V—the one lying in the ruins and already published in the Epigraphia Zeylanica as aforementioned.

This was, of course, a disappointment, as I had formed great hopes that the Inscription was that of Gaja Báhu II. However, it becomes a matter of interest, as, on mentioning the matter to Mr. H. C. P. Bell, formerly Archaeological Commissioner, he at once said he had never come across a case of a duplicate of an Inscription previous in date to the not infrequent pillars (e.g. Pada-

viya, Dumbutulu-vēwa, Elahera) of Parākrama Báhu I of the twelfth century. The "squeeze" was submitted to him; and, after being assured that Mr. Codrington preferred not to undertake

(3) Whilst this work was being done a wandering bear, hearing the noise, climbed a tree about 35 yards away to see what was going on, making his presence known by a series of snorts and grunts. Him I forthwith shot and his dead body remained hanging in a high fork of the tree to the great delight of the villagers,

it, he has very kindly consented to write a Memorandum on the Inscription as an adjunct to this Paper.

I reported my "find" to the present Archaeological Commissioner, Mr. A. M. Hocart; but that gentleman informed me that he could not possibly tackle these ruins, or any part of Tamankaduwa, before 1925—hence my natural desire to make the most of the discovery.

I can only hope that Mr. Hocart's future exploration of these ruins will bring many interesting matters to light, including that elusive Inscription of Gaja Báhu.
MEDIRIGIRIYA.

Plate I.

Pillar No. 1. Side A.
MEDIRIGIRIYA.

Plate II.

Pillar No. 1. Side A.

Lines 1—12.
MEMORANDUM.

By H. C. P. Bell, C.C.S., (Retired).

Foreword.

Mēdirigiriya, that little known jungle-bound Rock dealt with above by Mr. Storey, has so far yielded three mediaeval lithic inscriptions, discovered at three different times.

(i) In August, 1897, Mr. H. C. P. Bell visited Mēdirigiriya, when, engaged as Archaeological Commissioner, in circuit work in Tāmankaḍuwa.

In a brief preliminary notice of the interesting Buddhist ruins at the site, reference is made to an "Inscribed Pillar of King Abhaya Salamevan (Kasyapa V), third regnal year," then first discovered. (A.S. Annual Report, p. 7, 1897.)

(ii) Ten years later (October, 1907) Mr. D. A. L. Perera, Chief Native Assistant, Archaeological Survey, sent by Mr. Bell to carry out excavations at Mēdirigiriya, reported inter alia:—

"Before penetrating very far into the jungle, we came across the inscribed slab, the discovery of which had been previously reported to the Archaeological Commissioner. It lies about 100 yards south-east of the "Waṭa-dá-gé. Measurements; 5 ft. 3 in., by 3 ft. 3 in. There are 44 lines of writing in small Sinhalese characters; about one third of the letters are worn away." (A. S. Annual Report, 1907, p. 32),

This slab inscription the Archaeological Commissioner considered (loc. cit.) to belong probably to Mahinda IV (circa A.C. 975-991).

Estampages of the Pillar Inscription No. 1 and the Inscribed Slab were despatched, in due course, to Mr. Don M. de Z. Wickremasinghe, the Ceylon Government Epigraphist working in England. In 1912 Mr. Wickremasinghe published the Pillar record (Text, Translation and Notes); but declared that "a reading good enough for publication" of the Inscribed Slab could
not be extracted from the paper “squeezes.” *(Epigraphia Zeylanica, 1912, Vol. II. pp. 25-33.)*

(iii) The third Inscription (Pillar No. 2) was not found until the present year (1924) The credit for its discovery rests entirely with Mr. H. Storey of Warakâmure Estate, Mátalé District

Mr. H. W. Codrington C.C.S., on collating the “squeeze”, sent to him by Mr. Storey, with the text of Pillar No. 1 as published in the *Epigraphia Zeylanica*, rightly pronounced Pillar No. 2 to be virtually a duplicate. Mr. Codrington could find time to transcribe Side A only before returning the “squeeze.” It was, thereafter, forwarded to the writer, and his aid sought by Mr. Storey.

**Medirigiriya Pillar Inscription, No. 2.*

The identity of the King, ‘*Abhā Salamevan,*’ who issued these almost duplicate edicts on stone (Pillars No. 1, 2), with Kāsyaṇa V. (A.C. 929-933) is confirmed by the records themselves; wherein he is described as “born to the twice-anointed Queen” *(dē-bissevhu dā)* by “the great King Śrī Saṅg Bo, conqueror of Madhura” *(Madhurā-dunu Śrī Saṅg Bo Maha Rājhu)*.

This identification has already been established for a quarter of a century and more by the record on the Nāmbākaḍa Pillar (N.C.P.) discovered in 1897 by the Archaeological Commissioner; which reads:— “Śrī Saṅg Bo Maha Rājhaṭ ema kulan samaiye Saṅga Rejne kuse upon Abhā Salamevan Maha Rājhru” *(A.S. Annual Report, 1891, pp. 66-7.†*

Sangha, mother of Kāsyaṇa V, was twice “raised to the rank of Queen” ; first by Sena I, and, after his death, as “Queen Consort” by his nephew “Mugayin Sen” or Sena II *(Mahāvaṇa L. 58; LI. 6)*, the “*Abha Śrī Saṅg Bo*” of Ḫelleveva *(A.S. loc. cit. pp. 45-6)* and other pillar inscriptions.

The two Medirigiriya Pillar Inscriptions are dated in the third regnal year of King “*Abhā Salamevan,*” and in the month *Navan*, the latter point fixed by Pillar No. 2, the stone having broken away at the place on Pillar No. 1.†

---

*The Inscription is edited by Mr. Bell at the request of Mr. H. Storey, on the understanding that Mr. H. W. Codrington prefers not to deal with it himself.
†See *Epigraphia Zeylanica* I. 1907 p. 43.
‡See Plates I, II.*
This Pillar Edict was, therefore, granted to the Mēdirigiri Buddhist monks in the earlier part of the reign of that King.

A transcript of the Text agreeing with Plate III, is given below. Lacunae, where the stone is broken, and illegible parts (Side C, lines 6, 7, ), have been supplied by collation with Pillar No. 1.

For the Government Epigraphist’s official edition of Pillar Inscription No. 1, reference should be made to Epigraphia Zeylanica Vol. II. pp. 25-33 and its Plate 6.

Of the present sister Pillar No. 2 a translation closer, and less markedly periphrastic, is here offered; accompanied by Notes where called for.

**Text.**

Certain portions of the record on Pillar No. 2 (Side A, beginning of lines 10 to 13; Side B, lines 10 to 15; Side D; all lines) have unfortunately disappeared; other parts are too weathered to be read letter by letter. But patient collation of the two Inscriptions on Pillars Nos. 1 and 2 has enabled the text of the latter to be made out line by line everywhere, verbatim et literatim, except the missing pieces on Sides A, B, D, and lines 6, 7, of Side C; taken on trust from Pillar No. 1.

Pillar No. 2, Side C, ends abruptly with “me attani pe-”, giving no completed sense. If the Inscription concluded, as is more than probable, exactly as lines 12 to 17 of Side D, Pillar No. 1, the words “-rher dummahasi me ânne* ualaâghand kaâla kenek kavudu balu vâhâyâ Arogya siddhi” should have been on face D. According to Mr. Storey, no writing whatever is visible now; though that side (from a sketch made by him) shows signs of both wâtâpata and dêkêlta, two of the four emblems carved on the corresponding face of Pillar No. 1. Both pillars still retain their kalasa (vase) head.

The writing on Pillar No. 2 was more compressed by the stonemason than that of Pillar No. 1: thus, No. 2, Side A (26 lines) covers Side A 26 lines, with Side B lines 1 to 4, of No. 1; No. 2, Side B (26 lines) embraces Side B lines 5 to 26, and Side C lines 1 to 9, of No. 1; No. 2, Side C (27 lines) has lines 10 to 26 of Side C, and lines 1 to 11, of side D No. 1.

---

* Pillar No. 1 D, line 13, “yi me ânne,” is too worn to be read, but can be safely supplied, from other Inscriptions.
A.
1. Oka vasin bat
2. jayoraphi Sari Lak-
3. -divat talal tik vu
4. siri bar siri piitd
5. tamap yesen Damba-
6. -div talal ehli
7. ko't Madhuradi-duni Si-
8. -ri Saang Boy maha
9. radhu de-bisev-
10. (-hu dA) Abha Salame-
11. (-van) ma purnakatun-
12. (-van)n(ey) Navaye-
13. (va vi)seniyek te-
14. (-n sa)miyen vadale
15. (-yin) Paangi rad De-
16. -lu varin a Mekap-
17. -par Asholu
18. Mihindu isaa Sume-
19. -rgamu Satad isaa Ma-
20. -hale Kasba Rak-
21. -samnan varin a
22. Ku'ndasala Kitmen
23. isaa ep me tuva-
24. -k rad kol sam-
25. -daruvamo vadale-
26. -yin avud Bider-

B.
1. -vatu kujiyehi a-
2. -vu Ratisaye pi-
3. -hihi Mediliir
4. Et Veher Piya-
5. -ngale satar si-
6. -mayen etulv-
7. takt tenat de-ruva-
8. -ne de-kam ten no-
9. -vadna isa pere-
10-15 (nattiyam novadna isa
  dunumafula melatt
  novadna isa veriyam gam
gon gel mivun nonaf-
ganu isa dunuvu ba-

C.
1. isaa ved hal vessa-
2. -n gam vede e (....
3. ...)no karun isa ve-
4. leyut samdaruvan ga-
5. maat vede rat (...) nogan-
6.7.† nA isaa (mala elu kuku-
   -lan Veher vedhalaat bahA
   24. -t vadaleyin
   25. avud radkol

*Want of type to represent the half-nasal has been met feu or severs by substituting the
liquid s symbol.
† The text of these lines on Pillar No. 2 may well differ, as the words (inserted tentatively
from Pillar No. 1) seem to exceed available space.
‡ Owing to defective junction at this line of two strips of Mr. Storey's "squeeze", as
received, the letters "—ri Veher Piya" (essential to the sense) do not appear in Plate III.
Pillar No. 2. Sides A. B. C.
Translation. 1

On the fifth (day) of the waning half (ava) of (the month) Navan (Navaye) 2 in the third (regnal) year of His Majesty Abhá Salamevan, begotten on the twice-anointed Queen (de-bissevhu dá) by the Great King Sirí Saṅga Bo, conqueror of Madura (Madhurá-dunu), 3 descended from the Okkáka race (Oká vasín boť), imbued with victory (jayaró), 4 the tilaka (forehead mark) of the illustrious Island of Láŋká, who has fully illumined (ek heši kot) Dambadiva (India) with the glorious immensity (lit. "rich weight and pile," sirí bar sirí piṅč) of his fame (tamá yesen).

(The Edict) vouchsafed by His Majesty (vadáleyin) in the (State) Council (ek ten samiyen) of all of us nobles of royal blood (raj-kol samdarwan), by (His Majesty’s) Order assembled; to wit, Asholu Mihindu of the Body Guard (Mekáppar) and Sumer- gamu Sátá, 5 (both) descended from the family of Páñđi-rad Dápula, and Kuṅḍásalá Kitti descended from the family of Kasbá (Kásyapa) Arakasamaṇa.

Within the four boundaries of the (Temple) site (embracing) Et Vehera Piyangala 6 (Monastery) on Mędirigiriya (Rock) situated 7 in Rantissa belonging to Bidervatu-kuliya 8 (Division), (those who are engaged in the two...... de-ruvané, and (those who fill) the two posts of......de-kam ten) 9 may not enter (the Temple premises); the former inhabitants (pere-naṭṭiyan) 10 may not enter; the Body of Barbarian (or Foreign) Archers (Dunumaḍulu meḷáṭti) 11 may not enter; labourers (veriyan), 12 village oxen (gam gon) and draught (lit. carts and) buffaloes (gel mivun) may not be taken (for use); Chiefs of Archers (Dunuwá balat) 13 Chiefs of Provinces (and) Chiefs of Districts (Raṭ ladu Pas laddan) 14 may not enter; 15 the five Agricultural
Headmen (*Veleyut pasdena*)\(^1\) may not enter; footpads and vagrants (*mañgiva piyadiva*)\(^1\) may not enter; \(\ldots \ldots .\) (*sendive de utu kiri*),\(^1\) uncooked and cooked rice oblations (*bili sâl bili bat*)\(^1\) may not be removed; those who have committed assault (*kôjavan*)\(^2\) and been expelled from villages (*gemin piyat karavâ*) may not be (re)admitted on returning to villages (*gam vele*) unless (voluntarily) taken back (*ganut mise*); inmates of hospitals (*ved hal vessan*) who enter villages may not commit \(\ldots \ldots \); Agricultural Proprietors (*Veleyut samdarwan*)\(^2\) who enter villages may not take \(\ldots \ldots \); sick (*maña*)\(^2\) goats and fowls may be intrusted to the Vihâre hospital.

We nobles of royal blood, *viz.*: Asholu Mihindu of the Body Guard and Sumergamu Sâtâ of the family of Pândi-rad Dâpula, and Kûndasalâ Kitti of the family of Kasbâ Araksamana, assembled by Order (of His Majesty) in Council (of State) have granted this Immunity Pillar (*attiâni perher*) for the (Temple) site, within the four boundaries, (embracing) the Vehera Piyangala (Monastery) on Mêdirigiri (Rock) situated in Rantisa belonging to Bidervatukulâya (Division).

Whoever infringes this Edict (*me ánne*) will be (reborn) crow or dog.

All hail (*Arogya sidâhi*,\(^2\) lit. "health and prosperity")!
Notes.*

1. Mr. Wickremasinghe (*Epigraphia Zeylanica, II.* pp. 30), translates the preamble of Pillar No. 1 as follows:

"On the fifth day of the waning moon (of the month of......), in the third year (of the reign) of His Majesty Abhā Šalamevan who is (like unto) a tilaka mark (of adornment) to the......prosperous island of Lānkā, an embodiment of good fortune and majesty, a descendant of the Okkāka dynasty, and who was born of the twice-anointed queen unto the great king Mayurādunu Śiri Saṅg-BOY, illuminating the whole of Dambadiva with his glory.

Whereas it was (so) decreed by the Supreme Council, we, all of us, Officers of State, namely, Mekāppar Asaholu Mihinādu of the family of Pāṇḍi-rad Dāpuḷa, and Sumeragamu Sātā and Kuṇāsandal Kit of the family of Mahāle Kasbā Araksamaṇa, have come.

And whereas, touching the area included within the four boundaries of Meḍiligiri-Eṭveher-Piyān-gala situated in Rantieṣ in the district of Bideratu-kulīya, it was graciously decreed by the Supreme Council that holders (?) of the ....."

Grammatical construction allows equally, if not better, of the regal epitaphs being assigned—not to Abhā Šalamevan (Kāsyapa V) the son, but—to Śiri Saṅga Bo (Sena II) his father; whilst historical truth demands it. By his conquest of Madura Sena I may have partially at least "illumined Dambadiva" (India); the disastrous Expedition to Southern India of Kāsyapa V, his son, could hardly be matter for panegyric.

2. Navaye. Pillar No. 1 is broken where the name of the month should come in. Mr. H. W. Codrington, who at first read "ndvepe=Unduvap" on Pillar No. 2, accepts the writer's correction, Navaye, Navan (February,—March).

* In these Notes, for brevity, Dr. E. Müller is usually quoted as M.; Bartholomew Gunasekara, Mudaliyar and Chief Translator to Government, as B.G.; Mr. Don M. de Z. Wickremasinghe, Epigraphist to the Ceylon Government, as W.
3. Madhurâ-dunu. "Conqueror of Madura". Mr. Wickremasinghe (E. Z. loc. cit.), mistaking the medieval form of Singhalese अ धु for ओ यु, has read the phrase wrongly as "Mayurâ-dunu;" footnoting "born of the Mayurâ (peahen)," as translation:

The incidents leading up to the capture of Madura by Siri Saṅga Bo or Sena II are detailed with much gusto in the Mahawârâa (Chap. LI, 22-47).

"Little wonder that, in days when bombast in high places knew few bounds, King Sena II should have assumed the fairly won appellation of "Madhurâ-dunu," or "Conqueror of Madura;" just as some fifty years subsequent the Chóla King Parantaka, I, after overrunning the Pândiyân country, styled himself in his Tamil lithic records, "Madirai-konda;" whilst his grandson, Uttama Chóla was known as "Madhurântaka," the Sanskrit equivalent—a title which was also adopted a century or so later by Kulottuṅga Chóla III. " (Bell, Ceylon Antiquary, 1918, IV, pp. 24-25).

The biruda (epitaph) Madhurâ-dunu occurs under the form of Madhurâ pêhâla" (for the more usual phrase Pâñḍi rad pêhêra) in Inscriptions at Pudukkulama and Moragahavela (N. C. P.) and Kongalléva (S.P.)

In his transcript and translation of the last mentioned pillar record (Ceylon Inscriptions, 1883, 116, p. 78), Müller writes ingenuously:—Madûke pêhêla, "the King was pleased to sit under a maduка tree."

4. Jayorâ. Mr. Wickremasinghe reads "(jiyorâ)" on his "squeeze" photograph (Pillar No. 1), but makes "no attempt to give it an interpretation."

Photograph of that pillar (taken by the writer in 1897) shows the spelling of the word quite clearly. (Plate II.)


5. Sumergamu Śâtâ. This Noble’s name is among those on a broken pillar at Tâmaravila, Tamankaḍuva.
6. Et Veher Piyangala. Very probably so named after the Piyangala Monastery of Et Vehera Kanda at Mihintale (N.C.P.), mentioned in the well-known twin-slab Inscription of Mahindu IV (Ceylon Inscriptions, 1883, 121, p. 84; Epigraphia Zeylanica, I. p. 108).

7. Pihiḍi. The mason, blundering, cut hipiti for pihiti on Pillar No. 1 (Side A. lines 6,7).

8. Bidervatu-kuliya. A Council Pillar of Immunity (Polonnaruwa Inscription) was also set up by Order of King Abhaya Salamevan, on the 5th day of Vap in his third regnal year, at the village “Asurvaneγama in Bidervatu-kuliya in the Eastern Division set apart by the Tamils (Demalín bahddun pedum pashi Bidervatu-kuli yehi Asurvaneγama)”

9. De-ruvané; De-kam ten. Conclusive fixing of the special offices, services, or forms of work, covered by these terms has yet to be satisfactorily clinched.

Almost universally found together in pillar inscriptions of the period, they have so far defied definite solution.

M. (loc. cit. 1883 p. 102) —“that two......shall (not) enter; that two karmāsthānas shall not hinder (Mahakalattēva Inscription, 110). B. G. (loc. cit., 1897, pp. 60—1) renders:—“those who hold posts of two kinds of work;” “those who carry on two kinds of work” (Rambēva; Padaviya; Inscriptions). W. has:—“inhabitants (vessan) holding two kinds of services” (E.Z.,I. 1904, p. 37; Vessagiriya); “holders (?) of (the management of) two places of business” (II, 1924, pp. 32—3; Mēdirigiriya).

That de-ruvané de-kam ten were distinct seems established by more than one pillar inscription at Anurādhapura* giving each term separately with vessan immediately succeeding; and from the use of de-kam ten alone (Puliyanakulam; Anurādhapura).

De-ruvané (vessan). Presumably two words, as all de-kam, but possibly only one. No plausible m a... forthcoming.

Cf Ceylon Antiquary, IV, 1918, pp. 106-8.
De-kam ten (vessan). Employees at stations (ten) for two undertakings (de-kam) of special nature, e.g. tax- toll- etc. collectors.

On mere unsupported surmise, de-kam ten may perhaps have been two Departments similar to, or even identical with, the "two branches of the King’s service (Army and Revenue)," or the "two Ministers of Accounts" and the "Antarapagadhura," as organised by Parákrama Báhu I (Mahávansa, LXIX 29—35) in the Twelfth Century.

10. Perenátiyam, (perenátta, perenátiyuvam, and other variants). Taken as—Siwifelese pere “former” + Tamil nátiyuvam,-var “country-men” (Winslow).

Possibly the Veddá aborigines are meant; though the term perelékkan (which occurs simultaneously, as well as singly, in other records) would seem to fit these autochthrones better: pere+Lékkan “natives of Ceylon.”

M. (loc. cit) has no reference to the word. B. G. suggested (i) “dancers” (ii) “former rulers.” W. offered provisionally (E.Z., I. p. 53) “the former (villagers);” but has left the word untranslated in inscriptions dealt with later.

11. Dunumağulu meláti. Like other combinations (e.g. gam gon, gei mívun, &c.) these two terms, when both occur, are generally found together.

Dunumağulu. M. (loc. cit) prints the word, without translating. W. lets it stand in his translations; but adds (E. Z., II, pp. 5, 33) footnotes where it precedes meláti Meláti (several variants meláti, melázi, &c.). M. (loc, cit) prints, but gives no explanation.

B. G. (loc. cit) was the first to identify this word with Sanskrit mleccha “outcast” “barbarian,” “savage”. Mr. Wickremasinghe at first adopted B. Gunasekara Mudaliyar’s “savages,” (E.Z., I. p. 53); but has always subsequently quoted the word in Siwifelese, footnoting only when it follows dunumağulu. The combined terms he (E.Z., II, pp. 5, 33) suggests “may mean meláti of the archery department.”

The words (with kuli interposed occasionally) doubtless denoted a force of Foreign (or Veddá) Bowmen mercenaries employed by the Siwifelese Kings.

Mr. Wickremasinghe’s tentative rendering of “labourers,” classing the word with *gon, gel, mivun,* is supported by “*gel mivun minisun noganné kot*” in an Anurádhapura Inscription.

13. *Dunuvá balat.* M. has nothing. B. G. (loc cit.; Padaviya Pillar, where the line is weathered) reads *dunu pábalar,* and translates “archers and foot-soldiers.” W. here (E. Z., II. p. 33) renders *dunurá balat* (*dunuvá=Skt. dhanurvat; balat=Páli balattha’.* “archers” “officers.”

14. *Raṭ ladu Pas ladddan.* M. is wholly silent. B. G. (loc. cit) “those who have obtained the (whole) kingdom (*raṭ*) or part (*pas*) thereof.” W. prefers “district headmen or keepers of (district) books;” making “*raṭ-ladu=Skt. ráśtra labdha,* and *pas-ladu* (variant form)=Skt. *pañjiká labdha* (E. Z., I. p. 70).”

B. Gunasekara Mudaliyar’s rendering accords best with the *Maháwañsa* XLVIII, 83, 95, 118; LI, 122) “Chiefs of Provinces (*Mañḍalike*) and “Chiefs of Districts” (Rathiye.)

15. Pillar No. 2. Side C, lines 16, 17. Here Pillar No. 1. (C. lines 22, 23) differs: instead of *novadá isá* ("may not enter") it has *veḍe isir nokaranu isá;* which Mr. Wickremasinghe would render “shall not enter and exercise authority.”

16. *Veleyut pasdená.* Doubtless some grade of Agricultural Supervisors of the period, whose mantle has fallen at the present day on *Vel Muládéní* (*Vel Vídáne, Déviyá, Duráyá, Pádiyá*).

17. *Mañḍíva piyadíva.* (alternative forms *mañgíva piyagíva*). M. *loc. cit.): “travellers and pilgrims.” B. G. (loc. cit.) “those living by highway robbery (and) those living by vagrancy.” W. (E. Z., II. pp. 33.) “tramps and vagrants.” Whilst Royalty fatuously encouraged such pestiferous rogues, giving “largely to the beggar, the wayfarer and the mendicant” (*Maháwañsa*), the Buddhist monks, more wise, seem to have tabooed them.

18. *Sendive de utu kiri.* W. (E. Z., II. p. 33) offers no translation except “....milk;” and for the Bilibéva Inscription
(where the expression again occurs), only "sendive) de utu kiri milk" (E.Z., II. p. 43). The words are baffling.

(i) If kiri, in this connection, means "milk," the term may denote some form of milk-confection (cf. Sanskrit ut-karika "sweetmeat of milk treacle and ghee") such as those Sinhalese Kings delighted to bestow in charity (e.g. Mahāvamsa. XLV, p. 25).

(ii) Taking de=two; utu="six", kiri=kiriya (P. karisā), "four amunams"; de-utu kiri in the connection could possibly, if improbably, be stretched to mean "forty-eight amunams of sendive (so called) land".

The whole expression needs further investigation.


20. Kotavvan (variants kotavannan, kotavannavan). W. taking "kotā for mini kotā" (also met with at times) translates "those who having committed homicide."

Plain kotavannan occurs as frequently as the compounds with mini. Any brawlers guilty of serious assaults, homicide and murder aside, would be anathema to Buddhist monks unless they had first sought and obtained priestly pardon.

21. Velgut samdarvan. These landlords were presumably persons of good birth. Samdarvan=svāmi-darakānan 'descendants of lords." (W.)

22. Mala eluvan kukułan. Evidently but half satisfied with a rendering which involves the impossible acceptance by Buddhist monks of slaughtered flesh or fowl, Mr, Wickremasinghe, translates: "(Dead?) goats and fowls shall be assigned to the hospital of the Vihāre."

Mala at times seems to have had the elasticity of "dead" in English, and meant "sick" "badly wounded" "moribund". Cf. Tun Yaha lu Wastuva story in Saddharmā-Lankārya: "piṭitola hayā bėnda vada keremin mara marā ġepayana laddāva...."

Animals and birds, were received into Buddhist Temple hospitals for treatment.

According to the Mahāvamsa (XXXVII, 99). King Buddhađāśa appointed "medical practitioners to attend on
elephants and horses;" and the same Chronicle relates how "a certain raven afflicted with canker, and in great pain, entered the Hospital of the King (Parakkrama Bahu I)," where the physician treated and cured him (loc. cit. LXXIII. p 49—53)

23. *Arogya siddhi*. Only one other inscription (Mihintale, Pillar now in the Colombo Museum) is known ending with this combined phrase; but *Siddhi* alone closes the Maha Kirigalleva and Borupanvila Pillar Inscriptions (N. C.P.).
NOTES ON THE DAMBADENIYA DYNASTY.

BY H. W. CODRINGTON, C.C.S.

(Concluded from Vol. X, Pt. 1, page 53.)

The sole reign of Vijaya Báhu IV. calls for little comment. A point of interest is the presence of "Árya" mercenaries under one Thakuraka. This name appears to be a well-known Rajput title (Skt. thakkura). Now Tod, in his Annals of Rajasthan (Vol. I, p. 276), relates that Bheemsi, uncle of and regent for the young king Lakumsi of Chitor, who came to the throne in A.D. 1275, married Pudmini, daughter of Hamir Sank, a Chohan, of Ceylon. It seems probable, therefore, that the "Áryas" were Rajputs in the pay of the Sinhalese king. The Maháváya carefully distinguishes them from the Sinhalese.

Apparently early in the reign of Bhuvanaika Báhu I. (1271-1283) an invasion took place under Kálińga Ráyar, Choñaganga and others: this may be referred to in an inscription of the 11th year of Máravarman Kulasekhara Pándya I. (1279/80), "who was pleased to take the Malai-nádu, the Chola country, the two Końgu countries, Ílam, and Tońdaí-mándalam." A KálińgaRáyar appears as the minister of three kings, Jatávarman Sundara Pándya I. (1251—1280), Jatávarman Víra Pándya II. (1254—1275), and the Kulasekhara above mentioned.

The most important event of the reign was the great Pándyan invasion under Árya Chakravarti, who carried off the Tooth Relic from Yápañu. The Maháváya seems to connect this occurrence with a famine and to place it after Bhuvanaika Báhu’s death.

But the *Dañđā Sīrīta* definitely says that the country was invaded "in his reign" (śrīsīrītāvagām), though quite possibly at the very end of it. It is often stated that Ārya Chakravarti was the king of Jaffna, whose sovereigns in later times undoubtedly bore this title. But the *Mahāvāṇaṇa* distinctly calls him a minister, and he is well known as such from an inscription of the 37th year of Kulasekhara Pāṇḍya I. (1305)\(^{16}\).

The family may have obtained the northern kingdom after the disaster of 1254—1257, though the tradition preserved by de Queiroz makes the succession a peaceable one, or again the Jaffna Kandam, an era beginning on May 20, 1282, may mark its accession. If this be so, and if Ārya Chakravarti then put a relative on the throne by force, the Pāṇḍyan invasion may have occurred in that year, and Bhuvanaika Bāhu’s embassy to Egypt have been sent as the king of the Yemen had failed him in his need. But as the Sinhalese king’s death appears to have been followed by a long interregnum, it is more likely that the Pāṇḍyans fell upon Ceylon after the embassy and in the last days of the reign. There is no reason why the Ārya Chakravarti dynasty, if it came to the throne by marriage as stated by de Queiroz, should not have begun to rule in 1282, independently of any invasion.

Tradition, as given in the Lewuke sannasa, ascribes the foundation of Alutnuwara Devāle in Four Koraḷes to this Bhuvanaika Bāhu.\(^{17}\) The real founder was Parākrama Bāhu IV.

Parākrama Bāhu III. was the son of Vijaya Bāhu IV. and so nephew to the late king. From this reign onwards the *Mahāvāṇaṇa* gives no regnal years. Luckily we have the short Tamil poem, the *Sarajoti-mālai*,\(^{18}\) begun by the Brahman, Bhoja Rāja Pāṇḍita on the orders of the king in his seventh year and recited at his court on Wednesday in Vaikāśi in the spring of Śaka 1232 under the asterism Anusha, a date which works out as Wednesday, May 14, A.D. 1310. Given a year for composition, the accession must have taken place about A.D. 1302. The sole difficulty lies in the fact that the king is called "Parākrama Bāhu of Dambarai" i.e. Dambadeniya, whereas he lived at Polonnaruwa. The abbreviation may be compared with "Anurai" for "Anurādhapura," applied to any Sinhalese capital. The difficulty is more apparent

---

than real, as the dynasty was of Dambadeniya, and as late as the fifteenth century Parâkrama Bâhu VI. in the Pêrákumbâ Sirîta, (verse 72) is spoken of as "of Dambadeniya." This city, no doubt, was used occasionally as a royal residence. It should be observed that in common parlance the coins of Bhuvanaika Bâhu I. of Yapahu are called Dambadenî kâsî, "Dambadeniya money," and this term almost certainly includes those issued by the Kurunegala kings.

The date for the accession so obtained leaves us with an interregnum of some 19 years. It is precisely at this period that Marco Polo, passing Ceylon on his voyage from China to Persia (1292-c.1294), speaks of a king of Ceylon called "Sendemain," a name not yet recognized. Polo's version of Indian names is fairly good, witness "Sonder Bandi Davar" (Sundara Pândya Tévar), and the identification with Chandrabhânu thus is inadmissible. This king was independent and may have been the king of Jaffna, though at this time he can have been little better than a viceroy of the mighty Pândyan empire. A number of Pândyan coins of this period have been found in Ceylon. Marco Polo also tells of an embassy from Kublai Khan sent to Ceylon to obtain the Tooth and Bowl Relics in 1284; 19 a Chinese authority, Tao I Chih Lüeh, states that at the beginning of the Mongol dynasty (1280-1368) envoys were sent thrice for the Bowl, but apparently failed to get it. 20 When the Tooth Relic was recovered by Parâkrama Bâhu by personal application to the Pândya it is not apparent: it must have been before the death of Kulasekhara Pândya I. in 1308, presumably shortly after 1302.

The Mahâvânsa, as received, gives no indication of anything but a peaceful transfer of the sovereignty from Parâkrama to his first cousin Bhuvanaika Bâhu II. But Wijesinha records a variant text, which tells how the king suspected the prince of an intention to seize the kingdom and sent his barber to blind him. The same story appears in the abridged Mahâvânsa published by Upham. 21 According to the Dañdâ Sirîta, here almost contemporary, "a king named Pêrákumbâ, son of king Vijaya Bâhu, came to the throne of the Island of Ceylon, went abroad,

21. Sacred and Historical Books of Ceylon, I. The original of this abridgment should be traced.
and, pleasing the Pândyan king, received and brought back the Tooth Relic, and while, having come to Polonnaruwa, he was reigning, a king (ඉදිවීමඳුම්) named Śrī Nivāsa-báhu Advitīya Bhuvaneka Báhu son of king Bhuvaneka Báhu attained the sovereignty, enquired about the Tooth Relic, and, having heard that story, went with his own might and without fear, and having with his heroic arm subdued that Pērakumbá and got the victory brought the Tooth Relic to his own city,” namely Kurunegala.

From this narrative perhaps it may be deduced that his rebellion began shortly after the recovery of the Relic; in that case he was not successful until after 1310, unless indeed Parākrama was driven southwards and reigned for a time at Dambadeniya, a possible but improbable solution of the difficulty raised by the Sarajoti-málai. But it is more likely that Parākrama Báhu reigned as a tributary of the Pándya; doubtless Kulasekhara’s terms were onerous, when he gave up the Tooth Relic. If this be so, Bhuvanaika Báhu’s rebellion may have been induced by the overthrow of the Pándyan power at the hands of the Muhammadans in 1310. According to the Mahávamsa, (XC, 62) he was crowned in or shortly before the month of Jyeshta or Poson, at that time usually beginning in May, the ordination festival then held immediately following (කොළඹක්‍ය) his inauguration.

The received text of the Mahávamsa, (XC, 63) makes him die in his second year, reading: මහාවම්සය පෙන්වේ ටිළිලි මහා පෙන්වේ දිළිලි මහා. But the Daladá Sirita, written in his son’s reign, states that he celebrated nine ordination festivals, the same number as Parākrama Báhu II. This chronicle is a better authority for this king than the Mahávamsa, and a reign of at least nine years has to be assigned to him. As his son came to the throne in Śaka 1347 or A.D. 1325/6, this must have begun at least in 1316. Now the mode of distinguishing kings by numbers begins at this very time; the Sinhala Bódhivamsaya, written in the next reign, speaks of the king as “the second Paṇḍita Parākrama Báhu, son of the second Bhuvaneka Báhu,” and the Daladá Sirita plays on the same word “second,” calling our Bhuvanaika Báhu “second to none.” As this part of the Mahávamsa gives no regnal years to his predecessor or to his successors, I suggest that මහා
be emended to जीत्तेऽत्, the sentence reading in English: “this second Bhuvaneka Bāhu yielded himself to the law of mutability.” Verse 63 then will be exactly parallel with verse 103. This king built the Tun-bo Vehera, not mentioned in the Mahāvaṃsa.

His son, Parākrama Bāhu IV. succeeded in A.D. 1325/6 at Kurunegala. Among his works were the Sirighanānanda Vihāre at Viddumagāma or Vīdāgama near Rayigama, in which he installed the “great Elder of the Chola country” (Mh. XC, 98, 99), with whom he had read the Jātakas; this priest was the first of the Vīdāgama succession. In the country of Māyādhanu he built a “new city” and a devāle for Vishnu. Wijesinha so translates and makes matters worse by adding a note, “the country round about Sitāvaka,” under the impression that because Māyādunnē reigned at that place the Māyādhanu country was in the neighbourhood. We have seen that Vijaya Bāhu IV. placed Wākirigala in the charge of the Māyādunu host. A careful study of the Maha Kadāim-pota will enable the student to identify Māyādunu-raṭa with Galboda Korale in Four Korales. It is in this division that Ambulugala is situated. This in the fifteenth century was the seat of a principality extending over the Four and probably the Three Korales; hence the younger brother of Parākrama Bāhu VI; was styled Māyādunu Parākrama Bāhu Yuvaraja, as in the Paravi Sandesaya. The “new city,” therefore, was Alutnuwarara and the devāle the famous temple at that village, whence the red sandalwood image of Vishnu was translated later to the Kandy Maha Devāle.

The Sīqhala Bōdhivaṃsaya was composed in this reign by Vilgammula Mahā Sthavira of the Karambavāḷān lineage of Gangaṭalā, incumbent of the Kit Sirimevan Vihāre at Kelaniya. He appears again in the inscription at that temple dated a few years later in A.B. 1887 or A.D. 1344/5 23.

In the regulations for the Tooth Relic temple in the Dalada Siri, the Ganaveši and Kiliṅg (Kaliṅga) branches of the royal family are mentioned more than once.

It was in this reign that Kao-lang-pu (Colombo) was visited in November A.D. 1330, by the Chinese Wang Ta-Yuan; it seems to have been governed by an independent chieftain as it was 14 years later in the time of Ibn Batuta.

Parākrama Bāhu died before 1344, and two kings, Vanni Bhuvanaika Bāhu, who is said to have constructed Kurunegala tank, and Jaya or Vijaya Bāhu reigned between his death and the accession of Bhuvanaika Bāhu IV. in Śaka 1266\(^{25}\) or A.D. 1344/5.

**PLACE NAMES.**

These somewhat disjointed notes may be brought to a close with an attempt to identify the places in which Māgha and Jaya Bāhu had their fortresses. In the following list from the Mahāvaṇa the Sinhalese names are from the Pāḷavaliya, and the numeral indicates the order in that work, which, being in prose, may be more correct than that of the Pali chronicle.

1. Pulattthi city Polonnaruwa.
2. Koṭṭhasāraka village Koṭusara.
5. Padi country Padi.
7. Mānnāmatṭa Mānavatu.
8. Mahātīṭtha Mávaṭu.
15. Sūkara port Hūrāṭoṭa.

Chandrabhānu, on his second invasion, landed at Mahātīṭtha or Mávaṭu and overran nos. 5, 6, 7, and 11 before attacking Yapahu.

In the Maha Kaḍaim-pota, the countries of Pihiṭi-ṛata fall into six main groups: (1) those in the Matale, Kurunegala and Chilaw districts; (2) those on the boundary of Ruhanā, including Polonnaruwa; (3) those on the sea-board, including Mannar; (4) a large and scattered group, in which are Maha Galgamu, Dambulla, Kavuḍāvulu, Paluvak, Kokāla, Padi, Moru, Kurundugama and Mānavatu; (5) the Tamil countries, Chavakachcheri, etc.; and

---

25. Lankatilaka inscription, J. R. A. S., C. B., X, No. 84, p. 83. For Kurunegala tank, see Ceylon Literary Register, VI. 380.
(6) a group including, with others Gantalā (Kantalai), Minneri, Gónávatu and Anurádhapura, and forming the *bat-gam* of the ancient capital.

Mávaṭu is included among the countries bordering on Ruhuna, that is, on the Mahaweliganga: but its identification with the present Mantota is put beyond doubt by the *Kökila Sandésaya* locating it north of Mannar on the coast road to Jaffna. Kuḍa Vēligama is also placed in group (4), but immediately precedes the Tamil countries. It is clear that the groupings as they now stand are one out: by this adjustment Mávaṭu falls into its proper place next to Mannar, and Kuḍa Vēligama (Valikāmam) next to Chavakachcheri.26 It would appear that group (4) forms an outer circle round (6); Maha Galgamu presumably is Galgamuwa in the north of Kurunegala District, Dambulla and Kavudávulu (Kawdulla or Kawdulu-vewa) are well known; Paluvak-tota is the port from which Parākrama Bāhu I.'s fleet sailed for Rāmañña and may be Palvaki, north of Kuchchaveli in Trincomalee District;27 Kokāla perhaps is Kokilai, while Padi certainly is Padaviya. Kurundu (gama) must be the country near the lower course of the Malvatu Oya, called by Knox "Coronda Oyah," and the Maha Kurundu-vewa formed by Aggabodi I. (*Mhv.* XLII, 15, and *Puj*.), the present Giants' Tank. Mānaṭatu perhaps lay south of it, away from the sea coast, possibly on either side of the Modaragam Aru.

Gona may be the country north of the Gona river, that is the Kala Oya, which was dammed to form Kala-vewa (*Mhv.*XXXVIII, p. 165). Gónávatu in the *Kaḍaim-pota* was somewhere in the inner circle round Anuradhapura: but this, as it included Kantalai and Minneri, was extensive and precision is difficult. From its termination, Debarapataṁ, associated with Gona, should be a port, perhaps at the mouth of the Kala Oya.

Gonusu, with its various Sinhalese equivalents, remains a mystery. The mediaeval *cū* and *cū* are difficult to distinguish, and Govuḍu or Gomuḍu perhaps may be the name. Among the

26. But the *Kaḍaim-pota* also gives Ruhuna as bounded by the Mahaweliganga, beginning with Kotmale at its source and ending with Mávaṭu at its mouth. Perhaps there were two ports of the name. De Queiroz gives Periyatral on the coast between Trincomalee and the "point" of Jaftapataṁ as one of the places at which Vijaya was said by tradition to have landed, another being Mantota, or rather its territory on the opposite side of Ceylon. Incidentally it may be mentioned that the third place was Walawe; thus Parker's theory is not new.

27. According to Valentyn, Vol. V, p. 219, the Batticaloa Commandery began at the River Palaveca, 6 [Dutch] miles north of Trincomalee, the southern most part of the Vanni,
tanks built by Aggabodhi II. is Govaṭu, Hovaṭu or Hovuṭu: in the list it is preceded by Gangatala and Giritala and immediately followed by Neralu and Māṭombu (cf. Matombuwa Korale in the North Central Province.)

Pulachcheri would seem to have been connected with the wars of Parâkrama Bâhu I., as a garden of the name is mentioned at Polonnaruwa (Mhv. LXXIX, 12). Mipâtoṭa perhaps may be the modern Iluppaikkadavai, north of Mannar, the tree from which either name is derived being the same. Hûrâtoṭa, of course, is Uraturai or Kayts.

The Kadain-pota places Koṭusara or Koṭasara in Ruhuna, between Sorabora-Pangaragammana and Uva; it was approximately the present Wegam Pattu of Wellassa, in Kehelattawela Wasama of which division Koṭasara Piyangalu Viherâ is situated. Geja Bâhu fled from Polonnaruwa to Koṭṭhasâraka, (Mhv. LXX, 305); Wijesinha, for reasons best known to himself, has translated the name by “the country abounding with stores of grain.”

Wijesinha's foot-notes, giving the Sinhalese equivalents of place-names in chapters LXXXVI and LXXXVIII of the Mahâvaṇsa, agree with the Pujâvaliya except in the following cases:—

LXXXVI, 22 Khajjoti river Mêdiri-hoya.
" 41 Kâjanadî river Kala-ho-muvadora.
" 42 Sâlapâdaya river Salpâ-hoya.
LXXXVIII, 51 Vanaggâma Pâsâda Valgam-pâya in Siduru-
\" 54 Hatthigiri Kurunegal-pâya.

Mr Bell already has identified Kalu-ho-muvadora with Kalu-
wamodara, slightly to the north of Bentota. Kehelsénâva cannot be the village of the name in Rayigam Korale, but that in the Maggon-badda mentioned in the Pepiliyâna inscription; it no longer exists.

While on the subject of place-names, I would invite attention to a class ending in -naru, such as Polonnaru, Suînnaru (Ep. Zeyl. I, 12), Nànnaru (ib. 16), Padonaru (ib. 17), Itnaru (ib. II, 1), Kaļunaru (ib. 35), Hunannaru, Mahunaru (Mhv. LVIII, 43), Kaṭunaru (ib. LX, 49; LXVIII, 46), Mûnaru (ib. LXVIII, 49), perhaps the same as Muhunnaru of an inscription at Malagane in Giratalan Korale, Naļannaru (ib. LXVIII, 48), Tannaru (ib. LXX, 313) and Vênaru close to Kurunegala. There also is a Vennaruwa
in Dambadeni Hatpattuwa. The Pali of Poḷonnaru, Padonmaru, Kāḷumaru, Kaṭummaru and Hunaṃaru is Pulatthi-nagara, Padi-nagara, Kāḷa-nagara, Kaṭṭhanta-nagara and Upha-nagara. The reduplication of the n is noticeable. It is absent from Imaru and Vēnaru or Vāpi-Nagara (Mhv. LVIII, 43). It is found also in certain royal names: Kajun Nā or Khallāṭa Nāga, Eliun Nā or Ila Nāga, and Kuhun Nā or Khujja Nāga.

MAHA SAMAN DEVALE.

Postscript I. Since writing the above paper I have come across in my notes the following, extracted from an ola report sent by Ekneligoda Disawa in 1821 (Board of Commissioners' Correspondence); it gives the history of Sabaragamuwa Maha Saman Devale:

In Śaka 1158 (A.D. 1236) a Brahman minister of Paṇḍita Parākrama Bāhu of Dambadeniya came to Sabaragamuwa with about 700 men to search for gems, worshipped Saman, and vowed to build a palace (temple) of three stories if successful. They were successful and the king erected a temple and offered the villages Sabaragamuwa, Weralupe, and Ratnapura.

Bhuvanaika Bāhu [Vijaya Bāhu IV.], successor of the said king, for being cured of a turning of his neck backward, made offerings with 20 slaves, ordered that 1,000 betel leaves be furnished from Giliimale every month, and offered the villages Halpe, Kitulpe, Kuruwita and Tembiliyana.

In the time of Yāpa Bhuvanaika Bāhu, brother of the above king, on account of an invasion, the king offered Talawitiya, Millawitiya, Amuwala and Etoy villages.

King Bhuvanaika Bāhu of Kurunegala, having been victorious, offered Boltumbe, Kolombugama, Karawita, Kalawana, Pobituwa, Hangomuwa, Bopetta, Bulatvelgoda, Sannasgama and Lellopitiya. Owing to a belly ache of the queen of Parākrama Bāhu being cured by prayer to the god, Rasahena, Nakandala, and Kolombugama villages were offered. Vijaya Bāhu, being victorious, offered the villages Kotaketana, Dimbulwala, and Dehipahala. Mahalu Peṭakum of Jayawardhana-pura recovered from a disease and offered Etawakkala Kahawatta.

Bhuvanaika Bāhu Raja, son of Vira Parākrama Bāhu, successor of the above king, offered Amatagoda and Hidelanna.

On account of a miracle by this god in the time of Vira Parākrama Bāhu, brother of the above king, he offered Bibilegama,
Werahera and Maha Pannila. On account of war, Sitávaka Rája Sinha offered Hunuwala.

This traditional account should be compared with Mr. H.C.P. Bell’s “Maha Saman Devale and its Sannasa” in the Ceylon Antiquary, (II, pp. 36 ff.); in this grant there are enumerated the dedications from the time of Parákrama Báhu II. of Dambadeniya.

THE MEDAWALA SANNASA.

Postscript II. The Medawala Sannasa of Śaka 1677 (A.D. 1755), given at length by Lawrie in his Gazetteer (II, p. 581) after recording the early history of the Viháre, states that, owing to the war of Parákrama Báhu of Kurunegala with “Boda Mapa and Nanda,” the priests of the capital scattered, and one, Vanaratana by name, came to Medawala. Here he proposed to rebuild the old Viháre and reported to the king at Dedigama; on its completion lands were dedicated by the king from his throne at Gampola. I have been unable to obtain the Sinhalese text.

The king, whom I take to be one and the same throughout the narrative, should be Parákrama Báhu V. of Dedigama and Gampola, who dates his accession from the same year as Bhuvanaika Báhu IV. If so, this traditional account is of interest as giving some indication of the cause for the abandonment of Kurunegala. The name Mapa, presumably the yuvaraja, should be noted: perhaps the fighting was connected with the revolution described by Ibn Batuta, in which the old king “Alkonár” (Alagakonára) was deposed and blinded. It may be recalled that Parákrama Báhu II.’s queen was Sunétá Mahá Dévi of the Giránsa (“The Daily Routine of Parakrama Bahu II.”, D.B. Jayatilaka).

DATES OF SINHALESE SOVEREIGNS.

N.B.—All are approximate except those marked with an asterisk.

For the dates of the Gampola Kings, see J.R.A.S., C.B., XXII, No. 65, pp. 316 ff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>A.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vijaya Báhu I.</td>
<td>1056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born</td>
<td>1039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫpá - aet. 15</td>
<td>1055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuvaraja - aet. 16</td>
<td>1056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th year - enters Anuradhapura</td>
<td>1070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th year - Coronation</td>
<td>1073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th year - Velaikkárar rebellion</td>
<td>1084/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jaya Báhu .......................... 1108 —1145/6+
(Vikrama Báhu I) ....................... 1111 —1132)
Gaja Báhu II ......................... 1131 —1153
Parákrama Báhu I ................. 1153 —1186
Coronation - A.B. 1696 .......... *1153/4
4th year - Ruhuna rebellion .... 1156/7
8th --- - do. do. .................. 1160/1
12th --- - Aramana War .......... 1164/5
Union of priesthood - A.B. 1708 .. *1165/6
Pándyan War - between .... 1164/5-1167/8
16th year - Mahátittha rebellion . 1168/9
34th --- - Death .................. 1186

Vijaya Báhu II ...................... 1186 —1187
Mahinda VI ......................... 1187
Nissafika Malla .................. 1187 —1196
Víra Báhu ........................ 1196
Vikrama Báhu II .................... 1196
Chödaganga ......................... 1196 —1197
Llákavati (1) ..................... 1197 —1200
Sáhasa Malla ..................... *1200 —1202
Kalyánavati ....................... 1202 —1208
Dharmásoka ....................... 1208 —1209
Anikaṇga ........................... 1209
Llákavati (2) ..................... 1209 —1210
Lokissara ......................... 1210 —1211
Llákavati (3) ..................... 1211 —1212
Parákrama Pándya .............. 1212 —1215
Mágha ................................ 1215 —1236 +
Vijaya Báhu III ................. 1220 —1224
Katikávata ........................ 1222
Parákrama Báhu II .............. 1234 —1269
1st Coronation ...................... *1236
Polonnaruwa recovered .......... 1242
Chandrabhánu defeated .......... 1245/6
Pándyan invasion ................. 1254/7
Abdication ....................... *1267/8
2nd Coronation .................... 1268
Vijaya Báhu IV .................... 1267/8—1270
Bhuvanaika Báhu I .............. *1271 —1283
(Interregnum ..................... 1283c.—1302)
Parākrama Bāhu III... .. c. 1302—*1310 +
Bhuvanaika Bāhu II... .. ? 1310— 1325/6
Parākrama Bāhu IV... .. * 1325/6 —
Bhuvanaika Bāhu III... .. — —
Jaya or Vijaya Bāhu .. .. — 1344/5
Bhuvanaika Bāhu IV .. .. * 1344/5-*1353/4 +
Parākrama Bāhu V... .. * 1344/5-*1359 +
Vikrama Bāhu III... .. c. 1357—*1374 +
Bhuvanaika Bāhu V... .. 1372/3-*1404/5
or 1406/7 +
Vīra Bāhu .. .. * 1391/2-*1396/7 +
Vīra Alakēśvara (Vijaya Bāhu VI.) .. c. 1397— 1409
Parākrama Bāhu Êpá .. .. 1409—?1412

ERRATUM ET ADDENDUM.

P. 42, three lines from bottom. For 1276/8 read: 1267/8.
P. 52, one line from bottom. The Kaḍaim-pota speaks of "Kandavuru Dahastoṭa."
FOLK ETYMOLOGY.

Place-Names and Traditions in the Matale District.

By the late Mr. J. P. Lewis, C.M.G., C.C.S. (Retired.)

(Concluded from Vol. IX, Pt. III, Page 142.)

VI.—MATALE SOUTH—KOHONSIYA PATTUWA

107. Agalawatta. A ditch was dug to keep out elephants. The people made and supplied salt for the king’s Aramudala.

108. Alupotawela. So called by king Rájádhi Rája Sinha because he found a large number of trees here cut but not felled to the ground. The aluwa (sides) was not cut.

109. Aluvihare. When the Tripitaka commentaries were finished by Buddhagosa, the god Sekra came to hear bana, and was so pleased that he made an illumination. Alu = aloka, meaning “illumination.”

110. Ambana. It was granted to Migamuwa Mudiyansé for his services at Negombo. Damana was asweddemized, hence “Ambana.” (But see “Ambangana.” “Ambanpola.”)

111. Ambanpala. Called after a Vedda named Ambapáni. (But see Ambana.)

112. Andiyawatta. Called after a man named Andiyá.

113. Atirahapitiya—“plain of sweetmeats.” Adukkku were presented to King Rájádhi Rája Sinha by Pinnapawa Disáva here. (See Lawri’s Gazetteer for the explanation.)

114. Bandarapola. So called in the reign of King Gođapola.

115. Barekotuwa. So called after the people who had charge of the King’s fort or granary.

116. Bobila. Called after the tree of that name. (I do not know the tree. Not given by Clough.)

117. Dambarawa. Meals were given to the priests instead of services. On the execution of Wirasekara Mudaliyá, the village was given to Morukári (?) Disáva. (The latter name is indistinctly written and may be wrong.)
118. Delgasanga. In the reign of King Vijayapála the del trees were cut down by Delgasanga Rála in order to asweddumize it.

119. Diggala = “long cattle-shed” (of Wijesundara Mudiyansé.”)

120. Divilla. The queen of King Súriya Maha Raja died here on her way to Anurádhapura from Talagahagoda. The people who carried her in the palanquin said, “There is no life in her.” Hence the name. (This tradition is given by Lawrie.)

121. Dombawala. Called after the Veddá, Dombá.

122. Dorakumbura= “field of the door” (of the Walawwa.)

123. Dullewa. After a Veddá name Dúlá.

124. Dumbukola. So called by King Vijayapála of Goḍapola instead of its original name Ulpotayáya, because he found a jak tree there with many fruits approaching mellowness (dumbuk.)

125. Dunukewatta. So called beacaue there are rushes growing on both sides of the oya. (Dunuke=the screw pine or pandanus.)

126. Elkaduwa. A king marked the trace of the ela by cutting notches in the trees with his sword. This was the ela which irrigates the Atirahapiṭiya fields. Pinnapáva Disáva cut the ela and asweddumized the fields. The king presented the fields to Degalдорuwa Vihárë. Hence the name El (a)-kaḍuwa=“sword stream.”

127. Ellepolá. The former residence of the Disáva of Batticaloa. The third of the “Gampaha.”

128. Elwala. There are the ruins of a Pattini devále here.

129A. Embitiyawa Dorakumbura. Called after a Veddá woman, Embi. The second name on account of a door granted by King Sri Vikrama Rája Sinha.

129B. Étipola. After a rock.

130. Galagama. A daughter of King Víra Parákrama Báhu of Nevugala-nuwara (Kurunegala ?), alias Galagama Nuwara, married a Veddá king of Opalgalá. Here one day he asked, “Where is the whetstone on which arrows are sharpened?” She replied, “Gala game,” i.e. “the stone is in the village (house).” (Invented to account for the name. See under Opalgalá. Matale East, Sec. I).
131. Galaliyadda. The giant Kawatayá, on his way to Amurádhapura in the time of Dutugemunu, carrying stone pillars, made a dam across the Dodawala Ela when the river was flooded. Hence Galaliyadda = "the stone bank."

132. Galwadukumbura. A stone fence erected by the original settlers (whose names are given) in the time of King Vijayapála.

133. Gansarapola. Called after a kangaramá named Wellip-Pulli-Dewayá who lived near the spring of the tank. (What is a kangaramá ?)


135. Golahenwatta. Called after some dumb (golu) priests. The birthplace of Golahenwatta Nugaha Unmáse of the time of King Narendra Sinha. The fourth of the "Gampaha."

136. Hapudena=Wahapu-dena. King Vira Parákrama Báhu built a Viháré and dágoba here. He deposited the things he brought to pay the labourers here. (Evidently an invented etymology. What about the hapu or sapu tree ?)

137A. Hapuwida=Hapi-Hida. In ancient times the elephant named Hapi was lent by Dewannéhē to fetch kekulú sticks for making bows and arrows. As she was returning along the oya, the mahoot said, "Hapi hida," "Get down, Hapi," and made her lie down in the oya. (Invented)

137B. Harasgama. While King Godapola was fleeing from his enemies, he was stopped by a man of this place who laid himself down across the road to stop him, and afterwards built a palace for him at Máligatenna, now Alagumale Estate. He was known as Hárasgama Rálá and served the king.

138. Hemure=Wemure (Invented.)

139. Hirawela. From the hira tree.

140. Hulangamuwa. Called after Sólámana Bráhmana Rálá who settled here. (This seems a forced and unlikely derivation. How about the Hulangangs of Dumbara ?)

141. Idangama="lodgings village." A great Disáva provided lodgings and pehidun (cooked provisions) for a Vidáne here.
142. **Imbulandanda.** When King Senerat divided up the kingdom, he gave Matale to Prince Vijayapala, who proceeded to build his palace at Godapola. The villagers were ordered to supply him with a door. They felled a tree at Dorakotupuroda, and painted a plank of it with imbul, gum. The Prince was pleased and called the village by this name.

143. **Kaduwela.** A sword was found in the fields here in the time of King Rajadhi Rajya Sinha.

144A. **Kalalpitiya=Kalal, “worked mats,” and pitiya.** The mats were put out to dry on the plain by some monks of Kohontissarama in the time of Dutugemunu of Anuradhapura. (A Buddhist monk, Kohontissa, constructed a dagoba at Kohontissarama—still existing—and dedicated thereto all the villages in this Pattuwa. While he was building it, the people who came to offer flowers made a heap of the baskets (kalanga) which contained them. Hence the name Kalangoda. See Lawrie’s Gazetteer.)

144B. **Kaludemaditta.** There is a spring of water of this name here. The people supplied salt.

145. **Kanangomuwa.** From Kana Nila, a Vedda.

146. **Karagalalena.** The whetstone referred to was buried in this village. (Karagala=whetstone.)

147. **Kawadupeollela.** Called after a Vedda named Maha Kawudd of the time of king Vijayapala.

148. **Kivulapitiya.** Called after a Vedda, Kivulā.

149. **Koswane.** King Raja Sinha ordered the people to put steel nails into a jak tree; hence the name, “steeled jak.”

150. **Kottugoda.** Called after a Moorman settler from Kotté.

151. **Kurukoluyaya.** Called after a treasure of gold hat-pins and gold ornaments.

152. **Madawala.** Hérat Bandára, the Vedda, settled here. (See under “Udugama” in this section, also under Opalgala, Sec. I.)

153. **Malhewa.** Stags used to wallow in the mud here.

154. **Medagama.** The former residence of Panikki Mudiyanse and Danaolu Kumari Hāmi. The second of the “Gampaha.” There is an inscription.
155. **Mottuwela.** A pot was buried in a field here and a bo-tree planted over it. There is a plant *mottu* (*physalis angulata*) which might be the origin of the name, but Clough does not give this word as meaning a pot.

156. **Muwandeniya.** King Godapola on his way to Kandenuwara saw a herd of deer in a bog and called it "**Muwan-an-deniya**, the "deer-horn bog."

157. **Naldena = Nai-dena.** A treasure here was guarded by a cobra. (Explanation doubtful.)

158. **Narangamuwa.** Called after the Vedda, Nihará.

159. **Neluwakanda.** Called after a Vedda named Neluwá.

160. **Nikagolla.** Founded by a Marikkár from Kaylorattalam in India in the time of Dutugemunu. He cleared away the *nika* trees. ("Kaylorattalam" should be "Kaylorpattanam".)

161. **Owillagama.** Called after a Vedda of the name of Ówila who lived here.

162. **Padiwitigama = Padidiwitigama,** meaning "taxes ceased." A grant was made to Migomuwa Mudiyanse in the time of King Rája Sinha, of the *yalpota* and *gama*; hence the taxes ceased.

163. **Pamunuwa** was formed by settlers from Pamunuwa in Four Koraless.

164. **Pepolella = "Papaw tree field. [Ella = bank of a field, waterfall, rapids. (Not in Clough)]**

165. **Purijjala = Piritjala.** (1) King Vijaya, seeing that this place was inhabited by *yakkó*, and that there was a beautiful pond here, charmed a pebble and threw it into the pond, and thus drove away the *yakkó* and peopled the place.

   (2) Whilst a man was ploughing in the field called Kurunda in Warakamuré, about a mile from this pond, he, his plough and his yoke of buffaloes were drawn into it and disappeared. A Nilame of Pahala Walawwa, seeing this and that the current (or "attraction") was strong, had the pond filled up with rocks by elephants, and thus founded the village.

166. **Pussetonna.** There was a jak tree here the fruit of which had no substance inside; hence *pusee*.

167. **Raddeniya.** Called after a golden bier.
168. **Ratalawwa.** King Víra Parákrama Báhu of Galagama returned here after a victory, and, in order to test the constancy of his queen, hoisted a red flag by the tank. *Ratalawwa*=“red appearance tank.”

169. **Ratwatta=**Rahaswatta.

170. **Rayatalawela.** King Vijayapála was constructing an *ela* from Yatawara in Lower Dumbara which was interrupted at Kohilawatta by a large rock which he proceeded to blast. Álahakon Achchilá of Wewagammedda presented himself before the king and said, “If your majesty succeeds in blasting this rock and taking the water to Rayitaláwala, you can impale me.” The king succeeded and the Áchchilá presented himself with a stake to be impaled, but the king instead ordered him to supply the labourers with their morning meal. This he did, with boiled rice (*hunusáli*) and ghee. (See Lawrie’s *Gazetteer.*)

171. **Selagama=**“permitted village.” It was permitted to Rankot Welliya, a descendant of Minuwan Welliya, by King Vijayapála, to settle here. Minuwan was one of the four Welli Durayó who came to Ceylon when the branch of the Bó tree was brought from the town of Pelalup, the capital of King Dharma Tissa of India in the reign of Devánampiyatissa. (What about Minuwangoda in Negombo District? Is it called after Minuwan?)

172. **Talamure.** From a Jaggery caste talipot bearer of Rana-Sinha Mudiyanse’s named Talapat Déwayá who settled here.

173. **Uda Waradamana** (see *Waradamana*) was also founded in the time of King Vijayapála.

174. **Udagamuwa.** Called after a Veddá named Udangá.

175. **Udugama.** This was the residence of Hérat Bandára, son of the Veddá king of Ópalagala, the first of the “Gampaha.” See under “Madawala” and “Galagama” in this section.

176. **Udupihiila.** From a spout (*pihilá*) that existed on the side of the hill.

177. **Ulpotapitiya.** From *ulpota=*a spring.

178. **Unaweruwa.** From *una* (remainder of word unexplained).

179. **Urulewatta.** Ranimaleha came from Uruléwatta. A tradition also connected with the whetstone. (See under *Urulemulla* for derivation—Section VII.)
180. Wademada—“honey comb in the mud.” A honey comb of wasps (sic) was cut down here.

181. Wadooressa. Called after a kind of thorn of that name (Not in Clough.)

182. Walliwela. Called after a Vedda woman named Walli.

183. Waradamana (See also “Uda Waradamana”) was founded by Wijesundara Mudiyanse in the time of King Vijayapala. It had been cleared and then abandoned by Hannas Maha Nilame; hence “Waradamana.”

184. Warakamure. Guards were placed here by the king to look after a good jak tree. (Warakā—“a variety of jak in its ripe state.” Clough.)

185. Waralaggama=Wala-rak-gama, “watch round the village.” The people watched the palace of Queen Vihara Maha Devi. (Very doubtful).

186. Warapitiya. There is a tradition about King Godapola preparing to make war against King Rāja Sinha, but returning to India before he could carry out this purpose, and this is supposed to account for the name.

187. Wariyapola. Founded by Rantilaka Ārachchilā and Rāja-paksa Ārachchilā. Hence, on account of their joint endeavours, it was called Wariyapola.

188. Wehigola. A del tree here was felled by Kona-durayā. It took him three months and twenty-one days. The sound of its fall was heard by King Rāja Sinha at Kandy. The King was so pleased that he gave the man a tract of chena land here.

189. Weliganwala=“sandy village.” Palu Bandāra Wirabodi, who accompanied the branch of the Bō tree, stopped here on a sandy point between two oyas.

190. Wetasassayaya=Weta-hasse-yāya, “the tract inside the fence.” King Rāja Sinha’s buffaloes were kept here.

191. Yatawatta. So called because the queen of Vīra Parākrama Bāhu was hidden at Horagala, a rahas nuwara, for fear of the enemy.

VII. MATALE NORTH—UDUGODA UDASIYA PATTU.

192. Akuranboda was founded by a Bandāra from Arakan, who was afterwards put to death by King Rāja Sinha, and the village confiscated.
193. **Alakolaela.** From a plant of that name. (Not even by Clough.)

194. **Ambokka.** From *anga*, horn, and *bokka*, a creek.

195. **Demade**—"the stream in the valley."

196. **Dewarammulla**—**Dewarak-mulla**, "between two hills."

197. **Ehelapola.** A coconut was carved from the *ehela* wood used in a coconut fight here. The name means "*ehela* wood coconut." (*Cassia fistula*).

198. **Homapola**—"the place of burial" (*hom-pola*), because Sonuttara Terunnanse was cremated here.

199. **Koholanawela** was offered by King Dutugemunu to the priest Sunottara who brought Buddha’s relics from the Nāga world.

200. **Kohon.** Occupied by a Bandára from Kohonpura in India at the same time as Koswatta by the Kosampu man.

201. **Koswatta** was occupied by a person from the Kosampu country in the reign of Devánampiya Tissa—Deveni Piya-tissa; hence the name. (Fanciful; it is hardly necessary to go so far afield for an explanation of such a simple name, with jak trees everywhere.)

202. **Kotakumbura.** Called after the Veddá, Kotaba (?), who founded it.

203. **Kotanapola**—"the pounding place." Paddy was pounded here for the Akuranboda Bandára.

203. **Maningomuwa.** In the time of King Rája Sinha, a man of the Katupulle caste picked up in his arms the child of a woman of this place. The mother, saying that the child had thereby been polluted, dashed the girl against a stone, and killed her. Whereupon the King named the place Mánégama, saying that "the people here are full of pride." (*Máne*—pride.) [Given also by Lawrie.]

204. **Mayancholamada.** Called after ferns, "the marsh of ferns." (Not in Clough). What is the word for "ferns?"

205. **Monaruwela.** In A. B. 277, during the reign of Devánampiya Tissa, when the branch of the Bo-tree was sent over from India by Dharmásóka, people of eighteen different castes, including eight Princes of the Sákya race, accompanied it. The King assigned different places for them to dwell in. The Prince Bráhma Guptā
selected Udugoda, near the lake where peacocks resort, and his attendants occupied the neighbouring villages. Hence Monaruwela=“the peacock’s fields.”

206. Nembahitiyawa=Temba, a stone pillar that stands here. (Forced and unlikely. Is there a word temba meaning a pillar, or is it the name of this particular pillar? Not given by Clough.)

207. Olaganwatta=“the newly planted garden.” It was planted by the people who erected King Rája Sinha’s hambá granary. (Query: What does hambá mean?)

208. Paldeniya=“Stinking marsh.”
209. Palkada=“Stinking mire.”

210. Rusigama. A Bandára who came from Russia (!) was beheaded here by King Rája Sinha II. (This “bangs Banagher.”)

211. Ulleekumbura=Unudiyamulla, because people boiled water here for a king to bathe in. (Forced and unlikely).

212. Urulemulla=“the pole-cats’ burrow.”

213. Walmoruwa=“wild peacocks.”

214. Yamammulla=“place of the iron smelters.” (Yamánnu=iron smelters.)

VIII. MATALE NORTH—UDUGODA PALLESIYA PATTUWA.

215. Alutgama=Alut-ga-oma, “fresh cowdung,” because cowdung was supplied to the palace of King Vimala Dharma. (Seems fanciful.)

216. Dambawa=Dan-bo. So called because two Gurusú lived here and used to offer large quantities of meals to Kataragam Dewiyó. (Fanciful.)

217. Elamalpotaa. A white cheetah, ela diviyá, was presented to a king here. (This derivation is not obvious. Diviyá is an old word for a leopard, found in place names in the Morowa Korale and elsewhere.)

218. Hewanewila. Hewan=rushes. (Cyperus dehiscens, according to Clough.)

219. Kendangamuwa. Kendan=“conducted.” Members of the family of a Brahmin who lived at Wegodapola were conducted here.

221. A. Linawala=Le-na-wila. King Bhuvaneka Báhu washed his blood-stained sword in a lake here. (Fanciful.)

222. Madipola was founded by a Brahman named Mádiya.

223. Millawana="Milila sluice." (After the tree Vána=Tamil vâni, "of the Vanni.")

224. Oligama. A village of oliyó. (Tom-tom beaters.)

225. Polkumbara=Palkumbura="Pallan una," "lowered." (Fanciful).


227. A. Potawa from potakada, the bank of the amuna. (Not necessary to bring in kada; potáva=a dam of a paddy field.)

227. B. Palapatwela=Pala-pat-wela,"field of herbs." It was sowed by Karunakpulli Dewayá.

228. Talakiriwawa. Talakiri=tanakiri, "woman's milk," which was supplied to the palace at Godapola from here. (A very doubtful identity.)

229. Wahakotte. The queen of Bhuvaneka Báhu lived in the town of Kotte-nuwara near this village. The people of the village, hearing of the death of the king, took poison which they had under their pillows. Hence, "poisoned pillow." (Fanciful.)

230. Wegodapola was founded by a Brahmin from Wekaça in India. Where in India? (Fanciful.)

IX. MATALE NORTH—KANDAPALLE KORALE.

231. Andagala=Adagala, meaning "the day he came" rock. In the reign of Valagam Báhu it was purchased from Kalu Appu by a man who proceeded there, and formed the village the day he arrived. (The probable derivation from anda an eel is superseded by this extremely fanciful one. The story is told by Lawrie.)


233. Beligamuwa was granted by King Vijaya to his Prime Minister, Upatissa. In the time of Valagam Báhu, some of the descendants of Upatissa fell sick, and the king dedicated a part of the village to the neck of the image in Dambulla Viháre.
234. Beliyakanda= Doliyakanda, "palanquin hill," because a king's palanquin was left here on the top of a hill. (Fanciful.)

235. Bulaneveva. Bulana=a swampy place." (Not in Clough.)

236. Damana="no trees." (I do not know how this is arrived at.)

237. Damunumulla=Dana-mulla, "treasure-house."

238. Dandubendiruppe="timber heaped up."

239. Disavageveva. Called after Panikki Disáva.

240. Hatadukkuwa. Seven meals had to be supplied to the descendants of Upatissa.

241. Hatamuna. In the reign of Valagam Báhu, one nelí's sowing here produced a crop of seven amunu.

242. Hiniyalorotuwewa was founded by a washerman from Nat-tampota.

243. Hombawa=Hambawa. The people had to pound rice for the minister, Upatissa.

244. Manakindi was founded by Maha Naide.

245. Miwalapataha="bee-hive pool."

246. Namadagahawatta was founded by Rágagopala Kanaka Sinha pir Pullé Mudaliyar from India in the time of King Kírti Sri. (A curious mixture of Sinhalese and Tamil names.)

247. Olukolawala="water-lily leaves hole."

248. Pangala="stone lamp." (I should have thought="lamp stone.")

249. Pattiwela="cattle shed field." Madigo Disáva's cattle-shed stood here in the time of King Kírti Sri.

250. Rallerotuwewa was founded by Walagedara Rálá.

251. Rambawala. From ramba=plantains.

252. Ranwediyawa. The people had to pay gold fanams instead of rájakáriya.

253. Silwatgama was the residence of a paduvó man who became a priest—"Silwat Unnánse."

254. Tinipitigama=Hirimpitigawa. So called from the place of that name in Nuwara Kaláwiya, whence one of the settlers came. (Fanciful.)

255. Udorotawewa. Rota is a kind of grass. (Not in Clough.)

256. Walakumbura="pit field." A pit belonging to Upatissa was converted into a field.
257. **Walpulukotuwa**—“enclosure of pasture land.” Grass was planted here for Upatissa’s cattle.

258. **Weralanda.** A dágoba was built here by descendants of Upatissa.

**X. MATALE NORTH—WAGAPANAHU UDASIYA PATTUWA.**

259. **Haduwela.** An impenetrable thicket of thorny bush was cleared here.

260. **Kalugallawa.** Prince Kaludekada’s sword was concealed here.

261. **Melpitiya**—Gold ornaments were buried here. (*Mela-palanda-náwá.*)

262. **Murutuoluwa**—“the stump (head?) of a muruta tree” (*Lagerstroemia flos regina.*)

263. **Naula**—Nagawala, “nága hole.” A nága from the nága world sprang up here.

264. **Pilihudugolla.** The people supplied fish to the king. (How about the kingfisher? Was the word *pilihuduwá* unknown to the villager’s or to the compiler’s informants?)

265. **Serudandapola.** There was an édanda of seru timber here. (Not in Clough.)

**XI. MATALE NORTH—WAGAPANAHU PALLESIYA PATTUWA.**

266. **Bintembura,** dedicated to the lower lip of the recumbent Buddha image at Dambulla.

267. **Dambulla.** A Vedād named Saka Dedi Mudiyanse, whilst out hunting, got thirsty, and, searching for water along an elephant track, saw a number of elephants come out of a cave. They had been drinking water. He entered it and found 60 pairs of elephant’s tusks which had been there from remote times, also a pond, from which he drank. He informed Valagam Báhu, who was at Aluviháre superintending the building of that viháre. The King proceeded to the cave and started building the viháre there, but died before it was completed. It was finished by King Kirti Nissanka who gave 72 images to it and called it “Rangiri Dambulla.”

268. **Embulamba**—“sour mango.” A very large one was presented by Herat Abesekara Mudiyanse to King Valagam Báhu, who gave it this name.

269. **Eveulaihalagama**—“abandoned fields.”

270. **Gonawa.** Elks used to wallow in the marsh.
271. Kalundawa. The prince Kaludékada was concealed on a hill close by in the time of King Mahasen.

272. Kandalama, dedicated to the ears of the image (referred to above).

273. Kiralessa, dedicated to the armpits.

274. Lenadora dates from King Abayagiri (Valagam Bâhu). It means "cave-door."

275. Lenawa = "cave."

276. Makarayawala was founded by a Veddá called Makarayá.

277. Nayakumbura, dedicated to the forehead.

278. Padeniya, dedicated to the foot.

279. Ratmalagahaela. The people in the time of Valagam Bâhu had to supply baskets of ratmal for the four poya days to Dambulla Vihâre. (Ratmal = ixora.)

280. Siyambalawa had to supply water for washing the image. (referred to above).

281. Tittawelgolla, dedicated to the head of the image. Tittawela is a plant, anamirita paniculata. (Clough).

282. Udawela was dedicated by Valagam Bâhu to the eyes of the recumbent figure at Dambulla.

283. Welamitiyawa, dedicated to the elbow. It means "elbow tract." (This word for "elbow" is not recognized by Clough.)

284. Yakuragala. There is the impression of the feet of a hog on the rock close by. (What is the word for "hog" in this?)

XII. MATALE NORTH—INAMALAWA KORALE.

285. Avudangawa = Avulatgawa. There was a dispute for this village between two parties.

286. Bellanoya = "Oyster Stream." (Bellâ = "an oyster, shell-fish in general." Clough.)

287. Diganpataha = "Long Pool." (Clough gives pataha, "a sort of tom-tom," but says nothing about a pool.)

288. Etawaruhena. Etivara is a kind of grain. (Not in Clough.)

289. Gedigaswelana. There was a gedige here.

290. Inamalawa = Inaya-mala, "excellent flower," Kandure Bandára made a flower of gold and presented it to King Bhuvaneka Bâhu.

291. Kibissa was dedicated to the armpits of an image which was in a Vihâre here. (Kibissa is not in Clough. Kibisi-
múna, in Buddhist architecture, is the face of an animal without lower jaw, in the centre of an arch.

292. **Pahalatalkola** is so called from the palmyra. (I do not know this word for the palmyra.)

293. **Palutawa.** The repair of the breach of the tank here was abandoned and then resumed.

294. **Pidurugala** is dedicated to the golden alms-bowl of Sigiri Viháre. (Nothing to do with *piduru*=straw?)

295. **Sigiriya.** In 277 A.B. Dewanaape Tissa found in this rock a golden bamboo of three trunks, Yakoyakti, Kusama-yakti, and Yakyakti. In the first there were golden figures of women; in the second, golden flowers of all kinds; and in the third, golden figures of gods. The King said, "Let this always be remembered by me." Hence he called the rock *Sihi-giriya*=" Remembrance Rock." (Given also by Lawrie.)
THE CHÓLAS AND CEYLON.

By S. Paranavitana.

(Epigraphical Scholar of the Archaeological Survey Department, Ceylon).

FROM the earliest times, the history of Ceylon was much influenced by the neighbouring Dravidian kingdoms of the mainland. Even out of these, the Chólas had much more to do with the politics of the island than any other of the powers of the South of India. The Chronicle of Ceylon, the Mahávamsa, has frequent references to the Chóla Kings and their attempts to conquer the island. Likewise, the inscriptions of the Mediaeval Chóla Kings contain many allusions to Ceylon, which, on the whole, corroborate the accounts given in the Sinhalese Chronicles. They are also of invaluable help in clearing up many a doubtful point in the chronology of the period. Therefore, a knowledge of the Chóla connections with Ceylon is indispensable to the student of Ceylon history. The object of the present paper would be to trace the connections that the Chólas had with Ceylon, and the part they played in the history of the island. The relations that existed between the Sinhalese kings and the rulers of the Chóla country were invariably of a hostile nature.

Elara.

The first occasion on which the Chólas came into contact with the history of Ceylon was as early as the third century B.C. when Elára, a prince of the Chóla race, invaded Ceylon, and made himself the master of the northern half of the island, putting to death the Sinhalese prince Asela, who was then reigning at Anurádhapúra. Though he was a usurper and belonged to an alien race and faith, the chronicles have faithfully recorded his virtues and valour. Several stories are narrated of him in the Mahávamsa to illustrate

the strict impartiality with which he administered justice. One of these is the incident of 'the King's son and a Cow,' which is too well known to be retold here. Now, the very same story is told in the Tamil work, Periyapurāṇam, in connection with the mythical Chōla King, Manu-Chōla. South Indian tradition also knows of a chief named Elēla Sīngaṅ, who is reputed to have been a sea Captain, and who was the friend of the poet Tiruvalvūr, the author of the Kural. It is very tempting to identify the Manu Chōla of the Periyapurāṇam and Elēla Sīган of the South Indian literary tradition, with the Tamil usurper Elāra of the Sinhalese chronicles.

Gajabahu’s Invasion.

The next reference to the Chōlas in the Ceylon Chronicles, is during the 2nd Century of the Christian Era. In the reign of Vaṅkanāsika Tissa, the Chōla King made a raid into the island, and captured 12,000 Sinhalese as prisoners, whom he took to his own country; and made them work at the ‘City of Kāvére.’ Vaṅkanāsika Tissa’s son and successor, the famous Gajabāhu I., avenged this insult by a counter-invasion of the Chōla country, in the course of which he not only released and brought back the captive Sinhalese, but also made the Chōla king surrender to him 12,000 of his own subjects, whom he brought to Ceylon, and settled in various parts of the island. These accounts are not given in the Mahāvamsa, but the later histories like the Rājāvaliya, etc., which undoubtedly had recourse to older tradition of an authentic nature and recount these events in detail. Moreover, the exploits of Gajabāhu have taken a firm root in the imagination of the people, and his story has given rise to many a ballad.

The Tamil poem Silappadigáram also mentions Gajabāhu as one of the kings who visited the Court of the Chēra Senguṭṭuvuṅ on the occasion of his consecrating a temple to the deified heroine, Pattini or Kāṇṇagi; and further states that he, too, among many other kings of the mainland of India, built temples devoted to the worship of that goddess, in his own dominions. This fact is corroborated by the statement in the Rājāvaliya, that Gajabāhu, on his return from his South Indian Campaign, brought with him the anklet of the goddess Pattini. The Cult of Pattini, thus in-

roduced into Ceylon by Gajabáhu from South India, has taken firm root among the Sinhalese peasantry, and prevails up to this day; while it has died out, for centuries, in the land from which it was introduced to the island.

The Chéra kings of Malabar were at this time powerful rivals of the Chólas. As Gajabáhu went to South India as an enemy of the Chóla King, it is quite natural to think that he sought the alliance of the Chéras, and, consequently, paid a visit to that king.

The Chola Raid in 2nd Century, A.D.

Professor Krishnaswamy Aiyangar⁴ has surmised that the Tamil raid in the reign of Vankanásika Tissa looks like a feat of the Chóla King Karikála, who, it is said in Tamil literature as well as in the inscriptions of the later Chóla Kings, caused the construction of the embankments of the Kávéri, by the kings subdued by him. The statement in the Rájávaliya⁴, that the captive Sinhalese were made to work at the City of Kávéri, he thinks is a reference to the above mentioned achievement of Karikála. Mr. Vincent Smith, in his Early History of India, has also adopted this view and says⁵ that Tamil literature contains the statement that Karikála invaded Ceylon and carried off some prisoners whom he made to work at the construction of the embankments of the Kávéri. But it has been conclusively proved by other Scholars that Karikála cannot be assigned to such an early period as the 2nd century A.D., and that he actually flourished in the 6th century⁶. Moreover, the statement in the Rájávaliya is that the Sinhalese were forced to work, not in constructing the dams of the river Kávéri, but at the city of Kávéri, which must have been the same as Kávéri-púmpaṭṭinam, the old capital of the Chóla kings.

Buddhist-Saivite Controversy.

At the time of the Tamil Saivite Saint Máñikkavášagar, it is said, there was some intercourse between Ceylon and the Chóla country. The Vádavurpuráṣam gives an account of the King of

---

3. Some Contributions of South India to Indian Culture p. 91.
5. Early History of India by V. A. Smith p. 461.
The Cholas and Ceylon

Ilam (i.e., Ceylon) crossing over to the Chola country, accompanied by some Buddhist monks, for the purpose of refuting the Saivites at Chidambaram. A long description is given there of the disputes of the two religionists, wherein of course the Saivites are represented to have been victorious. After this the Saint is said to have crossed over to Ceylon and spread the Saiva Creed there.

Mr. Seshagiri Aiyar is of opinion that this Māṇikkavaṭṭagar, who is said in the Tamil works to have converted the Ceylon King to the Saiva religion, was no other than Sanghamitra, who, according to the Mahāvaṃsa, introduced heretical teachings into the Buddhist Church in Ceylon. This identification cannot hold ground for more than one reason. Sanghamitra of the Ceylon account is stated to have been one who had adopted the Vaitulya heresy, which is the name by which the Mahāyāna form of Buddhism was known in Ceylon. Nowhere is that word used for one of the Saivite persuasion. The date of Māṇikkavaṭṭagar has not yet been finally settled, but most scholars agree in assigning him to the ninth century of the Christian Era. Dr. Pope in his edition of the Tiruvāsagam assigns him to the sixth century A.D.

From the 2nd to the 9th Century.

From the time of Gajabahu till about the end of the ninth century, the Ceylon chronicles have nothing to record of the Chola connections with Ceylon. The reason for this is not far to seek. During this period the Cholas were reduced to a state of political insignificance owing to the rise of the Pallava Kings at Kāṇchi. The Chola dominions formed a part of the Pallava Empire, and the Chola princes were reduced to the state of feudatories under the Pallava rulers. About the beginning of the ninth century there was a great struggle between the Pallavas of Kāṇchi and the Pāṇḍyas of Madhura for the supremacy of South India, during the course of which both parties were exhausted.

The Cholas seized this opportunity to re-assert their independence, and Vyāvalaya captured the city of Tanjore where he founded a dynasty, which for about four centuries dominated the

---

7. For a detailed description of the dispute between the Buddhists of Ceylon and Māṇikkavaṭṭagar at Chidambaram, see the edition of Tiruvāsagam by Dr. G. U. Pope, Introduction, p. 67 ff.

8. Tamilian Antiquary Vol. I No. 4 p. 54.
South of India and very often made its influence felt in the island of Ceylon. One member of this family extended his conquests to further India and the Malay Archipelago in the east and as far as the Ganges on the north. Some of the Kings of this dynasty came into direct contact with the kings of Ceylon, and in the first half of the eleventh century the greater part of Ceylon was under their rule.

**Sinhalese and Pandyans vs Cholas.**

The first Chóla King who extended his conquests to the south was Parakéšarivarman Parántaka I, who ascended the throne in A.D. 907. His great ambition was the conquest of the Pándyan country which was governed at this time by a King named Rája-sinha. Before A.D. 910 the Pándyan territories were invaded by Parántaka, and their Capital, Madhura, captured. These achievements earned for him the title "Maḏirai-konda Parakéšarivarman" (i.e. Parakésarivarman who captured Madura.)

The Pándyan monarch who was worsted by the Chólas sought the assistance of the Sinhalese king, who readily supplied him with an army with which the Pándya returned to his country, and went to face the invader. A great battle was fought at a place called Vétúr, in which the combined armies of the Pándyas and the Sinhalese could not prevail against the Chóla hosts. An inscription of Parántaka I, dated in his twelfth year, refers to this event. After the defeat of the Sinhalese expedition, the Chóla king assumed the title of Samgrámaraṇghava (i.e. one who resembles Ráma in battle).

The flight of the Pándyan king from his dominions is alluded to in the Chóla documents as follows:—"Encircled by the fire of whose prowess the Pándya King at once entered the sea as if intent upon quenching that affliction, in haste abandoning his royal glory and his hereditary dominions."

The Chóla victory over the Sinhalese army which was sent to aid the Pándyan King is mentioned in the Chóla records in the following words:—

---

“Having slain in an instant at the head of a battle an immense army despatched by the lord of Lanka, which teemed with brave soldiers (and) was interspersed with troops of elephants and horses, he (i.e. Parantaka) bears in the world the title of ‘Samgrāmaraghava’ which is full of meaning.”\(^{11}\)

**The Ceylonese Version.**

Turning to the Ceylonese accounts of these events, we find the same facts corroborated in the *Mahāvamsa*. The Chapter LII. of that work contains the following narrative:—

“King Pándu, who had warred with the king of Chóla and was routed, sent many presents unto him (i.e. Kassapa V), that he might obtain an army from him. And the king, the chief of Lanka, took counsel with his ministers, and equipped an army, and, appointing Sakka-Senāpati to the Command thereof, accompanied it himself to Mahátittha, and he stood on the shore and brought to their minds the victories of former kings, and gave them courage, and thus sent them into the ships. And Sakka-Senāpati carried them safely to the other side of the sea, and reached the Pândyan Country. And when king Pándu beheld the army and the Captain, thereof, he was greatly pleased, and exclaimed ‘All Jambudvipa shall I now bring under the Canopy of one dominion.’ And then he led the two armies (his own and the Sinhalese King’s) to battle, but he succeeded not in conquering the King of the Chólian race. And so he abandoned the struggle and returned to his own place.”\(^{12}\)

According to the *Mahāvamsa* these events happened in the reign of Kassapa V, who, according to the chronology adopted by Wijesinha, reigned between A.D. 925-939; consequently the encounter of the Chólas with the Sinhalese army sent to help the Pândyans must have taken place within this period. But the Udayéndiram plates\(^{13}\) of the Bāna King Prithvipati II, dated in the 15th year of Parántaka corresponding to A.D. 921-2, and an inscription\(^{14}\) of the twelfth year of Parántaka (A.D. 918—19) mention the same events. Therefore the date assigned to Kassapa V, by Wijesinha, must be too late.

---


Parantaka’s Invasion of Ceylon.

Parantaka had another encounter with the Sinhalese. This happened after his 37th regnal year (A.D. 944). In his inscriptions after that date he is invariably styled “Maduraiyum Ilamum konda Parakesarivarman” (i.e. Parakṣarivarman who took Madura and Ceylon). This title was not adopted by him on the occasion of his victory over the Sinhalese troops at Vētur. That event happened before the 12th year of his reign and the epithet in question was adopted by him only after the 37th year of his rule. Moreover, as has been already mentioned, on the former occasion he assumed the title “Sanigrāma-rāghava,’ An inscription at Kuram, dated in his fortieth year, mentions that he actually entered Ceylon (Ilam pagunda). Therefore Parantaka’s invasion of Ceylon should have taken place before A.D. 945. The records of the Chōlas refer to this event in the following words:—“The fire of whose anger, after burning (his) enemies, quenched not in the waters of the sea, (but) subsided (only) by the tears of the wives of the Simhala (king), who was cut to pieces, and killed by his weapons.”

This invasion of Ceylon by Parantaka is thus recorded in the Mahāvamsa. In the reign of Dappula V,

“King Pandu, because he feared the Chōlians left his Country and got into a ship and landed at Mahādittha, and the King sent unto him, and was well pleased to see him, and gave him great possessions, and caused him to live outside the City, and while the King of Lanka was yet preparing for war, thinking unto himself ‘now shall I make war with the Chōlian king and take two seaports and give them unto king Paṇḍu,’ it came to pass that a fierce strife arose from some cause among the princes of the island to the great misfortune of Paṇḍu. And king Paṇḍu thought thus to himself, ‘I shall reap no benefit by dwelling here.’ So, he left his crown and other apparel and went to the Kēralite.”

Chola Embassy to Udaya III.

That the Paṇḍyan king left his Crown and apparel with the king of Ceylon is confirmed by the inscriptions of Rājendra Chōla I. In the reign of Udaya III (A.D. 941-9) who was a weak king addict—

17. Mahādevana, Chapter 53, vs 1-9, Wijesinha’s translation.
ed to drink and slothfulness, the Chōla king sent an embassy to him, asking for the crown etc, that the Pāṇḍyan King had deposited with him. When this request was refused the Chōla king sent an army to Ceylon, which slew the commander of the Sinhalese forces. The king fled to the Rōhaṇa district taking with him the insignia of the Pāṇḍya. The Chōlas were not able to enter the Rōhaṇa Country, and returned to India without accomplishing the object for which the expedition was undertaken. The date of Udaya III is given as 941-9, and as Parántaka boasts of his invasion of Ceylon only after his 37th year (A.D. 944), the above account of the Mahāvamsa must refer to the campaign of Parántaka in Ceylon.

After the death of Parántaka I, the growing power of the Chōlas received a temporary check at the hands of the Rāṣṭra-Kūtās, whose king, Krishna III, even during the lifetime of Parántaka, invaded the Chōla country, captured the province of Tondaimanda-lam with its capital Kāṇchī, and killed the eldest son of Parántaka, the prince Rājaditya who was sent to oppose the advance of the enemy. The Rāṣṭrakūtas even captured the very capital of the Chōlas, the City of Tanjore, and for about three decades after the death of Parántaka I the Chōla power was limited to a small tract of country in the neighbourhood of Tanjore. Thus during this period Ceylon was immune from Chōla raids.

*(To be Concluded).*

---

18. See Mahāvamsa, Chapter LIV. According to Wijesinha's translation of the Mahāvamsa the Cholas carried away the insignia of the Pāṇḍya king. But the Chōla inscriptions state that these treasures were taken away, not by Parántaka, but by Rājendra Chōla I about half a Century later. In showing that the translation of this part of the Mahāvamsa is not free from fault, Dr. Hultsch says: "For translating verse 44. (Makutādāni ddāya rājā So Rōhanam apā), Wijesinha committed the mistake of supplying after rājā Sō "this king" the words (" of Chōla " instead of (" of Ceylon "). See. J. R. A. S, for 1913, p. 575.
VILLAGES CONNECTED WITH KNOX.

By the late Mr. J. P. Lewis, C.M.G.

WHILE in the Central Province in 1906-10, I was instrumental in getting plain memorial stones erected at two villages to help perpetuate their association with Robert Knox of the *Historical Relation* and of some of his companions in captivity. Illustrations of these two stones from photographs are here given, from which the inscriptions can be read.

The actual sites where these captives of the King of Kandy resided it was of course impossible to identify, especially at Eladetta. In fact it could only be done approximately. The description given by Knox of his garden at Eladetta was difficult to apply on the spot, after the lapse of two and a half centuries, and the traditional site did not at all agree with that description, so a site was selected near a garden and near the paddy fields, as he mentions—the "Corn Fields" which "were on three sides of it," and the "little Corn ground" before the door. The stone, which might be taken for a milestone that had missed its vocation, was erected at the nearest point on the Gansabhawa path. (The inscription was content to say "Hereabouts.")

At Legundeniya the possibility of error was to some extent circumscribed. The site had to be at the summit of a mountain commanding four "passes," and the spot answering this description was of a limited extent. Here also there was a tradition, like the Eladetta tradition, rather unsubstantial but still current, as to the actual position of the house in which Knox and his companions had lived. At first I had the stone, which in this case bears a regrettable likeness to a tombstone, set up on this land just above the road from Pupuressa to Pussetenna Estate. But later
TWO MEMORIALS OF KNOX.
I came to the conclusion that the stone would be safer and more conspicuous closer to the road, and I asked the Ratemahatmaya, the late Mr. T. B. Yatawara, who had historical tastes, to have it removed to the side of the road, where, in spite of its funereal aspect, it should form an interesting reminder of Knox’s connection with the village of “Legendeny.” But whether this removal was carried out or not I do not know. (See *List of Inscriptions in Ceylon*, p. 341)

I hope that memorials of Knox’s connection with them may be set up in the other villages in which Knox lived, which I think are in the Seven Korales viz. “Bonder Cosse watt (Bandarakoswatta) and “Accrareagull” (Akkaragala) “in the county of Handapondowne” (Handapanduwana ?)

---

**KUVENI.**

By L. J. Gratien.

[When Kuvéni was cast off by Vijaya, who married an Indian princess, legend says she stood upon the peak Yakdessagala, near Kurunegala, and called upon the Gods to avenge her.]

* * * * *

O, smiling fertile earth that I have loved,
Look on thy daughter. All the wrong I wrought thee
Remember not against my chastened spirit.
For wrong with wrong is answered. Weakly loving
Did I betray thee to the ruthless stranger,
Who needs no more my aid, and scorns my beauty.
Thine am I, mother, in our desolation,
As thine I was before he smiled on me,
The princely in his manhood. Thrice he swore
To take me for his queen—and queen I was,
Though now no queen, but outcast; curses fall
On her who now sits by my hero’s side;
And I am desolate, am desolate.
Thrice did he swear that all this fertile land
Should lie untilled and barren—ah, his craft,
Ere he proved false; and desolate art thou,
My land, as though thy king had driven thee forth
Never to look upon his face again.

Yet ere he came did signs prophetic show
Me his, who thus has dealt with thee and me.
O land betrayed, thy daughter am I now
As when thou smiled'st back from stream and lea
Thy Sun-God's smile. Green did thy grasses wave
Swept by the cooling sandal-laden breeze
Fresh'ning all life. Thy waving branches hid
The music makers, whose sweet souls flowed out
In joy. On ground the many-tinted blooms,
In air the winged flames made bright our eyes.
At such a time I lived in thee and drank
Thy beauty, and thy beauty lived in me.
And at such time I sold thee. For that day
My hero came, the sky was warm,—ah me,
Unfathomable, all a blaze of blue;
And loveliness fulfilled itself on earth—
Such loveliness as shall not be again.
For I have sold thee, and thou liest now
Desolate as I am, Kuveni the cursed.

And desolate shalt thou remain, O earth;
For naught shall prosper that the stranger doth
Here, where I die, the victim of his pride.
Thy daughter am I, whom he spurns, and seeks
A queen from far to share with him our realm.
Therefore shall come again wave following wave
Of strangers who shall 'whelm his cities proud
And tame his pride who scorned me. Though he build
Piles to outlast the mountains, and restore
Green loveliness in thee, my earth, awhile;
Surely shall all be razed by stranger Kings,
Surely shalt thou be desolate again,
And he driven hence, whom here I made a King.
My curse is on him, and on thee, O earth.
Unhappy mother, thou, to bear a child
Shall work thee endless woe: unhappy I,
For I have cursed thee, Kuveni the cursed.
SELLAN KADAVARA, THE SPORT-GOD.

By John M. Senaveratna.

According to the Kadavara-tovil, Sellan Kadavara is a demon who is worshipped locally with an altar of sticks and the sacrifice of a cock.

We also learn from the Kadavarakavi that Umá created seven sons from a pond and that the R̄ṣis made them into one, Sellan, the "Sport God," who came to Ceylon. His robe is red, white and blue; his turban red; his matted locks are plaited together; on his shoulders is a golden chain; in his right hand is an enormous hoe (udella) and in his left an iron mace.

He receives offerings in a scoop near the Buddha, walks round the shore carrying a torch, and rides a white peacock. He has charge of Ceylon during the Kali Age, and is chief over the Yakas, being invoked as Senevi-ratna Kadavara. With a leopard he pursues cattle and sheds their blood.

This "Sport God's" sacred precincts in Ceylon are said to be Kalágama, Tirikuná-malaya (Trincomalee), Puttalama, Manná-rama, Halávata (Chilaw), Velási-madan-rata, and the fifteen Vanni-pattu, while he is said to dwell in Kataragama.

I shall be greatly obliged if any reader of the Ceylon Antiquary, who happens to reside in, or visit, any of the above places, can or will send me (or to the Antiquary, for publication) any further information connected with this interesting "Sport-God" of Ceylon.

COLOMBO PLACE NAMES

By J. C. van Sanden.

(Continued from Vol: IX: Part IV.)

PASBETAL.

Few other names offer more opportunity for speculation than that of the now little known ferry across the Kelani Ganga, at Mattakkuliya. A circumstance that tends to increase the
difficulties of the etymologist is that nearly every one of the early writers spells this name differently. Some of the forms used are Pass Betal\(^1\), Pas betal\(^2\), Pas Betal, Pass betal, Pass Pittal\(^3\), Passe Betal\(^4\) and Pas betalen\(^5\). The last-named way of spelling the name is, according to Mynheer, the equivalent of “the pass at which you pay,” but Mr. T. Petch\(^6\) argues: “Was there ever a ferry at which you did not pay?” The name given by the Dutchmen is in accordance with the history associated with the place, for did they not pay dearly in human life at this pass when they advanced on Colombo by way of Ja-els, after capturing the fort of Negombo?

The Portuguese who valiantly defended Colombo were not slow to recognise the strategic value of Pasbetal as a military post, and stoutly resisted the Hollanders at this point. From the Mutwal side, where the former lay under cover, they poured a well directed fire of shot on the Dutchmen as they attempted to cross the river on rafts. Again, when British troops sought to take Colombo from the Dutch, it was at Pasbetal that the latter, under Capt. Legrevise, upset their “grass-hoppers?” or “Jingalls” into the river and retreated to a coconut garden in the neighbourhood of Mutwal Street. The result of this single act of “indiscretion” cost the Dutchman dear, and he paid for it with his liberty and his position as the first power in the maritime parts of the Island.

Mr. Petch, goes on to say, “Is not Betal also French, betail, and Pas Betal, the Cattle ferry………?” which recalls Ox-ford, or to mention a Ceylon village name, Gonapinwuela, the Sinhalese for “the stream where the bull swam” or if the o in Gona is lengthened, “the stream where the elk swam.”

The Rev: Father P. Gnana Pragasar, O.M.I., in a contribution to the Ceylon Antiquary, in which he gives a long list of Portuguese words which have passed into currency in the local vernaculars gives battel as the Portuguese for “boat.” What is more natural in the association of ideas, the Pelman System notwithstanding,

---

2. In the maps of the Survey Department,
3. Welsh’s *Reminiscences*.
4. Thombe.
5. As spelt by the Dutch.
than to connect "ferry" and "boat?" It may be pointed out that, since the two words are so closely associated as for a person not to be able to mention one object without mentally visualizing the other, it is improbable that the word meaning "boat" would have been added on as a suffix to Pas, in order to differentiate from other passes. Again there is Small Pass in the Pettah, which is very much situated on terra firma, so that no boat is necessary to travel the entire length of the pass.

In regard to Grand Pass, not more than a mile from from Pasbetal, Mr. Petch himself says that from the varying descriptions of the authorities he has consulted, it is difficult to say definitely whether "Grand Pass" is properly the ferry near the Victoria Bridge, or some point further away from the river on the Colombo side, or whether the name was applied to the whole length of road so designated.

However the correct derivation of Pasbetal may be, it is a noteworthy fact that the name of the village immediately opposite the ferry, on the Negombo side, is Wattala. It is not unlikely, therefore, that the pass or ferry took its name from the village which it connects with Colombo, and that Pas betal is a corrupt form of Pass Wattala, the Portuguese and Dutch mispronouncing the Sinhalese name.

Grand Pass.

This name, too, comes in for prominence owing to the exigency of its situation. Not only is Grand Pass indicated in the oldest maps of the City of Colombo as one of the longest and most important roads, but it is also the route to Negombo and the all important Kandyan Kingdom, which in those days was always a matter of grave concern to the Europeans inhabiting the coastal regions. Whether or not Grand Pass was really the ferry called Pasbetal, or whether it referred to another ferry situated near the site of the old Bridge of Boats, or whether it was only some coin of military vantage along the road itself, the fact remains that Grand Pass has been a place of some consequence from Portuguese times. One way in which the adjective can be accounted for is by conjecturing that Grand is from the Portuguese grande, "big," and that the word was made use of in order to distinguish this pass from the pass of lesser importance in the Pettah. Hence the "big" Pass and "little" pass or
Small Pass.

Small Pass is the name applied originally to that stretch of road leading from Kayman’s Gate to Hulftsdorp. Whilst Grand Pass lay on the great highway from Colombo to the Kandyan districts, once a raiding army from the hills swooped down on the European settlement on the coast and crossed the river, the next strongly fortified post which had to be taken was Kayman’s Gate. Small Pass was one of the approach roads to Kayman’s Gate and it is but natural that a besieging army would have preferred this route to the flat ground along the sea shore where it would be exposed to the fire from the Fort. On the other hand, an attack directed form Small Pass could be supported by reinforcements from the hilly fastness of Hulftsdorp which also served as an excellent observation post.

Percival refers to Small Pass as Petit Pass, which supports the conclusion that, in the earliest days, the distinction existed and that Grand Pass and Small Pass were so designated from their respective importance in the defence of Colombo.

Hulftsdorp.

As its name suggests, Hulftsdorp is of Dutch origin. The suffix dorp means “village” and has been tacked on to the proper name Hult in the same manner that has produced the names “Johannesburg,” “Jonesville,” etc., The Hult who is immortalised here was General Gerard Hult of the Dutch besieging army. He was a celebrated soldier who arrived in Ceylon some time in the middle of 1655 and was first heard of in the sacking of Kalutara, then in the hands of the Portuguese. Early the following year, Hult directed a powerful attack on the Portuguese at Colombo, making Hulftsdorp his headquarters. The hill which he selected for this purpose was admirably situated, commanding an excellent view of the northern bastions of the castle. The siege lasted from November, 1655, to May, 1656. The General was shot through the arm whilst in the trenches in front of the fort of Colombo and died of wounds, two days before the Portuguese surrendered.

Hulftsdorp has been the residence of more than one distinguished person. In early British times, according to the late Mr. J. P. Lewis, Governor North, afterwards Earl of Guildford, and Sir Thomas Maitland, “King Tom”, lived here in a house belonging to a Dutchman named Pieter Sluyksen.
Literary Register.

HOATSON'S SINHALESE PRACTICE OF MEDICINE AND MATERIA MEDICA.

WITH INTRODUCTION AND NOTES,
By T. Petch.

(Continued from Vol. IX, Pt. IV, Page 242).

When a constitutional venereal makes its appearance the patient is affected with headache and fever, pains in the bones. This is followed by an eruption of a pustular appearance on the face, which ends in small ulcers covered with thin crusts. Ulcers form in the throat, swellings of the knee joint, etc. In such cases the Wedarales give the preceding medicine, called Navaratne-chnurne, every morning for seven successive days; after this the following decoction is given.

Take of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ingredient</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welmi-mool</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weni-wael-ghaetha</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inguru</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karambu</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadika</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wassa-wasi</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wateru</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.. Glycyrrhiza glabra
.. Zingiber radix......of each
   15 kalandas.
.. Caryophillus aromaticus....
   5 kalandas.
.. Necus moschata..10 madara.
.. Mace..10 madara.
.. River water..8 measures.

Boil from 8 measures to one measure.

1/7 part of this to be drunk every morning with a little cow’s ghee mixed with it. This medicine is called Kaisatula-te-denai Wadjira-kassai.

When foul ulcers exist in the throat, the following gargle is frequently used with good effect.
Take of

Alu-kehel-allâ-isma  ..  Musaæ rad.      . . . . . . . . 1 measure.
Tala-etta (pounded)  ..  Sesamum orientale       . . . . . . . . 1 measure.
Pitcha-mal          ..  Jasminum grandiflorum    . . . . . . . . . . a handful.

Take a young pumpkin and scoop out the inside through a hole made in the end; put the whole into the pumpkin and close it up for three days; at the end of this time it is fit for use as a gargle for the throat. This medicine when prepared is called Khata-sodane-kassai.

If the disease after a perseverance of some months in the use of these remedies does not appear to amend but on the contrary increases, mercury is then given, but always as a last resource.

The preparation of mercury which the Wedarales use in this part of the Island is called Rahadia-basne, but at the same time it may be mentioned that they seem to be acquainted with several other mercurial preparations.

The following is their method of preparing the Rahadia-basne

Take of

Watchinabi-mool  ..
Sudu-duru        ..
Karambu         ..  Caryophillus aromaticus
Wagapool        ..  Piper longum.
Aralu           ..  Terminalia chebulic.
Bulu            ..  Terminalia belleric.
Kotang alla     ..  —
Welmi-mool      ..  Glycyrrhiza glabra.
Manosila        ..  —
Siwanguru       ..  —
Elu-marindu     ..  —
Sudu-passanum    ..  —of each 4½ madara.

Reduce these articles to a fine powder by grinding in a mortar. Then take the tuberose root of the Hondel, scoop out the inside, so as to form a kind of cup to contain the above when a fine powder, along with Rahadia (Mercurium purificatum) 4½ madara; form a cover with part of the Hondel-alla, and fix it on with small pegs of wood, and surround the whole with a thick coating of clay. This is to be laid out exposed to the heat of the sun for three days.
The clay covering at the end of this time will be quite dry. It is now to be placed in a hole dug in fine sand, and to be covered up, leaving however the upper surface bare. On this a fire of a dry sort of wood called Myila-dara is to be made, and to be kept burning for twelve hours. At the expiration of this time, the utensil is to be taken out of the sand and to be left exposed to the heat of the sun for one day. The clay covering is now to be broken and the hondel-alla taken out and opened. The articles of medicine therein contained will be found a powder of a mahogany colour, to which powder the following articles, previously dried and powdered, are to be added.

Inghuru  ..  Zingiber.
Ela-khaturulu-mool  ..  —
Irhamussu-mool  ..  —
Trustwacl-mool  ..  Convolvulus turpethum.
Nika-mool  ..  Vitex foliis quinat...of each 4½ madara.

The whole is now to be well mixed and formed in a mass with Elinga-tel (or cow's ghee).

The dose of this mass is 10 or 12 grains given every morning for seven days. The mouth at the end of this time will generally be slightly affected. The patient is directed to bathe in cold water immediately after taking the medicine, and to continue the cold bathing for seven days after the use of the medicine has been discontinued. This practice of enjoining cold bathing whilst taking mercury for the cure of syphilis, is contrary to the practice inculcated in Europe, but it appears to be an uniform practice in this part of the world.

Chillies, lime juice, salt, the ash-coloured pumpkin, and mustard, as also animal food, particularly that of the elk, are prohibited from being used during the use of the above medicine and for some time after its use has been discontinued.

**Ulcers.**

1st. Premehay. Ulcers on the penis beginning with papulae and extreme itchiness, which, when scratched, are sometimes converted into sores covered with a whitish matter. For the cure of these sores the Wedarales begin with the following remedy.
Take of

Aralu  .......... *Terminalia chebolic* ........ a handful.
Bulu  .......... *Terminalia beleric*
Kahate-kolla  .......... Astringent leaves .... of each a handful.
Gam-miris  .......... *Piper nigrum* .... a few grains.
Haal  .......... *Oryza* .... a handful.
Ratte-loonoo  .......... Shallots .... a few.
Wateru  .......... River water .... a sufficient quantity to make a sort of congee to be drunk largely of for three days. No application is made to the sore itself, but a due attention to cleanliness is enjoined.

If the above mode of treatment fails to effect the cure they substitute the following.
Take of

Ranawara-kolla-kudu  .......... 20 madara.

To be taken as a dose in honey for three mornings. After which time if the sore has not healed, the following application is made to the ulcer itself.
Take of

Ranawara-etta and potu  .......... of each 5 kalanda.
Ingini-etta and mool  .......... of each 5 kalanda.

Dry these articles and reduce them to a fine powder then add,
Gam-miris  .......... *Piper nigrum* .... 1 madara.
Wagapool  .......... *Piper longum* .... 15 kalanda
Sudu-loonoo  .......... *Allium sativum* .... 15 kalanda.

The whole is to be so ground as to form a mixture with water of the consistence of honey. This is to be enclosed in a large leaf called Rat-kolla, and to be surrounded with a thick coating of clay. This is to be placed in a fire made of the wood of the Damba-gaha, till it is quite hard. The clay covering is now to be broken and the medicine will be found a dry powder, which is to be mixed in Talatel so as to form an ointment.

The sores are to be dressed with this ointment spread on cloth, or a little is to be rubbed on the sores.

---
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2nd. Pita-patule-wany. Sores on the feet from leech bites or any other cause, simple cuts, etc.
Take of

Kossamba-dalu  ..  Melia sempervirens......any quantity.

to be rubbed with honey, so as to form an ointment with which the sores are to be dressed, or
Take of

Labu-kolla  ..  Common pumpkin....one leaf
Mi-tel  ..  a sufficient quantity.

Dip the leaf into the oil, and hold it before the fire till it is quite soft, then apply it to the sore.

When indolent ulcers are situated on the legs or upper extremities, take of young limes, a handful, burn them to ashes,
Take of

Mi-itti  ..  bees wax..a sufficient quantity, melt it, and strain through a cloth, then mix the ashes of the burnt limes by stirring, and add
Palmanikum  ..  Sulphas cupri....20 madara, mix well by stirring and leave to cool. It is then to be taken and formed into a flat cake large enough to cover the sore and somewhat more, and to be retained by a tight bandage.

When excessive bleeding occurs from a wound or ulcer the Sinhalese Wedarales never attempt tying the vessel whence the blood issues, but in such cases they apply the following,
Take of

Bogaha-kolla  ..  Ficus religiosa....a handful.

Bruise on a curry stone and mix with as much Elinga-tel or cow's ghee as will form a sort of unguent, which is to be applied by way of Cataplasm to the wound or ulcer.

The following is also reckoned even more efficacious than the preceding in checking haemorrhage from a wound,
Take of

Suendel-alla  ..  Genus Musa.
Kadi-bat  ..  Rice soaked in water for 8 days.
Nelli  ..  Phyllanthus emblic.
Saebo-kolla  ..  —
Reru-kolla  ..  ...of each equal quantities.
The whole to be well rubbed in a mortar with Elinga-tel so as to form an unguent or Cataplasm to be applied on cloth to the wound.

**Sinhalese Remedies for the Itch.**

*Singalese Names.* *Lin. genus and Species.*

Take of

- **Buruta-gaha-potu** .. *Swietenia chloroxyylon...any quantity.*
- **Kalu-duru** ..
- **Sudu-duru** ..
- **Palmanikum** .. *Sulphas cupri.......of each 1 madara powdered.*

Mix well together and again boil.

To be rubbed on the part affected. When the disease appears cured, the patient must be well washed in hot water.

**Another.**

Take of

- **Wael-rootkattena-potu-isma**
- **Maha-rootkattena-potu-isma.......equal quantities.**
- **Tala-tel (purging oil of Tala)...a quantity equal to both.**

Put the whole into a brass chatty and expose the mixture to the heat of the sun till very warm, then,

Take of

- **Kalu-duru** ..
- **Sudu-duru** ..
- **Nelika** .. *Sulphur crud.*
- **Gyndegan** .. *Sulphur lotum.......of each 10 Madara.*

Roast these last articles in a chatty, grind and mix with the juices. Place again in the heat of the sun till an oil appears on the surface, which is to be skimmed off, and preserved in a bottle for use.

Previous to the application of this remedy the patient's body must be well washed with hot water.
Take of

Pila-kolla .. Galega purpurea.
Kokum-potu .. —
Tam-bappoo-haal .. (or rice from boiled paddy), of each a handful.
Wara-kiri .. Asclepias gigantica.
Ela-moutra .. Cow's urine... a tea cupful of each.

Grind the three first articles with part of the Wara-kiri and urine, then gradually add the remainder and keep in a jar for use.

To be rubbed on the part affected.

Sinhalese remedies in cases of Common Boils.

Take of

Haebo-kolla and potu .. A large handful.
Burn to ashes, then

Take of

Mi-etta .. Cera flava .. a pound.
Melt the wax in a clean chatty, then

Take of

Tala-tel .. Sesamum orientale
Deve-adre .. Fir wood knot rasped down.
Cam-miris .. Piper nigrum.
Khatukarosan .. —
Wada-kaha .. —
Mungala-alla .. —
Diamitta-mool .. —
Diamitta-kolla .. —
Mang-dresti .. —
Sina-mool .. —
Wara-mool .. Asclepias gigantica.
Aralu .. Terminalia chebula.
Bulu .. Terminalia belerica
Nelli .. Phyllanthus emblica... of each 1 kalanda.

Grind to a fine powder; then stir it into the melted wax and Tala-tel; the ashes are also to be stirred in, then place on the fire and boil, till it becomes a thick unguent to be kept in a bottle for use.
Rub some of this remedy round the situation of the boils. In cases of a discharge from the ear the above is a good remedy dropped into the ear. Sores in the upper part of the throat and inside of the mouth are often cured by it. In case of inflammation of the throat, it is a good remedy applied externally. In cases of abscesses in the lungs it is given internally in dose of 1 kalandra once a day and in the morning fasting. In abscesses of the liver it is also given internally. In swellings and abscesses of the perimaeum it is rubbed externally to the part affected. In inflammation and swelling of the calves of the legs it is reckoned a good remedy rubbed on the parts. In cases of sores between the toes it is also applied, and to sores on the soles of the feet.

Another for Boils.

Take of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Herb</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inderu-kolla</td>
<td>Ricinus communis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosamba-kolla</td>
<td>Melia sempivirens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamburu-kolla</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumburu-kolla</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawatta-kolla</td>
<td>Justicia adhatoda of each a handful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pound in a rice pounder and put into a chatly full of water and boil.

Fumigate the person affected with boils by covering him and the chatly with a blanket.

When buboes appear in the groins apply leeches; when the leeches have fallen off and a large quantity of blood has been taken away,

Take of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Herb</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bintamburu-kolla</td>
<td>Convolvulus pes caprae burn to ashes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inderu-tel</td>
<td>Ricinus communis a little.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mix the ashes with the castor oil and rub on the part when the leeches have fallen.

A Singalese remedy for Gripes.

Take of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Herb</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ghaetha-tumba-kolla</td>
<td>Phomis zeylanica a handful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Express the juice.
Pour the expressed juice into the patient’s eyes. When the pain in the bowels has abated, rub a little cow’s ghee round the eyes. If they are much inflamed from the application of the remedy, drop into the eyes a little Tana-kiri, (Woman’s milk).

*(To be Concluded).*
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