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ABSTRACT

This work is an attempt to analyse the social conditions in ancient Ceylon (c. 300-1000 A.D.). The first chapter starts with an introduction which briefly deals with the reasons why this topic was chosen. It also gives some indications of the socio-anthropological techniques to be applied in this study. The next part of this chapter is concerned with sources and examines both literary and archaeological sources with a view to assessing their historical value. Chapter Two deals with a discussion of family as a social unit with kinship terminology and the rights and obligations of kinship. Chapter Three is concerned with marriage and examines the different aspects of this institution including its influence on royal families in so far as the maintenance or restoration of their solidarity is concerned. Chapter Four concerns the position of women. In this, the general attitude of men towards women, the place of women in society and the position of the bhikkhuni Order are examined. Chapter Five contains a discussion of the emergence of new settlements in order to determine the expansion of Sinhalese. In chapter Six, different kinds of local groupings such as gāma, nigama, nagara and rājadāni are discussed. Chapter Seven deals with the social groups and ranking including a discussion of caste and class. The Conclusion summarizes the major results of this study.
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Chapter One
INTRODUCTION AND SOURCES

In this work an attempt is made to study the social conditions in Ceylon from about the fourth to the tenth century A.D. This period is generally known as the later Anurādhapura period.

As to the early Anurādhapura period, (i.e. before c. A.D. 320) the social history has already received considerable attention. In addition to a number of short contributions in periodicals written by different scholars, H. Ellawala in his work on the Social History of Early Ceylon, published in 1969, has fully succeeded in reconstructing many aspects of Sinhalese society from the earliest times to the end of the third century.

No systematic study of this topic during the period with which we are concerned has so far appeared. From time to time scholars have studied certain aspects. Thus, M.B. Ariyapala in his work on the Society in Mediaeval Ceylon as depicted in the Saddharmaratnāvaliya and other Sinhalese literature of the thirteenth century, published in 1956, compared some passages in his sources with those of the Anurādhapura period. Similarly, the Culture of
Ceylon in Mediaeval Times, a posthumous work of W. Geiger, contains a chapter on 'Social Organization and Caste System' in which some points of the family organization and caste system during the Anuradhapura period are briefly discussed. Geiger's study is based almost exclusively on the main chronicle.

Another study of this kind, made by S. Paranavitana, is included in the History of Ceylon sponsored by the University of Ceylon. Another contribution by Paranavitana appeared in the Sir Paul Pieris Felicitation Volume. The essay entitled 'Glimpses of the Political and Social Conditions of Mediaeval Ceylon' in this volume contains, however, only relatively few data on the social conditions in the Island.

In addition to the works cited above, the Institutions of Ceylon from Inscriptions (3rd century B.C. to the 10th century A.D.) by L.S. Perera, a doctoral thesis, presented to the University of Ceylon in 1949 deserves mention. Perhaps because Perera's subject covered a fairly long period, the social conditions prevailing in the period of our present study have received relatively little attention in this work.
Other sources, such as the Sigiri graffiti, which contain invaluable material for the reconstruction of the social history of ancient Ceylon, have hitherto remained unutilized for this purpose. Also the data provided by the most important chronicle, the Cūlavamsa, as well as by the inscriptions have not yet been systematically analysed.

Finally, the later Anuradhapura period has some special features which make it a very attractive field of study. For example, the increasingly close contacts between South India and the Island from about the seventh century are a particularly significant feature of the history of Ceylon during that period. It is of great interest to examine how far such relations affected the social conditions in the Island.

Having thus briefly stated the reasons that led us to choose this subject for our present study, we intend next to outline our scope and to give some general indication of our approach. As far as possible, we shall follow the principle laid down by social scientists who study a model of social reality to ascertain 'how the social system works'.¹ Thus, our aim is not to make a

---

descriptive study of all phenomena about which we receive information: social relations, art, religion, philosophy, and so on, but to analyse the social structure. Also, unlike some social scientists, we do not aim to draw from our study any laws either of the society or of human behaviour in general.

The method of structural analysis generally leads us to study the relationship between persons and groups. Such relationships are always organized through certain institutions. C.M. Arensberg and A.H. Niehoff describing such institutions, maintain as follows:

'Each people has its own conventions, social arrangements, and moral and ethical codes to govern their dealings with one another. There are at least three major institutions through which men have organized these relationships, though there are varying emphases on different sections of the three, according to the technological advancement of the culture.

First and foremost is the principle of kinship, upon which the very primitive people depend the most, and the most advanced people the least. This is the system of responsibilities toward relatives, and rights relied upon from relatives; it is derived from the basic human institution of marriage, the uniting of two unrelated people to produce a third. This institution is universal among all peoples; its main function is to bind together larger numbers of people, its secondary function is to rear children.

Common territory is the base of the second kind of social institution. This means that people
sharing the same area, and also having some cultural ties, cooperate to a certain extent. Such kinds of organizations are primitive hunting bands, village communities, neighborhoods in modern cities, the cities themselves in modern states, and ultimately nations.

The third kind of institution men have devised to organize their relationship with others is the special interest group or association. The individuals of such a group may be unrelated and have no territory in common, but they do have some special mutual interest—ritualistic, occupational, recreational, or other. All except some of the most primitive peoples have such relationships.¹

Our present study will mainly be in terms of these three bases of social relationships. We shall try to analyse 'kinship' in the section on family, kinship terminology and marriage. In this context, the position of women requires a detailed discussion. We therefore intend to deal with this topic in a separate chapter. Then we proceed to a discussion of the emergence of new settlements in the Island and subsequently to an examination of the patterns of settlement. Lastly, we intend to deal with the social groups and ranking. In this section, however, no attempt will be made to study the Buddhist Sangha mainly because this is a topic, which has already

been dealt with by many scholars, and in fact, would require a separate study. We shall, of course, always keep in mind the significance of the Sangha in relation to the rest of the society.

We are fully aware that a study like this presents a number of problems. I.M. Lewis pointed out that 'The historian's dialogue, however, is primarily with documents. He cannot directly interrogate his subjects, but can only deal with such artifacts as, by choice or hazard, they have bequeathed to posterity. The social anthropologist in contrast derives most of his primary data from direct personal observation and inquiry, studying social life as and where it is lived'. Especially those who are concerned with the study of ancient society collect materials from a strictly limited number of extant ancient sources. Therefore, the paucity of evidence and the nature of the sources themselves presents certain problems which the social anthropologists do not encounter.

Scholars, particularly social anthropologists, are concerned with investigating in what respects social anthropology and history draw strength for one

1. I.M. Lewis (editor), History and Social Anthropology, 1968, Introd., pp. X-XI.
another to their mutual advantage. In the present study, however, we have no intention of going into details of this kind. Yet it is fair to add that any attempt at analysing the ancient historical sources by applying some of the methods of social anthropology may contribute to a better understanding of the value of social anthropology for history.

Sources

The study of social conditions in Ceylon during the period under review depends on many sources. These can be divided into two broad categories, literary and archaeological. The former cover the literary works, including foreign notices, and the latter inscriptions, including the Sigiri graffiti, archaeological remains and coinage.

Many of these sources are well known to students of the history of Ceylon and have already been discussed by many scholars. We therefore confine ourselves to drawing attention to the importance of these sources as

far as our present study is concerned and to a consideration of the comparatively less known works.

The Mahāvamsa, in particular its later sections usually known as Cūlavamsa, is among the most important sources of information on ancient and medieval Ceylon. The importance of this source for a study of social conditions in the Island should not be overrated, as it mainly concentrates on religious and political developments. But nevertheless, it contains many more examples of great value for this study than any other single source.

A general study of this text, including problems concerning its authorship, sources, contents and authenticity, has been undertaken by a number of scholars. The comments made here are therefore mainly confined to those chapters which are of particular importance to us. The so-called Cūlavamsa begins with the reign of Meghavanā (303-331 A.D.) and what is now regarded as its first part ends with the account of the reign of Vijayabāhu I (1055-1110 A.D.). This part was written by one author. It has also been suggested

that it comprises two sections—one, up to the Cūla conquest of Rājaraṭṭha (viz. from XXXVII, 51 to chapter LV) which, in fact, covers the period of our study, and the other, from the account of Vijayabāhu I to the end of that of Parākramabāhu I (viz. chapters LVII to LXXIX).  

According to tradition, the Cūlavamsa was written by a therā named Dhammakitti who wrote during the reign of Parākramabāhu II (1153-1186 A.D.). This as has been suggested by Sirima Wickramasingha, should be identified as the second part of this chronicle. The next problem is to determine when and by whom the preceding part of the text was written. With reference to the first part of the question it can be suggested only that it was written during the period between the end of the reign of Vijayabāhu I and the beginning of that of Parākramabāhu I. According to another tradition, the Cūlavamsa was

2. The author of the Dāthāvamsa was also a certain Dhammakitti, who lived during the reign of Līlāvatī (1197-1200, 1209-1210, 1211-1212 A.D.)
3. A reference to the Dāthāvamsa is made in this part, but it is not clear whether this is to the original Sinhalese text written, it seems, in the time of Meghavappa.
written by a thera named Moggallāna a contemporary of Parakramabāhu I. This thera was a great scholar, who wrote the Abhidhānappadīpikā. Does the above tradition relate to the author of the first part of the Cūlavāṃsa?

It is, however, obvious that there is a considerable gap between the date of the earliest events described in the Cūlavāṃsa and that of the composition of the chronicle. But as has been suggested by many scholars the events included in the Cūlavāṃsa were already recorded in earlier writings, some of which may even date back to the events they describe. It is also believed that the chapters and some passages of the Cūlavāṃsa dealing with Rohaṇa are based on chronicles of that region.

The most important question is to decide to what extent the Cūlavāṃsa can be regarded as a source for a study of social conditions in Ceylon during the period under consideration. As we have indicated above, the Cūlavāṃsa is a record of religious and political activities of people belonging mainly to the court circle. These were concentrated mainly in and around Anurādhapura and

in the other urban settlements in the Island. Hence, prima facie it would seem that the Cūlavāṃsa has no direct bearing on social conditions of other classes in the Island. Nonetheless, this text proves of great value to the study of social history. Many aspects of political, religious and economic life, as described in this text, cannot be divorced from social conditions. On the other hand, the chronicle contains many accounts that can be utilized for a study of social conditions in the Island. These accounts can generally be accepted as genuine, as there was no reason why the author of the Cūlavāṃsa should have distorted such material. It is also to be pointed out that many data mentioned in this text are corroborated by inscriptions or by other literary works and by archaeological evidence.

Another important fact that may be noted in this connexion, is that the author of the Cūlavāṃsa, though he was a Buddhist monk, also included some examples of kind treatment of brāhmaṇas by the Sinhalese Buddhist kings as well as some religious developments in Ceylon which undermined the influence and the good name of the Buddhist Saṅgha. On the whole, it would seem that the Cūlavāṃsa provides us with a great deal of information
which is reliable and can be used profitably for our purposes.

The Pali commentaries, particularly those of Buddhaghosa composed at the Mahāvihāra in Anurādhapura in the fifth century A.D., contain some material useful for our present study. The commentators, when explaining difficult points in the doctrine of the Buddha or when defining terms in the original text often gave hypothetical examples. Such examples, it would seem, belong to different categories. First, there are examples quoted from the original Sinhalese commentaries composed in earlier times. Second, there are some examples which may have been meant to illustrate stories in the Indian subcontinent. Third, there are some theoretical examples and, finally, some other examples which commentators such as Buddhaghosa may have based on contemporary events and conditions.

The last kind of examples may be helpful in this study, but even in that case some caution is needed as commentators such as Buddhaghosa may well have been influenced by ideas of their own country. Therefore, it is necessary to analyse the details in the Aṭṭhakathās

1. See introductory verses in the Dhammapada Aṭṭhakathā, Papaññasūdanī and Manorathapūraṇī.
carefully before they can be used as evidence for the history of Ceylon, and each instance must be assessed separately. Nonetheless, the precise references to events in Ceylon as described in the Atthakathās can be accepted as genuine, for the commentators were generally free from sectarian prejudices. They had no intention, as appears from their works either to exaggerate or to underestimate the importance of persons, events and institutions.

In order to elucidate the nature of these examples a specimen may be given: the Samantapāsādikā, describing the passage ekakūṭiko gāmo in the Pārājikā Pāli, explains as follows:—yasmiṁ gāme ekā kuṭi ekaṁ gehāṁ seyyathāpi Malayajanapade, ayaṁ ekakūṭiko gāmo nāma ('ekakūṭiko/gāmo means the village where there is only a single kuṭi, (i.e.), a single house, as in the Malaya region'). Thus, Buddhaghosa, in order to elucidate the definition of ekakūṭiko gāmo, pointed out that this indicates settlements like those in Malaya. The existence of village settlements in Malaya with only a few homesteads at the time of Buddhaghosa is supported by other evidence. Even to-day this type of gāma is by no means rare in the central highlands of Ceylon.

Although the commentaries of Buddhaghosa are based on Sinhalese works as has been indicated above, the *Visuddhimagga* is an original work written on *sīla*, *samādhi* and *pañña*. This work, it would appear, has been greatly influenced by contemporary ideas in Ceylon. It contains, as hypothetical examples, many stories dealing with incidents which most probably took place in Buddhaghosa's own day. Many of these stories, which depict the day-to-day life of ordinary people, are complementary to the *Cūlavamsa* accounts which deal mainly with the people of court circle as mentioned above. Such stories may be of great help in the study of some aspects of the relationships between husband and wife, parents and children etc.

The *Sahasavatthuppakarana*, a collection of stories of both Indian and Ceylonese origin, written after the composition of the *Mahāvamsa* and before that of the *Mahāvamsa Tikā*, ¹ would seem more valuable than the *Visuddhimagga* in this respect, for it contains interesting passages which throw light on some aspects of the life of certain classes like *dāsas* and it contains some examples of the patterns of behaviour of ordinary people.

The *Vaṁṣatthappakāśini*, the Ṭīkā of the *Mahāvaṃsa*, is attributable to the period between eighth to the tenth century A.D.¹ It contains a mine of additional details which do not occur in the *Mahāvaṃsa*. There can be no doubt that some of these details reflect ideas and events in the time of the author of the text. It is in many cases, however, difficult to distinguish such details from others borrowed from earlier literature.

The *Dhampīya Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya* was composed by king Kassapa V (914-923 A.D.).² This is a Sinhalese commentary on the Pali *Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā* (by Buddhaghosa ?). It is considered to the oldest known text in Sinhalese prose apart from the inscriptions. Kassapa, explaining the different Pali terms in the *Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā*, has included many interesting examples which can be used for our study. Particularly, there are data in this text which prove useful for a study of Sinhalese kinship terminology during that time. It also contains passages enabling us to define certain terms of sociological interest which carry, however, different connotations.

The Sikhavalaṇḍa Vinisa, a Vinaya manual written in Sinhalese in the tenth century A.D., is also a useful work for our present study in some respects. Particularly, the implications of some terms described in this text are of great value for our present study. Some other literary works which contain historical matter are the Pūjāvaliya, Rājāvaliya, Nikāya Saṅghahaya and Saddharma Ratnāvaliya. As the importance of these works as sources of Ceylonese history, as well as their age and authors have already been dealt with by many scholars, it is not necessary to go into details here, but it may be pointed out that, like the Pūjāvaliya, they contain some popular traditions and other new material not available in other sources.

Apart from literary sources so far considered, some foreign accounts dealing with the period of our study will be utilized in this study. Of these, mention may be made firstly of the Christian Topography of the Byzantine writer Cosmas Indikopleustes, (between c. 530 and 550 A.D.). It is believed that he was a merchant

3. 'Cosmas was most probably a native of Alexandria, and may have been of Greek parentage', see J.W.McCrindle, Christian Topography, Introd., p.IV.
whose business took him to many places on the Persian Gulf, to the west coast of India and as far east as Ceylon. He later became a priest and composed many books. But only the above-mentioned work is still extant.  

The *Christian Topography* is a valuable record for a study of the foreign trade of Ceylon in the later Anurâdhapura period. This is of particular importance for us in the study of the *pattana-gâmas* (sea ports) of Marcian of Heraclea, a Greek geographer, who lived in the first decade of the fifth century A.D. and wrote about the ports in Ceylon, also deserves mention in this connexion; but the way in which Marcian collected the material for his monograph is unknown. J. Emerson Tennent assumes that Marcian used data originally collected by Ptolemy, as there is no evidence to suggest that Marcian had ever visited Ceylon. He must therefore have compiled his work on the basis of materials which had been already used by his predecessors as well as those collected by him from merchants who had gone to Ceylon.

In addition, there are some Chinese records which are useful for our present study. Of these, the

record of Fa-hsien must be mentioned first. Fa-hsien was a Chinese Buddhist monk who visited Ceylon in 412 A.D. and stayed in Anurādhapura for two years.¹ His description of the Tooth Relic festival and of the city of Anurādhapura is of particular importance for the present study.

Hiuan-Tsang (Yuan Ch'ang), another Chinese Buddhist pilgrim in the first part of the seventh century A.D., wrote a brief account of the Island in his work named Si-yu-ki. As Hiuan-Tsang had never gone to Ceylon, he must have written this section on the basis of second-hand accounts while he was in India. In general, his account is in agreement with other sources. Therefore, Hiuan-Tsang's account cannot be ignored in a study of the history of Ceylon; in particular, the description of the city of Anurādhapura and the Tooth Relic festival are of interest.

In addition, we shall call attention to two Chinese records which throw important light on Sinhalese nuns. The first is the Kao-seng-chuang ('High Priests' Record') composed by Houei-Kieo in 519 A.D.,² the second is the Pi-chiu-ni-chuang ('Biography of the Bhikkhunīs')

compiled by PaěŃchang in 526 A.D. The former contains the biographies of Guđavarman, a Buddhist monk of Kashmir and Sanghavarman, a disciple of Guđavarman. Guđavarman was invited to China by the Chinese emperor in 424 A.D. and visited Ceylon on his way to China. It is described in the above text how Guđavarman, when he lived in China, took a leading part in giving Higher Ordination (upasam-pada) to Chinese nuns in chapter formed by Sinhalese nuns. But after Guđavarman died before his task was completed, his above-mentioned disciple brought the ceremonies to a conclusion. This is corroborated by the Pi-chiu-ni-chuang, which gives also further details. Thus, Sinhalese nuns gave Higher Ordination to Chinese nuns, which demonstrates that Sinhalese women had attained a good position in the monastic community.

We are fortunate to have a large number of inscriptions which can be used in our present study. We have, however, no intention of going into details of all the inscriptions found during the period under discussion, but have to limit ourselves to some general comments and to a more detailed discussion of the most important ones. As a rule, inscription should be

1. Quoted in the Taisho Tripitaka, 50, 1927, pp. 934-948.
considered more reliable than literature as they were contemporary documents and therefore close to the events compared with literary works composed often long after the events or conditions that they describe. But it has to be pointed out that even in the epigraphic sources there are instances where allowance has to be made for exaggeration and literary form. There are parts of the inscriptions issued during the period under review, which though less than in later times, are devoted to eulogies of the king in whose reign the inscriptions are dated.

Before the fourth century A.D., there are many inscriptions, but these are short and mostly written near the entrance of the stone caves. But afterwards we get relatively long inscriptions engraved on rocks, pillars, stone-slabs and on parts of ancient buildings. Many of these inscriptions are referred to in Müller's Ancient Inscriptions of Ceylon, Journal of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Ceylon Journal of Science, Section G and Archaeological Survey of Ceylon, Annual Reports. The best edited inscriptions of Ceylon belonging to the period under consideration are published in the Epigraphia Zeylanica. A number of such inscriptions are published in the University of Ceylon Review, too. Paranavitana's new edition of inscriptions recently
published covers only the Brāhmī inscriptions attributable to the period from the earliest time (i.e. the third century B.C.) to the first century A.D. New inscriptions are still being discovered and are usually given in the Annual Reports of the Archaeological Survey of Ceylon.

It is important to mention that there are inscriptions throughout the period under consideration, though there are only few for the period from the seventh to the eighth century A.D. It is also worth noting that these inscriptions are found in different parts of the Island. These, together with the information on tanks and vihāras in the chronicles, are of immense value to a study of the emergence of new settlements and to define the areas, which were opened for cultivation.

The main purpose of writing of the inscription was to register a religious grant made, mostly, by the people of court circle. But these records contain invaluable data capable of giving interesting ideas about many aspects of social conditions in Ceylon. As land grants and other grants became more and more abundant from the eighth to the tenth century A.D., we get a large number of edicts concerning the matter. These edicts are of the greatest importance for us as they throw much light
on the social conditions of donors and also of donees: they show that some of the grants were made by an extended family and some were granted to an extended family; they also reveal that land grants were made in order that the land might be enjoyed by the donees in hereditary succession. These examples clearly imply the existence of true land ownership during the period under review. They also furnish us with details of the position of tenants. Thus, these inscriptions are of particular importance for a study of the relationship between the landowners and the tenants.

As has been indicated above, it is necessary to discuss some inscriptions which are of the greatest importance for the present study. The oldest of these is the Tōngigala Rock Inscription of the third regnal year of Meghavaṃśa. This record concerns the deposit by a certain Deva of a property in the niyamatana called Kalahumana situated in the north of the city of Anurādhapura with stipulation that the interest on the property be spent on the Ariyavaṃsa-festival in the Devagiriyavihāra.¹ The controversial term niyamatana may indicate a guild, as will be argued later. This record thus suggests

---

that the north of the city of Anurādhapura was inhabited partly by people with commercial interests. Again, a similar kind of information is contained in the Labu-āṭabāṇḍigala inscription of about the first half of the fifth century A.D.\(^1\)

Another interesting inscription has been found at Vēvālkāṭiya about 21 miles to the north-east of Anurādhapura. This inscription, which dated back to about the tenth century A.D., refers to dasagama which has been described either as a 'a group of ten villages' or 'a slave village'.\(^2\)

The inscription found at Hōpiṭigama near Badulla, generally known as the Badulla Pillar Inscription of Udaya IV (946-954 A.D.), is of special importance for this study.\(^3\) In particular, this is the only known inscription which throws light on the structure and function of a market town in ancient Ceylon. This market town appears to have been given as a fief to a high military officer (daṇḍa-nāyaka). It is known from the preamble of the edict that when the king visited the Mahiyāṅgana

\(^2\) Ibid.,I,no.21.
\(^3\) Ibid.,V,no.16, see also Paranavitana's excellent introduction to this edict which has been published with its new edition.
Vihāra, the traders and house-holders of Hōpiṭigama, in their petition complained that the bailiffs of the lord of the market town exacted illegal dues contravening regulations made by an earlier king. The king thereupon ordered that a Statute of the Council (sabā-vāvasthā) be promulgated, prohibiting such illegalities. As a result, this edict was promulgated by the lord of the Chancellery (lekamge). The regulations embodied in the edict may be divided into some parts. Firstly, it deals with the exaction of dues by bailiffs of the lord of the village in consultation with the representatives of the mercantile community and the elders of the village. Secondly, it deals with the rules to be followed by royal officers in their dealings with the village. Thirdly, it contains the details of the conduct of business by the traders in this market and the duties of the royal officers in this respect. And finally, it deals with the rights and obligations of the house-holders and the responsibilities of the village institutions with regards

3. See lines II, B19-C3.
4. See lines II, C3-36; the regulations in II, C3-7 may also to be considered as applying to the lord of the village.
to the maintenance of law and order. 1 'The document', Paranavitana notes, 'thus is of capital importance for the study of tenurial rights of feudal lords, local administration, and social and economic conditions during the later days of the Anurādhapura kingdom'. 2

Another very important document for our present study is the Mihintalē Slab Inscription of Mahinda IV (956-972 A.D.).3 The purpose of this inscription was to promulgate the rules for the administration of the Cetiya-giri monastery.4 This inscription is of particular importance for us in different connexions. Firstly, it states that land was granted to the officers in the monastery as their divel5 and so provides us with material for this type of land. Secondly, it gives details about tenants of temple domains. Thirdly, it also reveals that dāsīs and other women worked in the monastery as paid employees. Finally, it indicates that land was granted as a collective payment to craftsmen in the service of the monastery in order that they might stay together or enjoy its revenue.

1. See lines II, C36-D39.
3. Ibid., I, pp. 91ff.
4. Ibid., infra, cf.
5. Cf. infra, p. 188-199, 396.
In addition, there are a larger number of Sigiri graffiti, written between the eighth and tenth century A.D., which can be used for our present study. There are a few graffiti of the latter half of the fifth century, but none of these has yet been deciphered. There are also a few graffiti in Sanskrit, some in Nāgarī script of about the ninth century, and others in scripts that were in vogue in Ceylon or South India in the seventh or eighth century. About half a dozen graffiti in Tamil found on the wall dating back to the eleventh and twelfth century. There are graffiti in Sinhalese script of the eleventh to thirteenth centuries, too.¹

We are indebted to H.C.P. Bell who was the first to bring to light these writings.² John Still, who was Bell’s assistant for some time, and Ayrton, who succeeded Bell, appear to have taken some interest in the survey of these graffiti. In 1928, S. Paranavitana, assistant archaeological commissioner at that time, continued this survey.³ It is the great merit of Paranavitana that in

---

1. Cf. Sig. Graff., Introd., p.XII.
1956, he was able not only to edit 685 graffiti attributable to the period from the eighth to the tenth century, with their translations but also to point out their importance as a source for the study of the history of Sinhalese grammar and the development of Sinhalese script.¹

But Paranavitana does not appear to have shown the same interest in the study of these writings as a source of social history of the Island. It is true that there are many graffiti which are not sufficiently clear to reveal the real meaning intended by their authors, some are merely poetic expressions but, as we shall see, there are many other graffiti which throw much light on such topics as the position of women, wedding ceremonies and the emergence of new settlements in the vicinity of Śīgiriya.

There are remains of many religious monuments widely scattered in different parts of the country. Unfortunately, only a few of these are of a secular nature. There are also of numerous ruins of ancient irrigation works, but most of these have neither been

restored nor properly investigated. Similarly, many archaeological sites have not yet been excavated.

Nevertheless, the data conveyed by the archaeological evidence at our disposal may be important to determine in so far as they may enable us to get an idea of what areas were in cultivation. In addition, they are important for the study of the town plans in the Island and may provide us with information about the nature of the different centres in the Island, so that we may be able to define whether they were administrative, commercial or religious.

Lastly, the Chinese, Indian, and Roman coins belonging to the period under review and found in the Island, are worth mentioning. These coins alone would not have much value for our study, but taken in the light of what we can know from other sources they may also contribute to our knowledge of some aspects of the social history of the Island. These foreign coins, found mainly in ports, were no doubt brought there by foreign merchants. They may therefore confirm the view that foreign merchants, as visitors or as temporary residents, were established in the ports of the Island in ancient days, as is suggested by other sources.
Chapter Two

FAMILY AND KINSHIP

The family is the basic social institution as well as the most permanent one. As Radcliff-Brown pointed out 'kinship results from the family'. We therefore intend to commence this study with an analysis of family and kinship to be carried out with socio-anthropological techniques applied to historical data available mainly in the inscriptions, chronicles, old Sinhalese literature and Pali commentaries.

The family is defined by Burgess and Locke as a group of persons united by ties of marriage, blood or adoption, constituting a single household, interacting and communicating with each other in respective social roles of husband and wife, mother and father, son and daughter, brother and sister, and creating and maintaining a common culture. Hence, it is obvious, that the total of sentimental, economic, political

1. Man, XXXIX, 1929, p. 52.
and legal ties between spouses, parents and children, etc., make the family as defined above, a social unit.

Owing to variety of types of family structure and function, it is necessary to differentiate between such types. Therefore firstly, we intend to study the family as unit by itself, and then to examine kinship terminology and interpersonal behaviour patterns. As 'marriage lays the legal foundations for the family', our aim is next to deal with marriage and then to examine the position of women.

In most contexts the term *kula* denotes a particular type of 'family'. Yet the contexts are not always clear to show whether *kula* denotes the nuclear family or the joint family or the household group. By joint family we mean a coparcenative kin group consisting of a man and his parents, sons, sons'wives, daughters, daughters'husbands, brothers, brothers'wives, sisters, sisters'husbands and other dependant relatives. The term may also denote a group consisting of members of the nuclear family together with some other kin living together, sharing a common household or other-

wise living separate but holding property in common. The household group on the other hand was even larger, and could include slaves and household servants. It perhaps included friends and acquaintances, agricultural workers and their superintendants.

In the following pages we try to discuss the family as a social unit. As the precise implications of the term *kula* may raise difficulties in some contexts, as mentioned above, it will also be defined.

We may start with the discussion of some examples illustrating the types of family found in our sources. A certain senāpati conspired with his brother-in-law (i.e. Kassapa I) to seize the treasure of the royal family (*nīdhī rājakule*). This passage suggests that this treasure was still undivided, so that the term *kula* would here imply the joint family. According to the *Cūlavasya*, the royal family in this context consisted of the king and queens, at least two sons of the king by two queens, the king's daughter and her husband, and the king's sister. *Kula* may in this context indicate the household group, too, because the royal family normally comprises attendants and

---

domestic servants.¹

On the other hand, it is by no means clear whether kula in some passages denotes the nuclear family or the joint family. For instance, the Tiṃbiri-vāva inscription states that a lady named Anulabi, the daughter of Mitaya, donated a certain property² of her family (kula sataka, in Pali: kula santaka).³ In this case it is not specified whether the property means that belonging to the nuclear family or to the joint family.

In some contexts the family may mean either the nuclear or the joint family or even household group. Thus, Buddhaghosa explains that any close contact of a monk with ātikula constitutes an infringement of his own religious discipline.⁴ This may be used to denote different types of families of one's relatives: the following ātikula was a nuclear family. A bhikkhu named Saṅgharakkhita at Mahāgāma spent a whole rainy season of three months in retreat with a ātikula.

---

¹ See jīna, p. 405.
² I.e. the materamaji-baka of which the meaning is uncertain. Paranavitana believes that the tax due from the fish caught from the canals of the tank is meant by this term. See Ep. Zeyl., IV, p. 222.
⁴ Visuddhim., p. 91.
This natikula consisted of husband and wife only. As described in the Visuddhimagga, Saṅgharakkhita's association of natikula, however, by no means affected his priesthood because he was of well disciplined character.\(^1\)

In contrast, Sudinna, another monk who lived during the time of the Buddha, had a similar association with a natikula, but eventually rejoined his former wife. In this case, the natikula may, as has been suggested by N.Wagle,\(^2\) imply the joint family. The story describes that Sudinna went for alms to one of his natikula, i.e., to his parental house. A female slave of Sudinna's nāti (nātidāsi) while throwing away the previous evening's barley gruel, saw Sudinna standing near the door and recognized him. She ran to Sudinna's mother and told her that Sudinna had come home. In the meantime Sudinna was busy eating the barley gruel in the room provided for that purpose. Sudinna's father, coming from his work, saw Sudinna and requested him to go to his own house. Thereafter Sudinna used to go to this natikula very often and later had sexual intercourse

---

1. Visuddhimagga, pp.91-92.
2. N.Wagle, Society at the Time of the Buddha, pp.16-17.
with his former wife. In this passage, the female slave was Sudinna's nāti but not his parents'. Thus, Sudinna's parents and his nātis lived together sharing a common household.

The expected pattern of behaviour in ancient Ceylon was that, in principal, every-one should favour his relatives. This is gleaned from the following instances. An uncle, in this case king Dappula II (815-831 A.D.) assisted his sister's sons in attempt to establish their power in Rohana feeling 'concern for the welfare of his kinsmen' (bandhu-hite rato).

In another instance, we read of king Udaya II (887-898 A.D.): '... considered that one should show favour to his kindred and gave his brother's son (likewise) called Kassapa, the daughter of the Yuvarāja (Kassapa), Senā by name, to wife. The king himself took the other (daughter) called Tissā'.

According to another passage of the Culavamsa, king Sena gave all kind of favours to his relatives. Thus, on the death of Kittaggabodhi, who was a ruler

1. Vinaya Piṭaka, III, p. 11.
2. Cy., XLIX, 66-68.
of Rohana, his sister seized the kingdom and murdered Mahinda, the eldest son of Kittaggabodhi. The other members of his family, consisting of three daughters, betook themselves to the court of their mother's brother, i.e. Sena I. Sena had them brought up in the palace. When Kassapa, the eldest of them, was old enough, the king supplied him with an army and sent him to Rohana to recover the kingdom.

On the success of Kassapa, the king sent for his two brothers, Sena and Udaya, so that they might share the kingdom with him, and the sisters remained in the palace at Anuradhapura with the king. When they had attained marriageable age, the king gave Sāṅghā, on whom he had conferred the title of rājinī, to his nephew, the uparāja Sena, and the other two princesses, Tissa and Kitti, to Mahinda, the younger brother of the uparāja.¹

It is also to be pointed out at this stage that kin solidarity appears to have been the basic characteristic of the settlements in ancient Ceylon, as in other parts of the world. As we shall see the gama generally consisted of a group of families united by

---

¹ Cv., L, 50-60.
ties of kinship.

In contrast, the occasional occurrence of internal conflicts is a feature common to every family organization. As we shall see there were many instances of people acting contrary to the expected pattern of behaviour.¹

The noble families appear to have been distinguished from the ordinary families in certain contexts. References are made frequently to the compounds kulageha, mahākula or isurukula which always seem to have indicated a well-to-do family or perhaps an aristocratic family. Nahdimitta, a paladin of Duṭṭhagāmaṇī, was born in a kulageha of which the daily income is said to have been one thousand kahāpanas.² The kulagehas generally commanded the service of slaves.³ Thus, as has been pointed out by H.Ellawala, an ordinary family could not afford the service of slaves, the compound kulageha may denote well-to-do families.⁴

Similarly, kulaputta or kulina may mean a noble person, and kulagamas may denote villages where nobles

¹ See infra, pp. 75-77.
² Sahas ., p. 27: divase divase sahassuppādana-kulagehe.
³ Ibid., pp. 32, 148 etc.
lived or villages enjoyed by nobles. The compound mahākula obviously indicates a great family. The Samantapāsādikā speaks of a number of ordinary families (kulas) which earned their livelihood from a great family (mahākula). Thus, mahākula was a great family which commanded the service of the people of ordinary families as domestic servants and other workers.

Well-to-do families are denoted as isurukulas, too. The Pali compound addhakula ('rich family') has been translated in the Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya as isurukula. The term isuru is used in the Mahāvamsa in place of the word kuṭumbika in the Rasavāhinī: Saṅgha, the father of Suranimala, is mentioned in the Mahāvamsa as an issara, whereas the same Saṅgha is referred to in the Rasavāhinī as kuṭumbika. Kuṭumbika may denote a well-to-do person. The Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya defines the kuṭumbika as a person who owns some wealth.

It is extremely difficult to draw a hard and fast line between ordinary families, noble or well-to-do families, but the above-mentioned examples leave no doubt that there were distinctions of this kind between families in ancient Ceylon.

Evidence for hereditary succession to family property may be indicative of a well established family organization. But the right of inheritance in ancient Ceylon is very complicated. Some scholars who have dealt with this aspect attempted to show that the right of inheritance among the ordinary people may not have been very different from that of the royal families. For instance, H. Ellawala maintains as follows:

"Even though it is difficult to say with any degree of certainty what actual practice was customary so far as the right of inheritance among the ordinary people was concerned during this period, on the analogy of the two traditions of royal succession discussed above we are inclined to suppose that the right of inheritance among the ordinary people also may not have been very different from that of the royal families'.

The two traditions of the royal succession, as Ellawala himself has pointed out are that the tradition

of succession from father to son, which was followed by the kings from Mahānāga to Duṭṭhagāmaṇī, who belonged to the so-called Rohāṇa dynasty, and that from elder brother to younger brother as among many kings of the Anurādhapura period.

The right of succession to the throne during the period under review is rather complicated. According to Geiger, the rule was that 'first the whole generation must have died out, before the next generation came to the throne. When a king who had brothers died, not his sons, but the younger brothers succeeded him one by one according to age. Only when the last of them had died, the eldest son of the eldest brother of the preceding generation ascended the throne'.

On the other hand, M.B. Ariyapala argues that the rule of the succession was that the eldest son of the mahesi of the king should succeed his father on the throne and only in the absence of a son, his younger brother was to succeeded him.

As far as the available evidence is concerned, it seems to us however that both systems were in existence.

during the period under discussion. From the beginning of the period up to the reign of Mānavaṃma (i.e. 303-718 A.D.), it seems that the Sinhalese royal succession quite often passed from father to son, whereas from Mānavaṃma to the end of the period under consideration (i.e. 718-1029 A.D.) the most commonly followed system was that of a younger brother succeeding his elder brother; only if there were no brothers left, the eldest brother's son should succeed his father's younger brother; from the younger brother, the succession should pass to elder brother's son and the latter should be succeeded by younger brother's son. During the first part of our period, there were ten kings who reigned in succession to their fathers, but there were only four kings who succeeded their brothers.

In contrast, during the latter part of the period, there were only five kings who succeeded their fathers, but twelve kings succeeding their brothers.

1. They include Sothsisena, the son of king Mahānāma by a Tamil consort.
2. We have taken Jetthatissa II as the brother of Meghavāma; cf. Cv. XXXVII, 100; Cv. Transl., Geiger, p.9, note,1; P.jv., p.16; Ṛajatnākaraya, p.27; Ṛjv., p.37; CJSG, II, 1928-1933, p.102.
3. At least one of these five kings through succeeding his father, acceded irregularly to the throne.
In addition, during the same period, there were five occasions on which the succession passed from younger brother to elder brother's son but there was none of such cases during the earlier period.

The following example, too, may suggest that it was believed that the eldest son of the king by the mahesi was considered the rightful heir to the throne in the earlier part of our period.

King Dhātusena had a younger brother who helped him in his struggle for the throne. As a reward he was granted land and other income by Dhātusena after he had become king. The king had two sons, too, i.e. Kassapa by an unknown queen and Moggallāna by the mahesi. Kassapa murdered his father and seized the throne. In the end, Kassapa was defeated by Moggallāna and recovered the kingdom. In addition, the Cūlavamsa account would have us believe that Kassapa was not aware of any danger from his father's brother, but he feared action by Moggallāna, apparently because the latter was the rightful heir to the throne. Above all, if the succession would normally have passed from brother to brother at that time Dhātusena's

brother, if he was still alive, would have made a claim to the throne of his brother.

On the other hand, the following examples may suggest the prevalence of the other system among the kings of Mānavamma dynasty: Mānavamma's sons (i.e. Aggabodhi V, Kassapa III, and Mahinda I) succeeded one after the other in the order of their age. On the death of Mahinda, Kassapa's son (i.e. Aggabodhi VI) became king as Aggabodhi V probably had no sons. It is worthwhile to point out that on the death of Mahinda, his son (i.e. Aggabodhi VII) sent a message to Aggabodhi VI who was at Pācinadesa at the time, most probably asking him to come to Anurādhapura and have himself consecrate king,¹ because it was apparently the turn of Aggabodhi VI as he was the son of the elder brother of the father of Aggabodhi VII. Thus, Mahinda was succeeded not by his son but by his elder brother's son and Mahinda's son became king only after his father's elder brother's son.

Further, Mahinda III, Aggabodhi VIII and Dappula II, all sons of Udaya I, succeeded on the throne in

the order of seniority. On the death of Dappula III, his son, i.e., Aggabodhi IX succeeded him though there Mahinda III had a son. This was somewhat irregular. The Cūlavamsa, therefore, explains its background as follows: 'This king having gone to the world of gods, Aggabodhi (by name) had the drums of dominion beaten the selfsame day. His father (Dappula) to safeguard the succession for his sons, had not made his brother's son, Mahinda by name, ādipāda'. It becomes clear from this passage that Aggabodhi IX had no rights to succeed his father as there was a son of his father's elder brother.

We have, however, no evidence to show that the kings of any part of our period followed only a single system as there were at least a few cases which do not seem to conform to the system prevalent at that time. If we consider these cases exceptions to the rule followed in that part of the period it may be concluded that the normal succession of Sinhalese rulers from Meghavaṭṭa to Mānavammathe from father

1. *I.e.* Dappula II.
to son and from the time of Manavamma from elder to younger brother. There is, however, no evidence to determine whether only in the absence of sons, brothers succeeded in the earlier part of the period, and in the absence of brothers, sons succeeded in the latter. Therefore it seems that the available evidence is not quite sufficient to arrive at positive conclusion regarding the royal succession during our period. Hence, it is not possible to decide whether there is evidence for that the right of succession to the throne determine also the right of inheritance of ordinary people.

It is, however, stipulated in a number of inscriptions that land and immunities were granted by kings were to be enjoyed not only by the donee but also by his children, grandchildren and their descendants. For instance, a certain Niligalu Bud was granted land, while it was laid down that this land should be enjoyed by his children (daru) and grandchildren (mumu嘴buру). This may imply that the descendants of Niligalu Bud had hereditary succession to this property. Similarly, the Rāmbāva inscription states that a certain Kalīṇīgurad was granted land on the

identical terms.¹ In addition, the Puliyan kulam Slab Inscription of Udā Mahayā, i.e. Dappula IV (924-935 A.D.), registers certain immunities which were granted to Saṅgalnāvan with the stipulation that his children and grandchildren, too, were entitled to enjoy these immunities.² This type of grants remained in use during the Polonnaruva period and even later.³

These documents contain nothing to decide that the properties concerned were enjoyed in common by members of the family of the donee. But they suggest that these properties were to be passed from father to son.

From the foregoing discussion it follows that family (kula) could mean the nuclear family, the joint family or, perhaps, the household group. Although we may regard the nuclear family as the basis of kinship structure, the joint family system was in existence as a social unit during the period under review.

Our examples show that the Sinhalese kings were concerned with maintaining solidarity between members of the royal family, though there are quite

2. Ibid., IV, pp. 41-42.
3. Ibid., III, pp. 67, 246.
a few examples of princes killing their own relatives for the sake of throne and acting contrary to the expected pattern of behaviour. However, family solidarity could have been an important factor strengthening the position of the ruling clan in the case of stray rivalries between the Mauryas and Lambakaṇṇas, and invasions from South India, as well as internal troubles.

The noble and wealthy families, were distinguished from the ordinary families by the use of terms such as kulageha, mahākula, isurukula, kulaputta and kulīna.

We are in no position to decide how far the right of inheritance of ordinary people was influenced by the laws and conventions regulating succession to the throne, which itself raises numerous problems. The available evidence shows, however, that children would normally inherited their parents' property in the ordinary families. In the next pages we shall try to analyse kinship terminology and the rights and obligations of kinship.
Kinship Terminology

It is important to investigate kinship terminology from the socio-anthropological point of view as Radcliffe-Brown pointed out: 'the first step in the study of kinship system is to discover what terms are used and how they are used. But this is only a first step. The terminology has to be considered in relation to the whole system of which it is part'.

As to Ceylon, it appears that the classificatory principle was the most prominent aspect of kinship terminology, although the descriptive principle applied to some kinship terms during the period under consideration, as is the case at the present time. Mutna (father's father and mother's father), mutnu (father's mother and mother's mother), mayil

2. 'A classificatory term is one that applies to persons of two or more kinship categories, as these are defined by generations, sex, and genealogical connection', G.P. Murdock, Social Structure, 1949, p. 99.
3. 'A descriptive term is one which, like Swedish farbor (father's brother), combines two or more elementary terms to denote a specific relative', G.P. Murdock, op. cit., p. 98.
5. Dh. A.C., pp. 77, 88.
6. Ibid., pp. 77, 103.
(or) suhuru\(^1\) (mother's brother, father's sister's husband, father-in-law), nāndi (or) hus\(^2\) (father's sister, mother's brother's wife, mother-in-law), sīlivi\(^3\) (father's younger brother, mother's younger sister), māhāvi\(^4\) (father's elder brother, mother's elder sister), bāna\(^5\) (sister's son, son-in-law), mini-śībhī\(^6\) (sibling's daughter) and munumīburu\(^6\) (sibling's son) are a few examples of classificatory terminology which appears to have been in general use during the period with which we are concerned. Classificatory kinship terminology is generally regarded as a primary mechanism which facilitates the establishment of a wide-range system of kinship.\(^7\)

A notable feature of the classificatory system is the use of the same term to indicate the relatives of different categories. Thus, the term bāna (bhāgineyya, Pali) is applied to a collateral relative (i.e. sister's son)\(^8\) and to an affinal relative (i.e. 

---

2. Dh.A.G., pp.25, 80, 120.
3. Ibid., p.81.
4. Ibid., loc. cit.
5. Ibid., pp.80, 164.
son-in-law). Similarly, the term *nāhi* (modern Sinhalese, *lēli*; *vēli* in the Vādda language)\(^2\) stands for sister's daughter and daughter-in-law.\(^3\) This feature reflects a fact of social significance: in a society with preference for cross-cousin marriage,\(^4\) sister's children and sons-in-law or daughters-in-law are classed together. This principle is further illustrated by the classification of one's brother's children with one's own siblings because parallel cousin marriage is not allowed, as it involves close consanguinity; or, in Indian terminology, the marriage partners would belong to the same *gotra*. On the other hand, a mother's sister is classified in the same category as the mother (*sulu nav*, mother's younger sister, *māhāvi*, mother's elder sister),\(^5\) the father's brother as father (*sili vi* father's younger brother, *māhāvi* father's elder brother),\(^6\)

---

4. This point will be elaborated in connexion with marriage.
6. Ibid., pp. 84, 229.
the father-in-law as mother's brother (suhuru or mayil),
the mother-in-law as father's sister (hus or nāndi).

If the same classificatory term is applied, the context in which the term is used generally clarifies its meaning, enabling us to distinguish between different relatives. The following instances illustrate this point. In a passage of the Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya a certain man is referred to as bāna of a certain woman. The passage also informs us that this man was married with the daughter of the above woman. On the other hand, the same term i.e. bāna has been used as Naṅga ... Saṅgharakkhita bāna (younger sister's son named Saṅgharakkhita). Hence there is no doubt that the first example concerns affinal kin, viz. a son-in-law, but the second collateral kin, viz. a sister's son.

Where the context does not establish the meaning of the terms there are often other indications. For instance, we find the use of supplementary words which further define the precise meaning of the terms. As sutā can be used both for one's own son and for one's

2. Ibid., p. 80.
3. Ibid., loc. cit.
4. Ibid., p. 98.
brother's son, we find the word sometimes further defined by tamā (own).¹ In order to make a similar distinction between one's own mother and one's mother's sisters, the term mav ('mother') is defined by an adjective. For instance, the Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya specifies luhuvuhu mavā or vājū mavaṭa, (mother who gave birth to).² Once again to specify one's own father, the term piya is supplemented by the word dunu (begotten).³ The utilization of such methods to avoid ambiguity is a common feature of almost every classificatory system.⁴

Another important feature of the classificatory system during our period is the use of separate terms to indicate the sex as well as the seniority of the relative with reference to the speaker. For example, we find the words mal (younger brother), naṅga (younger sister) buhunan (elder sister), māhāvi (mahāpitā, or mahāmāṭa, Pali) father's elder brother, and mother's elder sister and sīlivi (cūlapitā, Pali) father's younger brother.⁵ This is a salient feature of the kinship terminology in present Ceylon, too, but some terms we mentioned above have been substituted by other terms:

¹ Fp. Zeyl., p. 185.
² Ph. A.G., pp. 67, 88.
³ Ibid., p. 88.
⁵ Dh. A.G., pp. 13, 81, 98, 216.
the terms akka (elder sister), mahappä (father's elder brother) băppă (father's younger brother) are used to-day instead of buhunan, māhāvi and silivi respectively. The words mal and naŋga continue to exist to-day with small variations such as malli, and nangi respectively. The modern term ayya for elder brother is not found during our period.

Another passage in the Dhampiyā Āṭuvā Gāṭapadaya may elucidate another feature of the classificatory kinship terminology. We read as follows:— 'Terms of endearment are such endearing terms of address as amma and tāta and the like to mother, father and such others'.¹ This passage implies that the words amma and tāta are used as forms of address, while the terms mav and piya are used as terms of reference. It also indicates that this principle is applied to other relatives, too. This suggests that the use of special terms of address was a part of kinship terminology during the period under review, as to-day.

References to the application of the basic principles of descriptive kinship terminology, too, are by no means rare during the period under discussion. For instance, terms such as mayila duva (mother's brother's daughter)\(^1\) and nändäya duva (father's sister's daughter)\(^2\) appear to have been used. Instead of sohoyur the terms sujumlah put (mother's younger sister's son)\(^3\) and sişipiyā put (father's younger brother's son)\(^4\) are used. Again instead of puta, bāvā puta (brother's son)\(^5\) appears to have been used.

Similarly, in the Tiṁbirivāva Rock Inscription a woman named Anulabi is referred to as the jhita (daughter) of Mitaya who is the puta (son) of ... \(^6\) instead of miniṁbirī (son's daughter). From these examples it becomes clear that the descriptive terms of reference were also used in special circumstances, notably if there was a chance of ambiguity.

In the Dhampiya Aţuvā Gāţapadaya and the Jātaka

\[\begin{align*}
1. & \text{Dh.A.G., p.225.} \\
2. & \text{Ibid., p.36.} \\
3. & \text{Ibid., p.48.} \\
4. & \text{Ibid., p.108.} \\
5. & \text{Ibid., p.270.} \\
6. & \text{Ep. Zeyl., I, p.227: ... puta Mitayaha jhita Anulabi.}
\end{align*}\]
Atuvā Gāṭapadaya there occurs a list of lineal kinship terms for seven generations i.e., mīmutu (great-grandfather), mutu (grandfather), piya (father), Ego, put (son), munumburu (grandson), mīmunumburu (great-grandson). For a comprehensive study of affinal kinship terminology the available material is insufficient. We find terms such as pati (or) himi for husband and ambu (or) himiniya (or) jā (or) dārā (or) bhāryāva for wife. Mayil (or) suhuru for father-in-law and nāndi (or) hus for mother-in-law, bāna and mīn for son-in-law and daughter-in-law respectively are also found. Most of these terms signify collateral kin, too, as mentioned above. This is probably because the wife called her husband's relatives by the terms which her husband used and vice versa. In present Ceylon this type of usage is, however, of emotional value, for both husband and wife as well as close relatives of both parties can give expression to their strong affection in this manner.

3. Dh. A. G., p. 80; see also Amāvatura, p. 154.
Paternal and maternal kin

\[\Delta \text{ mImutta (PMGGF)} \]
\[\circ \text{ mImutnu (PMGM)} \]
\[\text{mutna (PMGF)} \]
\[\text{mutnu (PMG)} \]

\[\text{nãndi sîlivi mãhãvi piya- mav mayil mãhãvi sîlivi (FZ) (FYB) (FEB) (F) (M) (MB) (MEZ) (MYZ)} \]
\[\text{nâna suhu- soho- soho- EGO} \]
\[\text{nana suhu- nana soho- soho- rubaõdu yurî yur (CC) (CC) (PC) (PC)} \]
\[\text{bana nin put dï} \]
\[\text{(CCS) (CCD) (PCS) (PCD)} \]

\[\text{mumuõmburu (PMGS)} \]
\[\text{miniõmbiri (PMGD)} \]
\[\text{mImunuõmburu (PMGGS)} \]
\[\text{mIminiõmbiri (PMGGD)} \]

CC, cross cousin; CCD, cross cousin's daughter; CCS, cross cousin's son; 
F, father; FEB, father's elder brother; FYB, father's younger brother; FZ, father's sister; 
M, mother; MB, mother's brother; MEZ, mother's elder sister; MYZ, mother's younger sister; 
PC, parallel cousin; PCD, parallel cousin's daughter;PCS, parallel cousin's son; PMGD, paternal and maternal 
granddaughter; PMGF, paternal and maternal grandson; PMGGD, paternal and maternal great-granddaughter; 
PMGGF, paternal and maternal great-grandfather; PMGGM, paternal and maternal great-grandmother; PMGS, paternal and 
maternal great-grandson; PMGS, paternal and maternal grandson.
It reveals from this chart that the main characteristic of the paternal and maternal kinship terminologies is the use of identical terms to signify the bifurcative relatives of four generations except only for the three middle generations. And it also seems that the same terms are used even in the latter case to denote some relationships. This terminological usage can be represented in the following diagram:

```
PM
|   |
PM
|   |
P M
|   |
P M
```

The kinship terminology which we have analyzed is characteristic of the 'forked merging' or Dakota principle. The main feature of this principle has been described by Lowie as follows:

'In certain systems, blood-relatives are classed according to generations regardless

P, paternal; M, maternal; PM, paternal and maternal.
of nearness of kinship and of their maternal
and paternal affiliations; in others, there
is bifurcation, the maternal and paternal kin
of at least the generations nearest to the
speaker being distinguished. We may call
the former the 'unforked merging', or geographi­
cally the 'Hawaiian' mode of classification;
the latter may be correspondingly referred
to as 'forked merging', or 'Dakota'.

In the light of what we have discussed above it
follows that the terminology makes a clear distinction
between relatives of different sex as well as age with
reference to the speaker; there are identical terms
to signify some collateral and affinal kin; and also
differentiation in stem terms for vocative and
non-vocative usage seem to have been established in
Ceylon during the period under survey. It may also
be pointed out that Sinhalese kinship terminology
during the period under discussion marks an important
stage in its development as far as the terms them­
selves and their use are concerned.

Rights and obligations of kinship

The analysis of the interrelationship between
kin has been utilised by social anthropologists as
a method to inquire into the problem of rights and

obligations of kinship.¹ This term should be understood in a social, not in a biological, sense. It implies therefore, the culturally prescribed obligations and rights of kinship such as love and affection, care and assistance, respectful or differential behaviour, day-to-day co-operation, participation in ceremonies connected with such events as birth, initiations, marriage, death and the right of inheritance.²

We shall begin with the relationship between parents (mav-piya, Sinhalese; mātā-pitā, Pali) and children (du-put, Sinhalese; putta-dhītā, Pali). Firstly, we intend to set out the norms of the relationship between parents and children and secondly we shall examine how far historical persons acted according to these norms.

The Manusmṛti orders that the primary aim of a husband and wife should be the procreation of children.³ The Sigāla Suttanta⁴ of the Dīgha Nikāya sets

---

4. This Suttanta, called 'The Layman's Social Ethics' has been very popular among Sinhalese from very early days. The Suttasaṅgaha, attributed to the latter part of the Anurādhapura period contains this Suttanta, too.
out that parents should restrain their children from vice and exhort them to virtue, they should train their children to a profession, and should contract a suitable marriage for them and provide them with wealth.

On the side of the children many duties are expected. It is stated that a child should make the following resolution:— Once supported by them I will now be their support; I will perform duties incumbent on them; I will keep up the lineage and tradition of my family; I will make myself worthy of my heritage; I will offer almsgiving in honour of departed parents.¹ The Commentator of the above Suttanta explains these aspects in detail. He emphasizes that children are expected to take care of their parents when they are old providing all that is necessary. Further, children should protect their parents' property, continue religious activities that are usually performed by their parents, and pay obedience to them.²

It is taught that by right behaviour towards one's parents one accumulates great merit.³ The Buddha

---

has praised the dutifulness of a son to his parents as follows:—'Let the householder dutifully maintain his parents; ... he goes to gods by name Sayañpabhā'.¹ And he who does not fulfil his duty and ill-treats his parents was condemned by the Buddha with the words:—'Whosoever strikes or annoys his mother or father by words ... let one know him as an outcaste (candāla)'.² These examples may suffice to show that the duties which children owe to their parents are more rigorous than those on the parents' side.

In the Aṅguttara Nikāya the Buddha explains why children should do so: '... Still the favour we have received from our parents will be far from being requited. ... Why so? Mother and father do much for their children, they bring them up, nourish and introduce them to the world (imassa lokassa dassetāro)'.³ It is therefore evident that filial duty is based upon the gratitude of children to their parents for what the latter feel or do for them.

The description so far dealt with may suggest that the parent-child relationship is ideally characte-

---

¹ Sutta Nipāta, p. 404.
³ A. N., I, pp. 60-62.
rized by love and affection, care and assistance, contracting a suitable marriage and extending equal treatment to all the children on the side of parents; reverence and respect, material care, continuation of lineage and paying homage to departed parents on part of children.

Now we may try to find out how far these principles were adhered to in the period under survey. According to the *Sikhavalaṇḍa Vinisa*, parents were preoccupied with thoughts about their children's well-being and took great care of the child from the time of his conception in the womb.¹ The *Cūlavamsa* mentions that *yuvarāja* Mahinda was craving for children mainly because they were indispensable for the strengthening of the foundations of the Sinhalese royal house.² The joy of the parents at the birth of a son is indicated by another passage in the same source: 'The King's consort Sanghā bore him a son, who embodied, as it were, in himself the princely form of Panāda.'³ When the king beheld the newly-born he was overjoyed, as Suddhodana over Siddhattha born in the Lumbini garden'.⁴

1. *Sikhav* V., p. 29.
2. *Cv.*, LIV, 10-11.
3. Panāda is a prince who is referred to in the *Suruci Jātaka*; see *J.* IV, p. 323.
At the birth of a child parents were anxious to know about his future. Therefore some of them, as to-day, consulted astrologers to ascertain the future of the child. For instance, king Aggabodhi VI (733-772 A.D.) consulted astrologers and, having heard that his son would prove worthy of the royal dignity, went into raptures and rewarded the astrologers with large amounts of money.

As far as the personal attachment of parents to their children by different wives is concerned there is little evidence to prove that there existed any kind of discrimination. It is well known that Dhātusena had two sons named Moggallāṇa and Kassapa, the first by a queen of equal birth and the latter by one of unequal birth. The senāpati of Dhātusena misled Kassapa and made him believe that his father discriminated against him; eventually, Kassapa cruelly tortured his father, but the latter explained: 'I have the same feelings for you as for Moggallāṇa'.

Our sources give little evidence for the patterns of behaviour between parents and siblings of a poly-

1. Cv.,XLVIII,77-78.
2. Ibid.,XXXVIII,80; Pijv.,p.144; Riv.,p.61.
gamous family. Even though the father behaved equally to all children of different wives mutual suspicion was not an uncommon feature. We saw earlier that a father might suspect a son and vice versa. Above all, we find examples showing that a wife could kill her relatives with poison, make her son king in name though carrying on the government by herself. Although it is not explicitly stated that her husband had more than one wife, it is reasonable to suppose that this would have been the case. Otherwise, it would be difficult to understand such behaviour.

We have no evidence to suggest that the personal attachment of parents to daughters should have been less strong than to sons. There were some kings who erected vihāras which were named after a son or after a daughter. King Kassapa I (477-495 A.D.), for instance, who had two daughters: Bodhi and Uppalavannā, built a vihāra and named it, after their names and his own. This was the Kasubgiri-Bo-Upulvan Vihāra. Once again another father erected a vihāra and named it after his daughter. Likewise, we have an example of a father

2. Cv., XLI, 64.
who did not forget to take his daughter whenever he went to listen to the Dhamma.¹ A mother made not only her son enter the Order but her daughter as well.² These examples may suggest that there was little discrimination against daughters.

It is evident that children are naturally inclined to look up to their parents with respect. The Culavāpsa contains a fascinating description of how king Aggabodhi VIII (804-815 A.D.) used to attend upon his old mother. The passage worth quoting:—

'The King found pleasure in the serving of his mother day and night. He went to wait on her already early in the morning, rubbed her head with oil, perfumed the parts moist with sweat, cleaned her nails and bathed her carefully. He clad her himself in a new garment, pleasant to the touch, and cast-off raiment he took and cleaned it himself.³ With the water therefrom he sprinkled his own head together with the diadem, and worshipped her perfectly with fragrant flowers as a cetiya. After making obeisance before her three times, and walking, with right side facing, round her and giving her attendants raiment and the like to their heart's content, he offered her delicious food with his own hand, partook himself of what she left and strewed thereof on his head.

1. Sahas., p. 126.
To her attendants he gave the best food such as was meant for the king, and when he had put in order her chamber, fragrant with sweet odours, he carefully prepared there with his own hand her couch, washed her feet, rubbed her gently with fragrant oil, sat by her rubbing her limbs and sought to make her sleep. Then with right side facing, he walked round her bed, did reverence three times in the right way, ordered slaves or servants as guard and without turning his back on her, went out. At a spot where she could no longer see him, he halted and three times again did reverence. Then happy at his action, and ever thinking of her, he went home. As long as she lived he served her in this way.¹

This passage may well be compared with the following account of the Sāma Jātaka.

'Sāma, the Bodhisatta, prepared their (i.e. his parents') food and the water for washing and brushes for their teeth, and gave them all sorts of sweet fruits, and after they had washed their mouths he ate his own meal. After eating his meal he saluted his parents and surrounded by a troop of deer went into the forest to gather fruit. Having gathered fruit with a band of Kinnaras in the mountain he returned at evening time, and having taken water in a pot and heated it, he let them bathe and wash their feet as they chose, then he brought a potsherd full of hot coals and steamed their limbs, and gave them all sorts of fruits when they were seated, and at the end ate his own meal and put by what was left. In this way he took care of his parents.²

---

This suggests that the description of Aggabodhi's tender cares towards his mother is greatly influenced by the Jātaka stories which ascribe similar behaviour to the Bodhisatta. It is not certain whether king Aggabodhi followed himself the Bodhisatta ideal. There is no clear evidence on this point, except for some religious activities carried out by this king which are not so different from those of many others. We feel that Aggabodhi's great devotion to his old mother is an authentic feature which was, however, described by the chronicler in terms influenced by those of the Jātakas.

The monastic organization in theory as well as in practice encouraged the children to remain attached to their parents. This was essential in a time when there were no public provisions for the old. According to the Sāma Jātaka, after a son had become a monk his old parents were helpless. Thereupon the former considered becoming a layman once again. In the

---


meantime, the Buddha preached the Mātuposaka Sutta.¹

On hearing this Sutta the bhikkhu was convinced: "If I become a householder I can support my parents;² but the Master also says: 'A son who has become an ascetic can be helpful'; ... I will now support my parents while still remaining an ascetic without becoming a householder".³ Then he begged for food and gave it to his parents.⁴ According to the Visuddhimagga, a bhikkhuni in Ceylon looked after her old sick mother.⁵

As far as conventional behaviour is concerned marriage of children seems to have played a vital role of the parent-child relationship.⁶

The jural element—the rights and duties—is and important factor of kinship relations.⁷ 'Inheritance and succession reveal very clearly the intrusion of jural regulation into the domain of family and kinship relations'.⁸ It is therefore necessary to examine this

---

1. S.N.II.No.9.
2. Thus, the bhikkhus are permitted to look after their parents. See Sikhatam.,pp.83,96.
5. Infra, pp.110-112.
element of the relationship between parents and siblings. Yet unfortunately, any serious study is extremely difficult for lack of evidence.

The right of succession to the throne during the period under survey may throw light on this aspect. But as we have seen elsewhere there were apparently no rigid rules of succession. Therefore we have examples of sons who succeeded their fathers, brothers who succeeded their brothers and of brother's sons succeeding their father's brothers.¹

There are, however, examples showing that kings favoured their own sons as long as the latter had proved themselves worthy of succession to the throne. Thus, king Silākāla (522-535 A.D.) appointed his eldest son Moggallāna, who later became king, to the position of ādipāda.² King Udaya I (797-801 A.D.) conferred the dignity of vuvarāja on the eldest son who succeeded him to the throne while others were made ādipādas.³ King Sena II (853-887 A.D.), who had no children at that time, made his younger brother

¹ See supra, p. 39 ff.
² Cv., XL1, 34.
³ Ibid., XLIX, 3.
Mahinda uparāja, but he transferred his brother's position to his son as soon as he had one. Sena was also able to keep his brother satisfied by means of a marriage alliance.  

Dappula II (815-831 A.D.) to safeguard the succession for his sons, had not made his brother's son, Mahinda by name, edipāda.  

As the above data have already been discussed by many scholars, we have no intention here to go into details of them. What is of particular interest to us is the kings' behaviour towards their sons as far as the succession to the throne is concerned.

References are not wanting to show that princes, on their part, carried out duties for their fathers. Thus, the son of Upatissa II (522 A.D.) made a great effort to protect his father's kingdom from an enemy. The Cūlavamsa writes: 'For seven days the King's people fought, then they weakened. Thereupon Kassapa thought:-

---

3. Ibid.,pp.135-136.
6. The son of the king.
"All living creatures here are perishing because of the siege of the town, the troops are enfeebled, the King is old and blind. I will take my father and mother (for safety) to Merukandara,¹ collect the troops and then punish the rebels". ... A terrible fight ensued. ... when his comrades had fallen and the royal elephant had succumbed, Kassapa handed him over to his driver, cut his throat, ...¹² Similarly, a son of king Saṅgha-tissa (618 A.D.) fought on behalf of his father.³

In contrast to the above passages, there are some references to misbehaviour of kings towards their sons and vice versa. For instance, a ruler of Rohaṇa expelled his son from the palace, which led to a battle with his father.⁴ Mahinda, the son of the ādipāda Dāṭhasiva in Rohaṇa, expelled his father and seized the territory.⁵ It is well known to students of the history of Ceylon how Kassapa I (477-495 A.D.) killed his father for the sake of the throne.⁶

2. Ibid., Geiger, pp. 52-53.
4. Ibid., XLIX, 66-73.
5. Ibid., XLIX, 10-13.
6. Ibid., XXXVIII, 80-115.
According to the Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā, the elder brother should behave towards his younger brothers and sisters as father and mother when the latter are dead (pitari mate pitā viya, mātari mate mātā viya).¹ In this respect the elder brother is next to his parents.

There are examples showing that historical persons acted according to his norm. Thus, Moggallāna I (495-512 A.D.) arranged the marriage of his two sisters who survived their father and perhaps also their mother or mothers. A certain minister, Saṅgha by name, wanted to marry a girl, who was under the protection of her brothers, as her parents had died. It is said that the minister consulted her brothers and when only the latter were satisfied with him as their sister's life partner the marriage was concluded.² This example implies also that not only the elder brother but others, too, had responsibility for certain matters regarding their sisters. We come across another interesting example in the Visuddhimagga. A certain widow had a son (the elder of the two) and a daughter

who entered the Order. When the widow became sick her daughter visited her, the former spoke to her daughter:
'Go and see your brother and tell all about my illness'. Then she went to see her brother and they together cured their mother. This may suggest that the elder brother had to look not only after the younger members of his family but after his mother as well. This was essential when he survived his father.

In many cases the succession to the throne passed from the elder brother to a younger brother who was a son of the principal queen. For instance, Kassapa III (724-730 A.D.) succeeded his elder brother named Aggabodhi V (718-724 A.D.) and later the youngest of the brothers, Mahinda I (730-733 A.D.) ascended to the throne. Similarly, three brothers named Mahinda III (801-804 A.D.) Aggabodhi VIII (804-815 A.D.) and Dappula II (815-831 A.D.) ascended the throne one after the other in order of seniority. There are many examples showing that a king appointed his younger brothers to the positions of yuvarāja, the heir apparent.

2. Cf. sons succeeded their fathers; see supra, p. 40.
3. *Cv.* , XLVIII, 1, 20, 26; *Riv.* , p. 64.
4. *Cv.* , XLIX, 38, 43 and XLIX, 65 respectively; *Riv.* , p. 64.
and ādipāda, the heir presumptive, in order of seniority. Thus, Sena I (833-853 A.D.) appointed his younger brother to the position of yuvara.īja.¹ Similarly, Sena V (972-982 A.D.) appointed his younger brother yuvara.īja.²

The younger brother reciprocated to the elder brother by means of personal attachment, obedience, respect and the necessary co-operation, Thus, the Cūlavāṃsa describes Mahinda as an obedient (anuvattanto) younger brother of Sena I.³ King Sena I (853-887 A.D.) constructed an āvāsa at Polonnaruva and named it after both his and his elder brother's names. This was the Senaggabodhi āvāsa.⁴ Similarly, Mahinda, the second younger brother of Sena II, built a parivena and named it after Mahinda and Sena—both their names.⁵ It would have been interesting to know whether these buildings were constructed on the joint property of these two brothers or on the private property of the younger brother. But no evidence is available on this matter.

Normally, people were known by their own as well as by their fathers' names. But there are some

2. Ibid.,LIV,58.
3. Ibid.,L,7.
4. Ibid.,L,73.
5. Ibid.,LI,60.
who preferred to refer to their brothers. Thus king Kassapa IV (898-914 A.D.), for example, introduced himself as the brother of king Udaya II (887-898 A.D.). He also glorified his brother's victories.\(^1\) This is perhaps due to the fact that his father (i.e. Kassapa), who did not become king,\(^2\) was not as prominent as his brother who secured relatively important place in the history of Ceylon.\(^3\)

Dhātusena received great assistance from his younger brother named Silātissabodhi during his campaign against the Tamils.\(^4\) King Aggabodhi III (632 A.D.), who was defeated by Jeṭṭhatissa II (331-340 A.D.), fled to (South ?) India. Before he returned to the Island Aggabodhi's brothers raised a rebellion. Most probably they assisted him in restoring his power. After he had re-established his power he made his youngest brother Kassapa uparāja as the brother who followed him in age, Māna, had died.\(^5\) The death of Māna was an

---

2. Cv., L, 46.
3. The Cūlavamsa devotes 46 verses (i.e. verses 90-136 in chapter LI to Udaya II).
4. Cv., XXXVIII, 35-38; cf. 15.
5. Ibid., XLIV, 103, 123-124.
advantage to the enemies of Aggabodhi: 'Now when Dāṭhā-
siva heard of the death of Māna he came in haste with
Damiṭa troops to the village called Tintini. At the
tidings of his advance Aggabodhi marched out with
his army, gave battle and was forced in the twelfth
year (of his reign) to flee to Jambudīpa'.¹ We are
told nothing about his youngest brother's role in that
battle.

Further, these instances indicate the solidarity
of the siblings in relation to others. This may be
further illustrated by the following examples. Kittaggag-
bodhi, the ruler of Rohaṇa, had four sons and three
daughters. The eldest named Mahinda was murdered by
his father's sister who brought the country with the
royal treasure under her control.² The remaining brothers,
enraged at the murder of their eldest brother, accompanied
by their three sisters, betook themselves to king Sena
I (833–853 A.D.), their mother's brother. Kassapa, the
eldest of the survivors, later restored his power in
Rohaṇa with the help of Sena I. Kassapa also fetched

---

¹. Cv.,XLIV,125-127; (Baiger's trans.).
². Probably after the death of Kittaggabodhi.
his two brothers Sena and Udaya from Anurādhapura to Rohana and shared with them the territory. He appears to have left his sisters with their mother's brother who brought them up and arranged their marriage when they attained the marriageable age.¹

This chain of events has also some further implications. Firstly, when the eldest brother was murdered the next in line took charge of his younger brothers and sisters. Secondly, the ruler shared the parental property with his brothers. But this was not always the case. For instance, Kittaggabodhi, who was restored to power in Rohana as Kassapa, did not share the territory with his younger brother but remained in the king's service.² As to the problem why Kassapa did not take into account his sisters regarding this matter one may infer from the fact that Kassapa shared the Rohana territory only with his brothers that daughters had no right to the parental property. On the other hand, as is evident from some other evidence, a daughter could inherit her father's property.³ However,  

¹. Cv.,L,57-60.  
². Ibid.,XLIX,66-72.  
no more evidence is available on this aspect. Apparently, Kassapa would have considered it in the interest of his sisters to continue to reside in the palace under the care of their mother's brother instead of going off to Rohaṇa, which perhaps still felt the influence of their father's sister's relatives. Finally, there remains the relationship between the brother's children and the father's sister, as well as between the sister's children and the mother's brother, which we intend to discuss in a separate section. There are some more events in which brothers worked together. For example, we read in an Śīgiri graffito that two brothers named Nārāyana and Māra visited Śīgiriya and wrote a verse together.¹

There are some examples of brothers who acted against the traditional rules. Consequently, conflict broke out between them. Thus, Kassapa I, the son of Dhatusena by a certain queen, seized the throne disregarding his brother Moggallāna, the son of Dhatusena by the mahesi, the legitimate heir to the throne. This struggle ended only after Kassapa cut his own throat.²

¹. Śīg. Graff.,v.558.
². Cv.,XXXIX,27.
On the death of Silākāla, the king's second son, named Dāṭhāpabhūti, seized the throne leaving behind his elder brother Moggallāna. He also killed his youngest brother Kassapa who is said to have objected against his enthronement as he regarded Dāṭhāpabhūti not the rightful heir to the throne. But Dāṭhāpabhūti did not succeed in enjoying the kingship for long because he was defeated by Moggallāna, who subsequently acceded to the throne.¹

The reason why Saṅghā, the daughter of king Mahānāma by the mahēṣī, having killed her half-brother named Sotthisena who had succeeded their father on the throne, gave the kingdom to her husband² is rather complicated. Sotthisena would probably have regarded himself as the legitimate heir to the throne in succession to his father because the latter had no brothers. On the other hand, Saṅghā would also have made a claim to the throne as she was the only child of her father by the mahēṣī. In this connexion it would be interesting to determine which pretender had the strongest right to the throne according to the traditional rule. But unfortunately, no evidence is available in

2. Cv., XXXVIII, 1-3; R.iv., p.60.
our sources on this matter. Another implication of the above incident is that Sajghā, on the one hand, killed her half-brother, and enthroned her husband on the other. This may mean that Sajghā's attachment to her husband was stronger than that to her half-brother.

Conjugal love and affection was a fundamental feature of the relationship between husband and wife. A merchant named Nandi lived at Mahātittha with his beautiful wife. Once the merchant, who went abroad on a trading venture, did not come home after a few years. Meanwhile, the minister Sīva, the ruler of Mahātittha, who was attracted by the beauty of Nandi's wife sent a large amount of money to get her into the palace. She refused the money with the following words:— "If the minister wants money let him take it from here; three years have already passed from our merchant's departure for abroad. I do not know whether he is alive or dead; when you know about his activities let me know”.

A wife in Anurādhapura, who had a quarrel with her husband left home early in the morning. This made her husband desperate and he ran after her; he even asked some monks who met him on the way about her.¹ This suggests that, though there could be misunderstanding from time to time, husbands were generally attached to their wives. King Jetthathissa III (632 A.D.), dying in the battle, remembered his mahesī and sent a massage telling her to become a nun and transfer the merit to him. The widow mahesī obeyed his instructions but not for long, because she died from heart break.² This example shows another implication: the widow was expected to pay homage to her deceased husband. This may be further gleaned from a Sigiri graffito in which the Sigiri ladies regarded as the widows of Kassapa and is stated that they had to remember him. Thus we read: '... Having associated with the king and lived in happiness, have hearts so hard as not to remember him when he is dead'.³ These examples have also some other implications such as these concerning re-marriage and

¹ Visuddhim., pp.20-21.  
² Cv.,XLIV,109-117.  
³ Sig., Graff.,v.81.
sati practice, which we intend to discuss in connexion with marriage.

The husband should provide his wife with all necessities and, in return, the wife should be skilled and diligent in household activities. A certain man founded a senasana for the bhikkhus. Subsequently it was occupied by a bhikkhu, who observed the vassa precept while staying there. The man, who went to the senasana, invited the bhikkhu at his house for alms and said to his wife that the bhikkhu deserved to be treated with kindness. His wife prepared delicious food and offered this to the bhikkhu during the whole rainy season. Another wife wanted to make an offering to the cetiya at Dakkhiṇa Vihāra and to the Mahāvāluka Cetiya. Her husband provided her with what she required and she made the offering. In another instance we hear that when a certain Tissā wanted to make a dāna, Munḍagutta, her husband, was worried as he could not afford a gift:— "People in this village give dāna with meat, fish, milk curd and so on, but how can we afford

to have these things?"— He asked his wife. Tissā did not bother her husband: she managed to prepare at least a poor meal for dāna from the money that she had saved by becoming a dāsī.¹ This example suggests also that there was a good understanding between Mundaγutta and Tissā.

There are a number of examples illustrating the relationship between the mother's brother (mātula, Pali; mayil, Sinhalese) and the sister's son (bhāgineyya, Pali; bāna, Sinhalese) during the period under survey. The kings, whenever it was necessary, took care of their sister's children and contracted marriages on their behalf. The latter were also provided with other requirements. They reciprocated this behaviour by means of respect and dutifulness to the former. Thus, the sons of Kittaggabodā, the ruler of Rohaṇa, betook themselves to their mother's brother, Sena (I) by name, as their father's sister had seized the territory on the death of their father, having assassinated their elder brother. Sena brought them up (vaddhesi), and in due course sent Kassapa, the elder of them, to regain Rohaṇa; and having the sister's daughters brought up

¹ Sahas..p.50.
with great care (sādhu vaddhetyā) given in marriage with great wealth (mahābhoga). The daughters were also placed in the position of rājini (ṭhapatvā rājiniṭṭhāne).\(^1\) In another instance, a mātula supported his bhāgineyya, who was also his son-in-law, to seize control of Rohaṇa.\(^2\) Dhātusena (459-477 A.D.) gave his daughter in marriage to his bhāgineyya who was assigned to the position of senāpati.\(^3\) Similarly, Aggabodhi I (575-608 A.D.) appointed his bhāgineyya to the position of malayarāja\(^4\) and gave him his daughter, Dāṭhā, by name, in marriage.\(^5\)

On the other hand, the bhāgineyya assisted the mātula: thus, it was his bhāgineyya who supported Mahānāga during his struggle for the throne. Having succeeded, Mahānāga wanted the latter to be his uparāja, who had, however already died in the meantime.\(^6\) Another prince, named Ratanadāṭha, similarly helped his mātula.\(^7\) Dappula sought support for his bhāgineyya in his campaign against Mahinda II (777-797 A.D.).\(^8\) Kassapa II (650-659 A.D.), had several children but all were younger at

---

2. Cv.,XLIX,66-73.
3. Ibid.,XXXVIII,81.
5. Cv.,XLII,6,10. See for the implications of these marriages infra, pp.97 ff.
6. Cv.,XLI,87-93.
7. Ibid.,XLIV,136.
8. Ibid.,XLVIII,98.
the time of his death. Therefore he summoned his bhāgineyya Māna who lived in Rohaṇa and entrusted him with the care of children and the administration of the government. Māna fulfilled his duties to his mātula with reverence.¹ It is however unknown whether Kassapa had faithful relatives at that time other than his bhāgineyya.

Some kings and princes were named after their mātula. Thus, Dhātusena's daughter's son was named after his mātula, viz. Moggallāna. He was therefore called Cūla Moggallāna, (i.e. Moggallāna II), (mātulaṅca paṭicceva cūlanāmena voharum). The son of the other daughter of Dhātusena bore the name of the latter's other son (i.e. Kassapa). The name of Khudda Aggabodhi (Kuḍā Akbō, Sinhalese) is also in the same order.² We find at least one example showing that a king took his mātula's name on his consecration: Hatthadāṭha, who seized the throne having defeated Māna, was consecrated as Dāṭhopatisa (659-667 A.D.).³ This would have helped Hatthadāṭha by emphasizing his close relationship to the deceased king a fact which was apparently of

¹ Cy.,XLV,6-11.
² Ibid.,XL,54,8 and XLII,40 respectively.
³ Ibid.,XLV,21.
particular importance to him because the other claimant to the throne was also a relative of a king. On the other hand, Hatthadātha probably took this opportunity to show that his opponent had no more rights to the throne than he, as far as their relationship to a king was concerned because his opponent, too, was only a bhāgineyya of king (i.e. Kassapa II).

In contrast to the above instances, there are some examples in which the bhāgineyya behaves contrary to the norm. Thus, Siva put his mātula to death and seized the throne.¹ Likewise, Kittaggabodhi in Rohaṇa killed his mātula probably for political reasons.²

There were some bhikkhus who ordained their sister's son. Thus, a bhikkhu at Korāṇaka Vihāra made his bhāgineyya enter the Sāsana and taught him the Dhamma.³ It is well known that prince Dhātusena, before becoming king, was ordained by his mother's brother Mahānāma, and it was the latter who assisted Dhātusena to protect himself against the Tamils who held sway

2. Ibid.,LI,110.
3. Visuddhim.,p.91.
over the kingdom.

From the above examples it follows that the relationship between the matula and bhāgineyya, at least in court circles, was an important aspect of the rights and obligations of kinship. This relationship does not appear to have been based merely on political considerations, but it was governed by personal attachment and conventional rules. In addition, although the bhāgineyya had no right to his matula's property he, in fact, often benefited from it.

In the family organization the structure and function of the joint family—the unit of a certain number of nuclear families the members of which lived together or worked together or otherwise who were recognized as belonging to a particular kin group—was the most characteristic feature. As the kinship terminology attests, kin of seven generations were recognized in this context. Of these, as far as interpersonal behaviour is concerned, the most important members were those belonging to the three middle generations. There is no evidence for a comprehensive discussion of the rights and obligations of, at least, the kin of these
three generations. It is also to be noted that most of the available evidence relates to court cercles and from this it also follows that there was a marked divergence between the expected patterns of behaviour and the actual behaviour of kin. Nevertheless, examples are by no means rare to show that there was a well defined pattern of family organization in the context of a patriarchal social system.

Marriage, which was closely connected with kinship, will be discussed in the following chapter.
Chapter Three  
MARRIAGE

Traditional law recognizes marriage as a fundamental institution because it is on marriage that the continuance of the basis of society—the family system—rests. Accordingly, the qualifications of the marriage partners, such as age, caste, the consent of the parents and the mutual love and understanding of the two partners etc. regulated the institution during the period under survey as in any other period. In general, the prestige and the status of the families of both parties were carefully considered before the conclusion of a marriage.

Regarding the age of marriage for a boy or a girl in the early period, H. Ellawala has pointed out that the general rule adopted by the Hindu writers was that the bride should be three or more years younger than the bride-groom and this rule was generally followed by the people. Further, he adds that the maiden and the youth were normally at the

age of around sixteen and twenty respectively, when they married. ¹ We find that these rules were also observed in the Indian subcontinent and in Ceylon during the period under review. Thus, the Smṛtis composed during the Gupta period adopted as a general rule that the bride should be three or more years younger than the bridegroom in the Indian subcontinent.²

The Dhammapada commentary, attributable to the fifth century A.D., states that people should be mature before starting married life and sixteen was considered the adult age for a girl to be given in marriage.³ The Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya of the tenth century A.D. speaks of a girl who had come to the age of sixteen (soḷos hāviridi viya ṣatt) when she was about to be given in marriage.⁴

Again, it mentions fifteen or sixteen as the ideal age for girls to be given in marriage.⁵ The Saddharma Ratnāvaliya of the thirteenth century A.D. writes: 'having remained with her parents up to the

¹ Soc. Hist. Early Ceyl., p.73.
² Gaut. Dharm. S., IV; Yājv. S., I, 52; Manu, V, 12; Apśṭamba Dharmasūtra, II, 6, 12.
³ Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā, (PTS), II, p.217.
⁵ Ibid., pp.66, 118.
age of sixteen, entered the bonds of matrimony, as
this was already the marriageable age.1 And again,
it describes how, when the girl attained the age of
sixteen2 (she was given in marriage).

From these examples it follows that the general
custom regarding the marriageable age for girls is
about the fourth century A.D., remained in use during
and after the period under study.

The important problem in this connexion is to
decide whether fifteen or sixteen was the norm for
girls. Most probably it was an ideal age rather than
a statement of practice. In present Ceylon twelve or
thirteen is considered as the normal age of puberty
for girls. According to Medhātithi, this was the puberty
age of girls even in ancient India.3 Also the Smṛtis,
with reference to pre-puberty marriage in the Indian
subcontinent, determined the twelfth year as the latest
limit for a girl to remain a maiden.4 This suggests
that the Smṛti writers considered that twelve years

1. Saddharma Ratanāvaliya, p.315: solos häviridi vanaturu
demāpiyan aturehi rāndā evakaṭa sarana hiṇdina vayasa
heyn sarana gosin.
2. Ibid., p.290: solos häviridi vayastā pāmīṇī kalī.
3. Manusmrṭi-bhāṣya, IX, 92.
4. Parāśara Smṛti, XII, 5-6.
was the normal age of puberty for girls. Therefore if fifteen or sixteen was considered the ideal age for girls to marry in ancient times and it follows that parents at that time also desired that their daughters should remain unmarried at least three years after attaining puberty. This desire certainly exists to-day among the parents in Ceylon, but we know that this is by no means a regular practice.

The available sources give no information as to the practice of child marriage in Ceylon at any time. On the contrary, as has already been pointed out, there are a number of references suggesting the prevalence of post-puberty marriage. We cannot conclude, however, that pre-puberty marriage was unusual in the Island, as we are not certain that our sources represent all types of marriages, while none of these explicitly states that such marriages did not take place in Ceylon.

With this reservation the apparent absence of child marriage in Ceylon, though being in accordance with the practice in most parts of the world, requires some comment in the South Asian context. Pre-puberty marriage is the rule laid down in ancient India. Many Śrītis, such as the Śamvarta, Parāśara, Vyāsa and
Śaṅkha, considered pre-puberty marriage the ideal.\(^1\)

According to Medhātithi the right time for a girl to be given in marriage was her eighth year.\(^2\) The twelfth year was the latest time laid down for a girl to remain as a maiden.\(^3\) A brāhmaṇa found guilty of marrying a girl after she had attained puberty in her father's house, was not considered fit for conversation and dining in the company of the other members of his caste.\(^4\) Alberuni records that the Hindus married at a very early age and were not allowed to marry a woman above twelve years of age.\(^5\)

But this rule, even in India, was apparently followed by very few people, especially by those belonging to the orthodox families of brāhmaṇas and those who followed their example. Instead, the majority of the people considered the age of about fifteen as the proper age of marriage for girls. A number of Jātakas inform us that the age of sixteen (saḷasa vassakāle) was considered the proper age of a girl to be married.\(^6\)

---

3. Parāśara Smṛti,XII,5-6.
4. Ibid.,VII,7.
There are instances in Indian sources of the fourth century A.D. which suggest that marriage generally took place when the partners were mature enough to start married life. B.S. Upadhyaya points out that this is a principle implied in the works of Kālidāsa.¹ According to the Haršacarita of the seventh century A.D. the marriage of princess Rājyaśrī took place when she was fully grown.² Similarly, a princess like Kādambarī got married only when she was mature enough.³ Although we have only few examples, it becomes clear that the brahmana rule of child marriage was not generally followed in India during our time. Hence, one can rightly argue that if the rule was not always followed even by the Hindus in India it is unlikely that it should apply to the Ceylonese whose main religion was not Hinduism but Buddhism. It should also be emphasized that the Buddhist texts mention only post-puberty marriages, as has already been seen. Further, it is worth mentioning that pre-puberty marriage was not prevalent among the Tamils.

From the foregoing discussion the following points emerge. Firstly, it is clear that the rule that

the bride should be younger than the groom was considered essential during the period under survey, as was the case in the Indian subcontinent and also in other periods of the history of Ceylon. Secondly, it seems that only post-puberty marriage was practised during our period, as during other periods of the history of Ceylon. Thirdly, the ideal age of the bride was, normally, considered to be fifteen or sixteen. Finally, the apparent absence of child marriage may reflect a low degree of brahmanization of Ceylon.

The custom of marrying daughters in the order of their age seems to have been established in our period. This implies that the eldest should marry first, and the youngest last. For example, king Sena I (833-853 A.D.) first gave his sister's eldest daughter to his brother's eldest son and later the other two daughters to the younger, most probably to the second, son.¹

Other important considerations in the case of marriage were the caste (sub-caste) and gotra affiliations of the partners. In this connexion, it is

essential to examine the exogamic and endogamic rules. As to the unions regarded as incestuous there are great differences from society to society, but sexual relations between father and daughter, mother and son are universally taboo. Sexual relations between siblings are also taboo. Yet there are exceptions to the last rule. We find brother-sister marriages among some nations. These taboos are applicable to Ceylon as well. Unfortunately for us, our sources do not permit us to know what other unions were regarded as incestuous during our period.

The Smrtis advocate certain exogamic and endogamic rules. According to them, marriages between sa-gotra, sa-pinda and sa-pravara partners are prohibited. The last two terms are typical of Sanskrit literature. A short explanation of these terms may be required: 'It has been pointed out that the gotra probably meant

1. W.F.Ogburn & M.F.Nimkoff; A Handbook of Sociology, 1947, p.462; The Dīgha Nikāya mentions a marriage between brother and sister (see I, p.92); cf. A.R.Radcliffe-Brown; African Systems of Kinship and Marriage, Introd., p.71; Yama-Yama marriage is well-known to the students of history of India.
"herd" and, later on it came to denote the "family" or the "clan" i.e. all those tracing their family back to one common mythical ancestor.\(^1\) Sa-pinda literally means 'having the same pinda', and so connotes the kinsmen connected with the offering of the pinda to certain ancestors at the sraddha, i.e. the maternal and paternal kinsmen of six generations in ascending and descending line.\(^2\) Pravara can be traced back to the cult of the fire-worship amongst Indo-Aryans. The purohita (priest), officiating at a sacrifice to Agni, used to recite the names of famous rshi ancestors when invoking Agni to carry libations to the Gods; therefore, the pravara came to denote the series of such ancestors of persons who had in former times invoked Agni. Now, evidently the list of ancestors has had its social bearings: for, by and by, pravara came to be associated with the various samskaras of domestic and social nature, the most important being the vivaha; and it is laid down by some of the authorities that a man shall not

---

marry a woman who can be traced from any of the ancestors as mentioned in his pravara¹.¹

The extent of the adoption of these rules in ancient Ceylon is not easy to determine. However, the absence of parallel cousin marriage and, on the other hand, the prevalence of cross-cousin marriage in the Island during our period (as in any other period) show that the sa-gotra rule was followed by the people.

Dhātusena (459-477 A.D.) gave his daughter in marriage to his sister's son (bhāgineyya).² Also Aggabodhi I (575-608 A.D.) married his daughter Dāṭhā to his sister's son (bhāgineyya).³ Dappula II (815-831 A.D.) gave his daughter Devā in marriage to his sister's son (bhāgineyya).⁴ Sena I (833-853 A.D.) contracted marriage between his brother's son and his sister's daughters.⁵

We find an example of a sa-gotra marriage, viz., the marriage between Aggabodhi VII, the son of Mahinda I, and Saṅghā, the daughter of Mahinda's brother's (i.e. Kassapa III) son (i.e. Aggabodhi VI). The following

---

² Cv., XXXVIII, 82.
³ Ibid., XLIX, 71.
⁴ Ibid., XLII, 6, 10.
⁵ Ibid., L, 50-60.
chart illustrates this point.

However, this was a marriage of political convenience.¹

From the above examples it may also follow that cross-cousin marriage was preferred by people during our time as in the preceding and the following periods.² Further, we know that in present Ceylon this marriage is considered not only proper but normally obligatory among both the Sinhalese and the Tamils.³

H.W. Tambiah, referring to the Apastamba Dharmasūtra opines that this practice was peculiar to the Hindus of South India and that this is the reason why the Sinhalese preferred it.⁴ Yet, this practice was by no means confined to South India, because there are a plenty of examples showing that this practice was in existence in the North. Thus, king Ajātasattu

1. Infra, p. 125.
married Vajirā the daughter of his father's sister.¹ The Dhammapada Commentary refers to a householder of Magadha named Māgha, who married his maternal uncle's daughter named Sujātā.² Ananda tried to marry his father's sister's daughter named Uppalavāṇṇā.³ A number of Jātaka stories refer to this type of marriage.⁴ Hence Tambiah's opinion is not supported by evidence. Above all, before him, B.N. Sharma has denied that the system of cross-cousin marriage is confined to South India. '

'It would be wrong', he writes, 'to suppose as some have done on the basis of Medhatithi that such (cross-cousin) marriage were confined to South India, for Upamitibhava-prapañcakathā, which represents the conditions in western India, mentions this marriage as of frequent occurrence'. Further, he gives a number of examples in order to prove that this was a very ancient tradition in the western part of India.⁵ Unfortunately, Tambiah has not taken Sharma's argument into account.

For these reasons it is clear that cross-cousin marriage is not confined to South India. It rather

1. Mahāvagga (PTS ), VII, i, 2, 3.
2. Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā (PTS ), II, p. 265.
3. Ibid., II, p. 49.
5. Sharma, op. cit., p. 11.
follows that the practice of cross-cousin marriage requires no further discussion as it is widely found all over the Indian subcontinent. But unfortunately, the Smṛtis do not reflect actual custom. It should be added that cross-cousin marriage is common also in some other parts of the world.¹

Thus, it may be possible to suppose that cross-cousin marriage, widely spread in Indian subcontinent, would have influenced the marriage institution in Ceylon. In particular, as Sharma has pointed out, this practice represents a very old tradition of Western India; and the earliest Aryan migrations to Ceylon probably took place from this part of India.² Hence the system was probably established together with these earliest colonists. There is some corroboration of cross-cousin marriages among the earliest colonists. For example, Dīghagāmapī (c. sixth or fifth century B.C.), the son of Dīghāyu,³ married his father's sister's (i.e. Bhaddakaccānā) daughter Cittā.⁴

Thirdly, the practice was common in Eastern India as well.⁵ and the other stream of migration to Ceylon

3. He founded the village Dīghāyu; see Mv.,IX,10-11; Ep. Zeyl.,V,p.134; JCBRAS.(NS),VI,1963,p.25.
4. Dv.,X,7; Mv.,IX,1,6,10,11,16-18; Piv.,p.115; Riv.,26.
can be traced to that part. ¹ So this may be another probable reason accounting for the prevalence of this system among the Ceylonese. Fourthly, there is evidence for a third stream of migration to Ceylon, that is the South Indian stream. ² This would again have strengthened the prevalence of cross-cousin marriage in Ceylon.

Finally, aboriginal clans, such as the Văddas follow the practice of cross-cousin marriage. Yet it is possible that this is because Vădda clans adopted the later colonists' system.

The preferential matrilateral cross-cousin marriage is often associated with linked lineage such that one lineage customarily gives its daughters to another. But as far as the available evidence goes there is nothing to suggest that there was a particular lineage that provided husbands for the kings' daughters or one that provided wives for the kings' sons.

According to the rules laid down in the Dharmaśāstras with reference to marriage in the Indian subcontinent

it is emphasized that marriage should take place between persons of the same caste (varṇa). Ellawala has argued that this varṇa system was followed by the Ceylonese during the period which he covered in his research. References in the sources regarding this aspect during the period under our present study are rather vague. The Raṁbāva Slab Inscription records that the parents of king Mahinda IV (956–972 A.D.) belonged to the samadā (in Pali: samajātī) and the same kula. Udaya IV (946–954 A.D.) explained that his mother and father belonged to the same dā. Dā and kula in these contexts may mean 'equal birth' and 'caste' respectively. Yet it is to be borne in mind that kula in some contexts also means a type of family. However, these examples suggest that the kings always tried to explain that they consecrated queens from their own caste as mahēsīs according to the traditional rule.

1. Manu, III, 4; Yājv. S., I, 52.
5. Supra, pp. 30ff.
This practice was considered essential for some reasons. First, khattiyas could fail to get consecrated as kings unless they took a queen from their own caste. Second, princes, whose mothers had not been consecrated as mahesīs, were handicapped in the succession to the throne. For instance, Kassapa, the eldest son of king Dhātusena (459-477 A.D.), and Sotthisena, the son of king Mahānāma (410-432 A.D.), were not legitimate heirs to the throne because their mothers were not the principal queens.

The Buddhist texts, too, explain that princes born by queens of unequal caste were not fit for the throne: The Dīgha Nikāya states that khattiyas would not consecrate a son who is born out of the union of khattiya youth and brāhmaṇa girl or a brāhmaṇa youth with a khattiya girl because he is not pure by birth for seven generations on the mother's side in the former instance and the father's side in the latter case.

Generally, so-called high-caste people were aware of varṇasamākara. We learn from the Dīgha Nikāya that the

2. Cq., XXXVIII, 80; Rjv., p. 144 and Cq., XXXVIII, 1; Pjv., p. 144; Rjv., p. 60 respectively.
sons of the mythical king Okkāka married their own sisters through fear of breaking the purity of the line.\(^1\)

The Sinhalese kings, especially those of the eighth to the tenth century A.D., traced their descent to the khattiya vāma\(^2\) on both their mother's and father's side. In other words they asserted the purity of their khattiya descent, no doubt in order to strengthen any claims to legitimacy.

In addition, it may be suggested that they also intended to emphasize their opposition against varṇasaṁkara. Thus, king Mahinda IV (956-972 A.D.), in the Vēvālkātiya inscription claimed that both his father and mother were khattiyas. Further, according to the Cūlavāṃśa he fetched a princess from Kaliṅga\(^3\) and made her first maheśī. The chronicle also states that by procreating

\(^1\) D.N., I, p. 92. As A.R. Radcliffe-Brown has pointed out, there are societies in which kings or chiefs may marry, or even are expected to marry their own sisters; see African Systems of Kinship and marriage, introd, p. 71.

\(^2\) See for the khattiyas in Ceylon, infra, p. 364 ff.

\(^3\) It has recently been suggested that Kaliṅga mentioned in these sources was in South East Asia (Ceylon and Malaya, pp. 27 ff). But in the absence of conclusive arguments the present author adheres to the older established view that the term refers to Kaliṅga in the east coast of India (approximately modern Orissa).
sons by her the king founded the royal house of the Sinhalese (iti Sīhala-vamsaṅca paṭṭhapesi)\(^1\) which however reigned only for one more generation. These passages explain that king Mahinda, as his father and fore-fathers did, married a prince from his own caste. Further, he appears to have encouraged others to follow this example of the royal family by stating in the same inscription that people should continue to adhere to the marriage customs of their families or caste (kula).\(^2\) In short, Mahinda paid particular interest to follow the rule that marriage should take place between the persons of the same caste (vārṇa).

It is not sure that the rules applying to kings were the same as those valid for others. However, there are some examples showing that da was taken into consideration by parents when they arranged their children's marriages. For instance, according to the Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya of the tenth century A.D., parents of a girl looked for her husband to their own da.\(^3\) The Rasavāhini of the fourteenth century A.D. speaks of certain parents who did not give their consent to their daughter

---

1. Cy.,LIV,9,11. The historicity of this marriage is supported by an inscription, Ep. Zeyl.,II,p.69.
being married to her lover till they were satisfied about the jāti of the youth. ¹ It is by no means clear in these contexts dā (in Pali: jāti) denotes either 'birth' or 'caste'.

Another important problem connected with the selection of marriage partners is the area where the partners lived. But our sources do not furnish us with enough material in this field. We only read in the Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya and Saddharma Ratnāvaliya that the parents made sure that they knew the region (padesa) from where their future son-in-law came.² Unfortunately, no more evidence occurs for this aspect in the available sources.

Further, we hear of some other qualifications of marriage partners which were taken into consideration before a marriage was contracted. Dappula II (815-831 A.D.) gave Kittaggabodhi his daughter, endowed with all kinds of beauties and qualities (sabbarūpagunopetaṭ), as a wife.³ A person named Saṅgha wanted as his wife a girl merely because she was of noble character.⁴ Sena I (833-853 A.D.) married his sister's daughter to Mahinda,

1. Rsv.,II,p.35.
4. Sahas.,p.175.
who was endowed with 'all qualities' (sabbaguṇopeto). ¹ Dappula of Rohaṇa was more devoted to his subjects than any earlier kings of his line. Therefore he was highly respected by his people: king Silāmeghaṇa (623-632 A.D.), heard all about him and, delighted, gave him his daughter in marriage. ² According to the Sahassavatthu-ppakaraṇa, brothers (their parents no longer lived) gave their sister in marriage to a person called Saṅgha only when they were satisfied with the wealth (dhanam) of the latter. ³

In order to get an idea of these qualities it may be useful to examine some references that can be found in Indian sources and in Sinhalese works based on Indian stories. According to the Pañcatantra, the bridegroom should be endowed with qualities such as (good) family (kula), character or virtue (śīla), learning (vidyā), wealth (vitta) and the right age (vayas). ⁴

The Vinaya Piṭaka states that the bhikkhu Udāyi arranged a marriage in which the girl's qualities are described to the boy's parents as beauty (abhirūpā),

---

2. Ibid.,XLV,50-82.
charm (dassanīyā), loveliness (pasādā), learning (pāṇḍitā),
wise (medhāvinī), cleverness (dakkha) and industriousness
(analasā), and similar qualities are needed to the girl's
parents.¹ The Saddharma Ratnāvaliya speaks of a youth
who brought a beautiful girl (rupasampannā) from a
merchant family of equal status.²

Evidently, virtue, ability, scholarship, wealth
and beauty of both partners were taken into account
in the case of marriage. Yet there is little evidence
enabling us to study these qualities in the order of
their importance.

In order to understand the function of marriage
it is also necessary to enquire how far the parents'
consent and the children's wishes decided the result.
In this respect it is interesting to examine the
traditional forms of marriage as depicted in the Hindu
texts, as well as those in the Buddhist texts. There
are eight forms of marriage according to the Hindu
writings, namely, brāhma, daiva, ārṣa, prājāpatya, gāndharva,
rākṣasa, āsura and paiśāca. The brāhma form is that
the damsel was offered as gift to a fit bridegroom,
invited by the bride's father himself. As far as parents'

¹ Vihaya Piṭaka (PTS.),III,p.135.
² Saddharma Ratnāvaliya,p.653.
consent is concerned the daīva, the prājāpatya, the 
ārṣa and āsura are quite similar to the brāhma form 
except prājāpatya which demands the consent of the
bridegroom. The marriage between two lovers with their 
mutual consent but without their parents' mediation is 
called the gāndharva form. The rākṣasa and the paiśāca 
forms represent two kinds of unions that took place 
by force, as the maiden was abducted from her home and 
seduced her against her wish. Neither the parents' nor 
the girl's consent is implied in these cases.¹ These 
last two forms seem, however, to have been exceptional.

On the whole it appears that the parents' consent 
on their children's marriage was of greater importance 
than that of the marriage partners themselves in the Hindu forms of marriage.

All these forms of marriage are broadly included 
in three forms in the Buddhist sources: marriage arranged 
by guardians of both parties is the first and formost 
one which includes apparently all forms of marriage 
with parental consent. The second and the last were 
gāndharva and svayamvara respectively which were given

¹. Manu, III, 20-21, 27-34; Yaś.v. S., I, 58-61; Śaṅkha Smṛti, 
IV, 124-126.
less importance. This suggests that the Buddhist sources also give preference to a marriage arranged by the parents or guardians of both parties.

According to most passages in the Cūlavāṃsa, marriages of members of the royal families were subject to parental consent. Thus, king Dhātusena (459-477 A.D.) bestowed the dignity of senāpati on his sister's son (bhāgineyya) and gave him his daughter in marriage.²

Upatissa II (522 A.D.) gave his daughter in marriage to Silākāla together with the necessary revenue (sahabhoga).³

King Aggabodhi I (575-608 A.D.) conferred the dignity of malavārāja to his sister's son (bhāgineyya) and gave him his daughter Dāthā in marriage.⁴

King Silāmeghavanṇa (623-632 A.D.) married his daughter to Dappula of Rohaṇa and granted him the office of yuvarāja.⁵

Aggabodhi VI (772-777 A.D.) married his daughter to his father's brother's son named Aggabodhi; but after some time she fell out with her husband as went back to her father and, weeping before him, bitterly said: 'without reason the husband thou gavest me kills me.'

---

2. Cv.,XXXIX,80-81.
3. Ibid.,XL,7.
4. Ibid.,XLII,6,10.
5. Ibid.,XLV,51-52.
(akāraṇe maṃ māreṭi dinno vo sāmiko). 1 Udaya I (797-801 A.D.) married his daughter Devā to Mahinda of Rohaṇa. 2 Dappula II (815-831 A.D.) gave his sister's son (bhāgineyya) his daughter Devā in marriage. 3 Sena I (833-853 A.D.) contracted marriage on behalf of his sister's daughters. 4 Sena II (853-887 A.D.) arranged for a marriage between his younger brother's daughter Saṅghā by name and his own son Kassapa. 5 A passage in the Sahassavatthuppakarana explains that a certain minister named Saṅgha did not get married to a girl till he got the consent of the brothers (as her parents no longer lived). 6

These instances clearly show that at least in royal circles the parents or guardians generally arranged for their children's marriages. Most of the Indian texts attributable to our period contain similar information. 7 The case of Aggabodhi VI may suggest that the father had not taken his daughter's wish into account.

2. Ibid., XLIX, 12; see for other implications of this marriage, supra, p. 97.
3. Ibid., XLIX, 71.
4. Ibid., L, 50-60.
5. Ibid., LI, 15-18.
7. Harṣacakrta, pp. 140-142; Rāṇāvali, p. 3; Bhātakathākoṣa, p. 102.
Her words 'the husband thou gavest me' (dinno vo sāmiko) may indicate that her marriage was arranged only by her father's decision.

The last part of the passage explains that she had had a love affair with her maternal uncle's son (mātulaputtako) for a long time, perhaps before her marriage with her grandfather's son. As a result, she ran away with the former. This example may suggest that she felt disappointed by her father's selection of a husband because of her love affair with her cross-cousin whom she would normally have married. Further, the reasons that led to the conclusion of this marriage suffice to show that the king intended to confirm the friendship with Aggabodhi through this matrimonial alliance, rather than follow the traditional preference or select a suitable other partner for his daughter. In the Saddharma Ratnāvaliya we find an example of a girl who accepted a marriage proposal only for the sake of her parents.²

Love affairs are not wanting at any time. A Sigiri poet named Mahāsttāy speaks of separated lovers

1. Cv., XLVIII, 45, 54.
who have become united (viyovun vuyū siyou) and, united became very closely associated, when watching Sīgiri.  

A number of graffiti writers stated that girls welcome the companionship of boys. Some verses explain that the boys and girls exchanged love latters. This is corroborated by the Sikhavalāṇḍa Vinisa.

The Cūlavāṃsa contains some examples of love marriages. For instance, Ādipāda Udaya concluded a love marriage with his father's sister's daughter. We have already mentioned the love affair between the daughter of king Aggabodhi VI and her matrilateral cross-cousin. Consequently, she got divorced from her husband, who had been selected by her father and was remarried with her lover. The Sahassavatthuppakarana speaks of a younger merchant at Mahātittha who had a love affair with a beautiful girl named Hema in the western part of Anurādhapura. It is interesting that not only the merchant used to go to see Hema at her place but also the latter herself went to see the merchant at Mahātittha, at a long distance.

---

2. Ibid., v.294.
3. Ibid., vv.134,269,484,595,640.
4. Sīkhyav., V., p.28.
6. Ibid., XLVIII, 58-59.
7. Sahas., p.127.
According to this survey, it follows that arranged marriages were no doubt the ideal. But elopement and love matches were probably common then as now.

Marriage of the ordinary people during our period was normally monogamous just as in the earlier period, whereas the practice of polygamy was mainly confined to royal personages. There is no need to devote much time to tracing the numerous examples in our sources of royal harems and kings' different queens. It is important to add that the available records contain no evidence of polyandry, as is also the case with other early sources before the Kandyan period.

As to the wedding ceremony our sources give little information. A passage in the Vēvālkāṭiya inscription of the tenth century A.D. suggests that maṅgala and avamaṅgala rites differed from family to family or caste to caste (kula). Though this passage does not define what was meant by the terms maṅgala and avamaṅgala, generally, these terms indicate 'marriage' and 'death' respectively. Yet no evidence is available for these

2. See Cy., XXXVIII, 80, 112; XXXIX, 55; XLI, 7; L, 50, 8, 15-17; LII, 64-67; Sig. Graff., v. 147; Ep. Zeyl., I, p. 49; II, p. 141; III, p. 223.
rites indicated in this passage.

In addition, a Sigiri graffito, attributable to the latter half of the eighth century A.D., contains a passage worth considering. Thus we read:- 'Speak after having placed between (my) breasts a blue badge 1 (especially) prepared'. 2 These words attributed to a woman may indicate that she wanted the gallant to address her only after having tied the tālla (marriage badge). This may suggest that, as to-day, the tying by the bridegroom of the tālla (Sinhalese), tāli (Tamil) ('badge'), around the bride's neck was in practice at that time.

This ceremony is at present solemnly carried out either on the day of betrothal or on that of the pōruva ceremony. 4 It may become clear from the following evidence that this ceremony is a tradition handed down

1. The adjective blue (nil) may indicate that the badge was embossed with a blue diamond.
2. Sig. Graff., v.219: Tepalan piyovur mājā kūla lamuka āra nil tǎllak.
3. The low-country and up-country Sinhalese call it tālla and māla respectively. In the urban areas both terms are found.
4. For some details of the pōruva ceremony as practice in the Kandyan area and low-country see Niti-Nighanduva, chap.3 section 1 and Bryce Ryan, The Sinhalese Village, pp.82ff respectively. See also, C.M.Austin de Silva, 'Maṅgul Tahanciya-an Ancient Sinhalese Marriage Custom', Sir Paul Pieris Felicitation Volume,1956, p.33.
from ancient times. 'The essence of the contract of matrimony', Queyroz wrote in the seventeenth century A.D., 'consists in the handing of a jewel called tale, (i.e. tālla), which the bridegroom ties round the neck of the bride with a cotton thread tinged with saffron. ... A day being fixed for the marriage, they erect a high bower at the door of the bride, and the bridegroom comes accompanied by all his relatives to tie the tale ...'¹ Similarly, Rahula in the fifteenth century A.D. mentioned that a necklace was tied around the bride's neck.²

Further, Edgar Thurston has pointed out that this is a ceremony which was followed by South Indian Tamils from very early times.³ It is a well known fact that Sinhalese and Tamils were linked together by many ties during our period. There are a number of occasions when Sinhalese princes fled to South India and returned home with troops.⁴ Similarly, South Indian kings also fled to Ceylon.⁵ In addition, Tamils both in and outside Ceylon sometimes acted as king-makers in Ceylon. For

---

2. Kāvyaśekharaya, VI, v. 22.
3. Edgar Thurston, Castes and Tribes of South India, 1909, pp. 36.
4. Cv., XXXIX, 20; XLI, 94, 106; XLV, 13; Piy., p. 145.
instance, when Dāṭhopatissa fled to India, Tamils in Ceylon sent a message to him asking him to come back to the Island and take possession of the throne. Hence Māna, the opponent of Dāṭhopatissa, who was responsible for the security of Anurādhapura and Rohaṇa, asked for the help of the mercenaries in Ceylon to secure his position. However, the Tamils supported Dāṭhopatissa, who subsequently became king.¹

The Sinhalese kings sometimes enthroned Indian princes in India: The Cūlavāṃsa relates how king Sena II (853-887 A.D.), invaded the Pāṇḍya country and succeeded there in placing his nominee on the Pāṇḍya throne.² This is corroborated by epigraphic evidence.³ It is known that an indirect consequence of these contacts was the occupation by the Cūḷas of Rājaraṭṭha. Thus, the Tamils occupied a strong position and were associated with the Sinhalese royal family by means of marriages and other relations more than ever before. Towards the close of the tenth century A.D. there were permanent Tamil settlements in some parts of the country.⁴

¹ Cv., XLV, 11-12.
² Ibid., LI, 27-47.
³ See Bilibāva, Āṭṭiraṅgollāva and Ellāvala inscriptions, Ep. Zeyl., II, pp. 39 and 44.
⁴ Cf. K. Indrapala, op. cit., p. 83.
Therefore the Tamil custom of the tying of the marriage badge would have applied to the Sinhalese wedding ceremony in the latter part of the Anurādhapura period as indicated by the above Sīgiri graffito.

Although divorce and remarriage were not regarded with favour they did occur. Thus, Aggabodhi's daughter Saṅghā fell out with her husband and returned to her father. The king at once sent her to a home for bhikkhuṇis. But she did not stay there long because she got involved in a run-away marriage with the son of her maternal uncle. The reaction of her father and the former husband against her behaviour is quite interesting. They ran after the new couple and Saṅghā, after being captured, was returned to her former husband. The account of the chronicle does not set out the reasons that led to the king's disapproval of her re-marriage with her cross-cousin. But her first marriage, which was arranged by

1. Cey.,XLVIII, 55-56.  
2. In present Ceylon the cross-cousin has the right to marry the bride even by force. Therefore, before contracting marriage with an outsider the cross-cousin must voluntarily resign his claim. This is done, according to custom, by means of receiving kadulu bulat ('betel of the gate'), a bundle of forty leaves of betel) by the cross-cousin at the gate of the bride's residence, when the marriage procession approaches the gate. (See for further details Ralph Reiris, Sinhalese Social Organization, p. 198). We have no evidence to state whether the cross-cousin had this right in our period as well. If it was the case Saṅghā's marriage without her father's consent would be in agreement with custom. Cf. Adipāda Udaya's love marriage, below, p. 138.
her father, was motivated by political considerations as we shall see later. It is, therefore, possible that the king wanted to re-confirm her first marriage when she showed once again interest in married life, as he disapproved of her second marriage.

In the same period in India the kṣatriyas prohibited the re-marriage of widows, as has been pointed out by Sharma, who also observes that some widows entered a religious order as nuns. Another passage in the Cūlavāṃsa suggests that a king in Ceylon encouraged his mahesī to become a bhikkhunī after his death: king Jeṭṭhatissa III (632 A.D.), when dying on the battle field, left a message to his mahesī:

'Enter O great queen, the order, recite the sacred texts, read the Abhidhamma and transfer the merit to the king.'

We learn from the following verses that in pursuance of these words of the deceased king she became a bhikkhunī and undertook the reading of the Abhidhamma together with its Aṭṭhakathās and also recited the Dhamma during the rest of her life.

2. Cv., XLIV, 109: Pabbajitvā mahādevī sajjhāyityā ca āgamaṃ Abhidhammāṃ kathetvāna pattim dehi ti rājino;

cf. Geiger's transl., p. 84.
The ideas of the Sigiri poets attributable to the period from the eight to the tenth century A.D. are interesting in this context. The following are some examples:

'These ladies did not speak as the king ... died and departed'; '... the damsel, who (wears) a golden chain on her breast ..., does not speak to anyone else whomsoever, as the king died at that time'; '... having heard that king is dead, appear to be as if they are hurling (themselves down) from the summit of rock, together with the flowers taken (in their hands), saying 'We shall die.'

Though these ideas are expressed in a poetic manner they suggest that the widow was expected to lead a secluded life. Although the sati practice was not normally followed the quoted instances, together with the passages already discussed from the Cūlavamsa suggest that widows were expected to lead a life of complete chastity. But, as described by Abu Zaid, who wrote in the mid-tenth century A.D., no widows in Ceylon were supposed to become satis although some of them volunteered to do so.  

The absence of the sati practice in Ceylon seems quite plausible. On the one hand, though this practice

1. Sig. Graff., vv. 2, 19 and 584 respectively; cf. vv. 18, 360 and 450; Paranavitana's transl.
was advocated by the Hindu writers, it was not generally observed by the Hindus themselves, except among some circles in some areas, for instance in Rājputāna in the later period.¹ In this connexion what is of particular interest to us is the extent of its popularity in the Deccan and extreme South of India. Before (c.) 1000 A.D. this practice was very rare in the Deccan. We find no references to its popularity; on the contrary, according to the Arabian records there was no compulsion to practise the satī rite, instead it was entirely left to widows to choose.²

In so far as its popularity in the extreme south of India is concerned Altekar opines that 'among the members of the Pallava, the Chōla and the Pāṇḍya ruling families, so well known to us from numerous inscriptions, we do not come across any cases of satī down to c. 900 A.D. It is therefore clear that the custom was yet to obtain a footing in South India'.³ On the other hand, Buddhism discouraged the people from any sort of inhuman

2. History of India as told by its own Historians, ed, Elliot & Dowson,p.122.
deeds like killing, suicide etc., and also different kinds of rites.

Thus, there is nothing to suggest that the *sati* rite was practised in Ceylon. But, as has already been pointed out, widows were expected to lead a life of chastity. However, examples of divorce and re-marriage are also not wanting. As to the *Cūlavaṃsa* we have already seen how the queen of Aggabodhi VII left the king and re-married with someone else. This interesting story continues by recording that she spent the last part of her life with her first husband.¹ A story in the *Visuddhimagga*, assigned to the fifth century A.D., tells us of a woman in Anurādhapura who, after a violent quarrel with her husband, made her way towards Mihintalē. On the way she wanted to make love to a *bhikkhu*.² A widow queen became the wife of a *senāpati*, settled down happily and bore children.³ The queen of Upatissa I (368-410 A.D.) put her husband to death and subsequently married his younger brother.⁴

Generally, marriage was patrilocal. Besides some vague allusions we find no examples of matrilocal

---

marriages (modern Sinhalese binna bāhīma). A Sigiri verse speaks of a person named Vajur Agboy, who resided in the house of a lady called Sātā.¹ In another Sigiri graffito someone describes himself as the husband of a lady called Boya (Boya kalaśāmi).² Paranavitana concludes that these two passages are examples of matrilocal marriages.³

Yet one may question his conclusion especially because these examples are of a complicated nature. As to the first passage, we are not certain whether Vajur was the husband of Sātā or her relative. The second passage does not also necessarily imply that Mahasattay resided at his wife's house. Firstly, there is nothing in the passage to decide that Maha-amuṇḍora was his wife's home. Secondly, the most important point is that Mahasattay does not actually state that he resided in his wife's house. Thirdly, Mahasattay, either alone or with his wife, would have visited Sigiriya and inscribed his name together with that of his wife in most suitable

1. Sig. Graff., v.268; Sātā kalu-ge vasana Vajur Agboy mi (I am Vajur Agboy residing at the house of lady Sātā).
2. Ibid., v.154; Maha-amuṇḍora vasana Boyakalasāmi Mahasattay mi (I am Mahasattay residing at Maha-amuṇḍora, the husband of lady Boya).
3. Ibid., Introd., p.CCXIII.
way at his disposal. Finally, Boya was perhaps a well known figure at that time and therefore Mahasattay introduced himself as her husband.

Regarding the dowry system only the Cūlavamsa gives some materials. Thus, it records that king Upatissa II (522 A.D.) gave his daughter in marriage to Silākāla together with revenue (saha bhogena).¹ Sena I (833-853 A.D.) married Saṅghā, the elder daughter of Kittagabodhi of Rohana,² to uparāja Sena with important revenue (mahābhogaṃ datvā).³ Tissa and Kitti, the sisters of Saṅghā, were also given with revenue (bhoga) to uparāja Mahinda.⁴

These passages suggest that a dowry was given to the bridegroom by the bride's party at least in the marriages of royal persons. Yet there is no indication as to whether the other party paid a bride price to the bride. Also nothing is known to the conditions under which these grants were made, nor is it clear whether a dowry was involved in marriages of ordinary people.

1. Cv.,XLI,8.
2. King Sena's sister was given in marriage to Kittagabodhi, Cv.,XLIX,71.
4. Ibid.,L,59-60.
A notable feature of the marriage institution during the period under survey is the fact that its political influence seems to have increased. In the first place, we find examples of the existence of matrimonial bonds between members of the same royal family which may have promoted good relations, or if necessary, contributed to reconciliation among members of the family.

According to the Cūlavāṃsa king Aggabodhi VI (772-777 A.D.), had a father's brother's son (parallel cousin) by the same name, who was heir to the throne. In course of time a quarrel broke out between them. Though it did not last long, the prince moved out of the capital and fled to the Malaya mountains. The king pursued him, brought him back to the capital and in the end, offered him the hand of his daughter Saṁghā.¹ There is no doubt that this marriage was motivated by political considerations. The Cūlavāṃsa also states that the king, arranging this marriage, was convinced that the prince would be more trustworthy after the marriage (hoti

¹. Cv.,XLVIII,39-54.
King Sena II (853-887 A.D.), following this example, conferred the rank of uparāja on his younger brother Mahinda with Dakkhiṇadesa as his principality. As he had committed an offence in the king's harem (antopure paraśajhītvā) he fled to Malaya out of fear for the king. In the meantime, the king had got a son (Kassapa) and, on the very day of his name-giving (nāmadānadine yeva) consecrated him uparāja or, according to the version of an inscription, he was consecrated yuvarāja at the same time of his birth (dunū sānāhime yuva-raj bisev-siri pāmāṇā).

At this juncture, through the mediation of the bhikkhus, the king and his brother seem to have come to an amicable settlement. However, the king was not satisfied and the Cūlavamsa continues with these words: 'the king thought these circumstances my younger brother

1. Cv, XLVIII, 54; cf. Geiger reads the first two pādas of verse 54 as hoti nissamsayām dhīro iti tūṭho atī va so and renders as 'he is no doubt firm, he, being highly pleased'; see Cv. Transl., p. 115, note 2.
will be reliable for me and took careful counsel with his ministers (*evaṃ sati kaṇṭṭhako nissaṅko mayi hotī'ṭi sammā mantīhi mantiya*) and, diplomatically (*budho*) married the beautiful daughter of the *yuvarāja*, Saṅghā by name, to his own son Kassapa¹.¹ It is obvious that this marriage was of great political importance, as the king had to consult his ministers in this matter.

Secondly, we have examples of matrimonial alliances between the Moriya and Lambakaṇṇa clans. Thus, Silākāla, the son of Dāṭhāpabhuti of the Lambakaṇṇa clan, who had been in the service of Kassapa I, brought the Hair Relics (*kesadhatu*) from the Bodhi-


---

¹ Cy.,LI,17-19.
³ *Ibid.*,XLI,8-26; cf.
During the time of Kumāradhātuṣena (512-520 A.D.), Siva (521 A.D.) and Upatissa II (522 A.D.) the position of Silākāla seems to have been well established. So Upatissa wanted him as his son-in-law. In spite of this relationship Silākāla fought against his father-in-law and eventually became king.¹

On the other hand, Upatissa II (Lamāṇi Upatis, Sinhalese)² had a matrimonial alliance with Moggallāna as well. The Cūlavāṃsa refers to Upatissa as Moggallānassa bhaginisāmi (Moggallāna's sister's husband).³ This suggests that Upatissa got married to a sister of Moggallāna. Thus, Moggallāna, Silākāla and Upatissa became relatives by means of marriages. The following chart may illustrate this relationship and also the line of Silākāla:-

2. Piv., p. 145; Riv., p. 55; Nks., p. 222.
The history of the Island between about the seventh and the ninth century A.D. especially during the period from 623 to 659 A.D. when we witness a continues struggle for the Anurādhapura kingdom between two parties in the kingdom, was a period of dynastic instability.¹ In these circumstances Rohaṇa made itself independent. Until the Cōḷas occupied Rājaraṭṭha, perhaps even during the Cōḷa period, some of the Rohaṇa territory remained independent. During such a long period the main relationship between the two kingdoms appears to have been that based on marriage alliances. It is therefore, necessary to examine, in brief, these alliances. According to the Cūḷavaṃsa, Aggabodhi, the first independent ruler of Rohaṇa in our period, established his own dynasty. The eldest of his younger brothers, Dappula by name, brought glory to his line through political and religious achievements. The chronicle explains how the king of Anurādhapura (Silāmeghavaṃsa), having heard of his achievements, gave him his daughter in marriage.²

When Udaya I (797-801 A.D.) was on the throne of Anurādhapura, a nobleman called Ādipāda Dāṭhāsiva

---

2. Cv., XLV, 50.
was in Rohaṇa with the title of Rohaṇa (desamhi) bhogādhipati. In his Rāssahela inscription he is referred to as Aṭṭayā Daḷasiva. Geiger has considered this title as that of the administrative officer responsible for the revenue of Rohaṇa. His son Mahinda was no longer on good terms with his father and found his way to the king of Anurādhapura. King Udaya placed under him an army division enabling him to bring the principality under his control. In order to strengthen the friendship (tena metṭim thīram kātum) with Mahinda the king gave also him his daughter Devā in marriage. Thus, the ties between Anurādhapura and the new line of Rohaṇa became closer. This was the first of a number of similar alliances between the two royal houses. As a consequence, the kings of Anurādhapura got involved in the family troubles of the rulers of Rohaṇa.

Though the Cūlavamsa does not explicitly mention this there was most probably a matrimonial alliance between the two royal houses during the time of Aggabodhi VI (733-772 A.D.). During the struggle between Dappula,

1. Cv., XLIX, 10.
the sister's son of king Aggabodhi VI, and Mahinda II (777-797 A.D.) for the throne, the Čulavamsa mentions that the two sons of his sister were summoned from Rohaṇa by Dappula. This passage may suggest that Dappula's sister had been given in marriage to the ruler of Rohaṇa and as usual, Dappula sought his nephews' support in his warfare. Unfortunately no further details about this relationship are known.

Mahinda of Rohaṇa, imitating, as it were, his father's ill treatment towards him, expelled his sons from the place. They naturally turned to their maternal uncle, king Dappula II (815-831 A.D.). They were welcomed by the king, who subsequently gave his daughter Devā in marriage to Kittaggabodhi, the eldest of them, and supported him to seize the throne of Rohaṇa. Once again family dissension arose within the royal house of Rohaṇa: Kittaggabodhi had four sons and three daughters, most probably by queen Devā. The eldest of them was murdered by his father's sister who seized the throne on the death of Kittaggabodhi. All the others were taken to king Sena I (833-853 A.D.), their maternal

1. Cv.,XLVIII,90.
2. Ibid.,XLVIII,98.
3. Ibid.,XLIX,71-72.
uncle, who brought them up. When Kassapa, the eldest,
was old enough to lead an expedition to expel the usurper
from their principality, Sena I supplied him with forces
and directed him to take possession of his province.
Further, when his sister's daughters reached marriageable
age (vavappattāsu rājakaṁṇāsu) he married Saṅghā, on
whom he had conferred the title of rājinī,¹ to his nephew,
the uparāja Sena, he offered the other two princesses
Tissā and Kittī, to Mahinda, the younger brother of
the uparāja.²

Once again, we come across a political marriage
between the rulers of the two regions. Mahinda, the son
of Kassapa V (914-923 A.D.), who became the ruler of
Rohana, had a claim to the territory from his father and
mother (lābhī Rohaṇadesassa mātito pitito pi ca).³ The
ambitious Mahinda wanted to expand his territory so that
it would include the Anurādhapura kingdom. King Kassapa
IV (898-914 A.D.), who was on the throne of Anurādhapura
at that time tried to oppose him, but in vain. Then the
king, more diplomatically, sent Mahinda's father, the
yuvarāja Kassapa, to persuade him to return to Rohaṇa.

This mission proved successful. Mahinda returned to

¹. She is referred to in inscriptions as debisev and
   bisev, see Ṛp. Zeyl.,III,p.95.
². Cv.,L,50-60.
³. Ibid.,L,100.
Rohana but found his subjects in rebellion. Consequently, he had to flee to the north. In the end, some bhikkhus led him to the king. It seems that this long-lasting political conflict ended in the marriage of Mahinda with one of the daughters of the king. After the marriage the king sent him back to Rohana.

Although it is uncertain why the king ultimately contacted Mahinda in this particular manner, it may be suggested that he wanted to maintain peaceful co-existence with Rohana, rather than subjugate it. This may well be due to the influence of the bhikkhus who brought Mahinda to the king.

The following table shows the matrimonial relations between the rulers of Anurādhapura and those of Rohana of the line of Dāthāsiva:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anurādhapura line</th>
<th>Rohana line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Udaya I</td>
<td>Dāthāsiva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mahinda*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dappula II</td>
<td>Devā = Kittaggabodhi*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kassapa</td>
<td>Devā = Kittaggabodhi*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sena II</td>
<td>Sanghā Tissa Kitti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kassapa IV</td>
<td>Sanghā (by Tissa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahinda</td>
<td>Sanghā (by Tissa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kassapa V</td>
<td>Sanghā (by Tissa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>princess = Mahinda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Kings of Rohana.
When Anurādhapura rulers wanted to bring Rohaṇa under their control it seems that they also took advantage of the issue of previous matrimonial alliances even if these had contracted a generation earlier. For instance, prince Kittaggabodhi, the son of the ādipāda Mahinda, the elder brother of the king Udaya of Anurādhapura (887-898 A.D.), rebelled against the king. His main attack came from Rohaṇa, because he had been able to bring the people of Rohaṇa under his control after his maternal uncle's assassination.¹ King Udaya did not fight directly against him. Instead, he looked for an officer who could assert a claim to the Rohaṇa principality to lead the expedition against the rebel. His choice fell on Mahinda, the son of yuvarāja Kassapa (i.e. Kassapa V). This Mahinda had some right to the territory because both his grandmothers were daughters of the earlier Kittaggabodhi² of Rohaṇa. Mahinda was welcomed by the people of Rohaṇa and succeeded in re-establishing the earlier relationship.³

---

1. The name of the ruler still remains unknown, although Geiger presumes it was Kassapa, the second son of Kittaggabodhi, see, Cv. Transl., p. 50, note, 2.
2. See the table on page 133.
In the light of the foregoing examples it becomes clear that marriage was the main mean by which the two royal houses were brought into closer relationship, as they, thus, became more directly involved in each other's family disputes.

It is worth noting that matrimonial alliances were often considered important for political aims in many parts of the world. It may be interesting to examine a few examples of such alliances concluded between royal families in South India during our period. The marriage between Rudrašena II of the Vākāṭaka dynasty and Prabhāvatī Guptā, the daughter of Candragupta II of the Gupta dynasty, was a very effective marriage alliance. Another example is that of the marriage between Narendrasena of the Vākāṭaka dynasty and the daughter of Kakutsthavarman of the Kadamba dynasty.

During the struggle of three empires (the Cālukyas of Vāṭāpi, the Pallavas of Kāṇcī and the Pāṇḍyas of Madurai) in South India we find that a number of marriages were concluded to establish friendly relations between

1. K.A.N.Sastri, History of South India, p.104.
2. Ibid., p.104.
the ruling dynasties. For example, the struggle between 
Māravarman Rājasimha I (730-765 A.D.), the Pāṇḍya ruler, 
and the Cālukya Kīrtivarman (744/5-755 A.D.), was for 
a time interrupted owing to a marriage.¹ Dantidurga 
(c. 752-756 A.D.), of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas made use of the 
same alliance in order to establish his power over the 
Cālukya territories.² Dhruva (780-792 A.D.), another 
Rāṣṭrakūṭa king, succeeded in concluding a treaty with 
Viṣṇuvardhana (772-808 A.D.), the ruler of the Eastern 
Cālukyas, by taking a daughter of the Eastern Cālukya 
king as queen.³ The Cōla king Aditya (871-907 A.D.), 
established a friendly relationship with Sthānpuravi, the 
Cera king, by means of a marriage.⁴ In the relations 
between the Eastern Cālukyas and the Cōlas marriage 
played a vital part.⁵ 

Finally, matrimonial alliances were important 
factors in the foreign policy of the Sinhalese rulers. 
The Cūlavāṃsa mentions that Mahinda IV (956-972 A.D.), 
made a princess from Kaliṅga.⁶ The Rāmbāva inscription

---

2. Ibid., p.150.
3. Ibid., p.152.
4. Ibid., p.168.
5. Ibid., p.180; The Cōlas, pp.268-269.
contains information about this queen. In later times also we find examples of rulers who followed this principle. For instance, one of the means used by king Vijayabähu I (1055-1110 A.D.) to strengthen his position vis-à-vis the Cūlas was to establish matrimonial

1. Ep. Zeyl.,II,p.68: Paranavitana, according to his own decipherment of interlinear writings on the Abhaya-giri Slab Inscription, reconstructed quite a dramatic account of this marriage. It is worth a brief note:-

A Pāṇḍya king named Varaguṇa, the son of Śrīmāra, was enthroned by a Sinhalese king. The son of Varaguṇa named Śrīmāra arrived in Java from the Pāṇḍya country, and got married to Guṇavatī, the daughter of Guṇār-gava. Not much later, Guṇārṇava arrived in Ceylon after being defeated by the Cambodian ruler during the reign of Sena. Guṇārṇava requested the yuvarāja Mahendra to lead an expedition to Java in order of reinstate him in his kingdom. The yuvarāja proved successful and returned home after having married Sundarī, the daughter of Śrīmāra by Guṇavatī.

The personages mentioned above are identified by Paranavitana as follows:- The king with whose aid Varaguṇa secured the throne of Madurai was Sena II (853-887 A.D.). This is supported by the Cūlavamsa and the inscriptions. (See Cv.,LI,27ff; Ep. Zeyl.,II,pp.38ff; V,p.105). The yuvarāja Mahendra, according to Paranavitana, is the king to whom reference is made in the Cūlavamsa. He was married to a Kaliṅga princess. Sena, who was on the throne when Guṇārṇava arrived in Ceylon, was the fourth of that name.

Finally, Paranavitana draws the conclusion that Kaliṅga with which the mahesi of Mahinda IV was connected is not the well known region of that name, but Malaysia or part thereof. (See Ceylon and Malaysia, pp.30-36). Though the story seems interesting, the document itself is quite controversial. (Cf. L.Gunawardhana, UCR, XXV, 1967, pp.22ff).
alliances with the Kaliṅga kings and the Pāṇḍyās, who were equally hostile to the Cōlās.¹

In the light of the foregoing discussion of political marriages with took place between (a) members of the Anurādhapura royal family itself, including the Moriya and Lambakanna clans (b) the Anurādhapura and Rohaṇa royal families and (c) Ceylon and Kaliṅga it follows that the marriage institution played an important role in politics by its effects on the rights of succession to the throne, by ending disputes between the royal families, as well as by keeping the regional rulers under control. Further, it played at least some important part in foreign relations. Some marriages had far-reaching consequences.

To sum up, an attempt has been made to study the structure and function of marriage during our period. We have tried to compare our data as far as possible with those in both preceding and subsequent periods. In addition, some features of marriage in Ceylon were compared with the Indian subcontinent whenever this seemed desirable.

Firstly, we intended to set out the prevailing norms of the marriage institution, and subsequently tried to find out the extent to which historical persons adhered to these norms. Thus, we discussed different aspects of this institution such as marriageable age, the absence of child marriage, exogamic and endogamic rules, preferential matrilateral cross-cousin marriage, the qualifications of marriage partners, the influence of parental consent on the selection of marriage partners, monogamy and polygamy, the absence of polyandry and its existence in the Kandyan period, divorce and remarriage, the absence of the sati rite, the existence of patrilocal marriages and the absence of matrilocal marriages, the existence of the dowry system and the absence of evidence for the paying of a bride price and, finally, the influence of the marriage institution on politics.

It is evident that there was considerable divergence between the expected and the actual behaviour of the people, as far as marriage is concerned. Regarding the marriageable age of a girl fifteen or sixteen was considered ideal. Yet there is no evidence that this ideal was always followed in practice, just as to-day.
Most marriages were concluded with parental consent, but there were love matches and elopements as now. Neither divorce nor re-marriage was favoured but both occurred.

During the period under survey there is no evidence for marked changes. Most aspects of marriage remained unchanged during our period. But certainly there are developments, especially as far as its influence on politics is concerned.

However, some features of marriage which did not exit during our period emerged later. One of these is polyandry, which was widely practised during the Kandyan period. During our period some widows entered into Order as nuns. Yet there are no examples showing that this happened in any other period. Though in present Ceylon there are matrilocal marriages we find no evidence for their occurrence during our period. Similarly, there is no evidence to the existence of a bride price although the dowry system existed. These aspects play a vital role to-day especially in arranged marriages. No cases of levirate and sororate are recorded in any period of Ceylonese history.

Chapter Four

POSITION OF WOMEN

In order to determine the place of women in society, it is necessary to study the attitudes of men towards women and, particularly, the services rendered by women in their various roles as mothers, wives, sisters etc. with special reference to their involvements in political, social and religious affairs. Any serious attempt to study these aspects is beset with certain difficulties, which must be borne in mind from the beginning. On the one hand, the chronicles provide comparatively little information on those activities of women to which the student of social history should attach importance. On the other hand, even the information that we find is limited to women belonging to court circles or to the nobility. The role of ordinary women in society would certainly deserve great attention, but our sources are almost completely silent in this respect. In addition, there are a number of epigraphic records but these contain only limited data.
However, as to the prevailing attitudes towards women, the Sīgiri graffiti give us interesting materials. Firstly, their authors belong to our period. Secondly, as their literary activities demonstrate they all belonged to the educated élite of society. Further they supply important data, for most of them left with their writings such details as their personal names, together with surnames, occupation, residence and titles indicating official and social ranks like mapuruma, mahalē, himi and bata.¹ On the other hand some of the graffiti writers were bhikkhus, others were ladies.² Thus, the Sīgiri graffiti give us some idea of different strata of society. Thirdly, these writers had no intention to lay down rules, nor were they philosophers like the Buddha, who reflecting upon the dangers for men if they were seduced by women. The Sīgiri poets simply put their feelings, aroused by the beautiful paintings and the impressive surroundings of Sīgiri, into one single couplet or quatrain.

It is true that most of these writings are lyrical in character, and some are inspired by traditional ideas

---

¹ Sīg. Graff., vv. 143, 621, 543 and 357 respectively, see also Introd., pp. CCX-CCXIV.
² See for the bhikkhu writers, Sīg. Graff., vv. 88, 136, 224 and 461, and for poetesses 286, 504 and 681.
rather than by the practice of the time; also there are some writings composed apparently by misogynists, but on the whole their historical importance cannot be underestimated.

Despite these limitations, a careful examination of the details of the literary and epigraphic sources may enable us to get some idea of the position of women in our period, even though the result may not prove entirely satisfactory.

A.S. Altekar, dealing with the general attitude of people towards women in India, points out: 'In the same century and in the same province we sometimes come across diametrically opposite views about the worth, nature and importance of women. One school declaring that the highest gift of God to man, while the other is seen asserting that the best way to reach God is to avoid woman'.¹ As far as the attitudes towards women are concerned this view applies also to Ceylon.

If one considers the passages dealing with attitudes towards women it becomes clear that there was no uniformity. A bhikkhu named Kasub expressed as

his view, in a verse written on the Sīgiri gallery wall, that the artist was quite skilled to express the feelings of women through the medium of paintings.¹ But this idea does not agree with what most of other graffiti writers feel. According to them the feminine mind is enigmatic mainly because women behave contrary to their appearance. Thus, Bohodevi (in Pali: Bodhideva ?), the private secretary (payamulleydaru) of prince Mihidel, addressing one of the painted women, stated that the latter entices people but does not speak.² Other writers complained that the ladies behave as though they are pleased but do not really accept the supplicant.³ 'You, Dalami of Atalagama writes, 'have the appearance of smiling, but your heart is hard'.⁴ To Sivat of the house of Sivatna Māḍabi, the ladies are pitiless but they show a gentle smile.⁵

A poetess, named Batī,⁶ in collaboration with the other writers mentioned above, made a verse about members of her own sex, stating that the ladies are

---

¹ Sīg. Graff., v.541.  
² Ibid., v.119.  
³ Ibid., v.225.  
⁴ Ibid., v.415.  
⁵ Ibid., v.225.  
⁶ Batī herself introduces that she is a woman.
attractive but without a loving heart.\(^1\) Another tells us that women conceal their affections by an appearance of being hard.\(^2\) It is worth noting, however, that not only women conceal their feelings as this is the common feature of all human beings as the Buddha said.\(^3\)

On the other hand, there are some Sīgiri visitors who regarded the women as goddesses. Thus, an anonymous writer declared, '... I know that you are celestial beings' (danim topa sura bava).\(^4\) Some of them even regarded Sīgiri as heaven because it was the only place where there were such very beautiful ladies.\(^5\)

This exaggerated emphasis on the celestial nature of women is, however, not limited to Ceylonese writers. Varāhamihira, for instance, described women as goddesses of fortune (Lakṣmi).\(^6\) Manu unequivocally assigns to women the status of presiding deities in the home.\(^7\) At the same time, the opposite idea was also very common, Kit Sang Boy, a Sīgiri writer, states that damsels retarded (the progress of) him who is going to heaven.

---

1. Sig. Graff., v.87; cf. v.122.
2. Ibid., v.603.
3. Dhammapada, II, p.56.
4. Sig. Graff., v.50.
5. Ibid., v.456.
6. Brhat Saghita, Strīprasaṃsādhya, chap.74, vv. 4-6 & 15.
Similarly, Bhartṛhari condemned women as obstacles in the way of those anxious to reach the door of heaven. Guruḷugōmi in the Polonnaru period cited many passages in support of this idea.

We come across some versifiers among the Sigiri writers, who condemned all womankind. Thus, Menen wrote as follows: 'To have one's mind ensnared, being attached to her, by a damsel who is winsome on account of her radiant smile and who is pleasing is (like unto) taking the jewelled hook of an elephant-driver and placing it on one's own head'. The writer of verse 582 describes a boy, who fell in love with a girl, as a bee imprisoned in a lotus flower. This view is very popular among the Sigiri writers. Some of them confessed that the girls enslaved them with the fluttering of their eyelids, their gentle smile and talk.

Not only Sigiri poets but also various other men treated women in this manner. The Buddha explained...

1. Sig. Graff., v.44.
2. Sṛṅgāraśataka, v.45.
3. Dharmapradīpikā, pp.141-159.
5. Ibid., vv.25-27,44,449,487,495,638.
in the Anguttara Nikāya: 'More than anything else, the form (rūpa), sound (sabda), scent (gandha), savour (rasa) and touch (poṭṭhabba) of the women enslave the man.'

1. Women', Somadeva Śuri claims, 'when heard of, deprive one of the faculty of hearing; looked at, they deprive one of the power of seeing; remembered, they captivate the mind; and embraced, they disable the mind; when in love, they take away one's life; when separated they take away one's joy'.  

2. A similar idea occurs in a different form in one of the Śiṅgiri graffiti: 'The king is said to have been ruined on account of these women, and the same fate will overtake those who go after them now'.

There are some of the Śiṅgiri writers, who hated the permanent association of man with woman. One wrote that woman is like taking the fire on to one's head after having warmed oneself at it.  

4. Another explicitly expressed his idea thus: 'As one is captivated at once internally as well as externally, the supporting of women by men is like leaping from a peak'.

---

2. Yaśastilaka Campu, I, 73.  
3. Sig. Graff., v. 494.  
4. Ibid., v. 672.  
5. Ibid., v. 23.
writer of verse 456 degraded women as discarded scum (sāp-muṅdu) and advised his friend not to make friendship with them. Some of the writers beat all others by referring to women by the abusive epithets of the 'faithless one' (asad)¹ and 'shameless one' (vili nāttan).² There is no doubt that some of these expressions represent the views of misogynists rather than the general attitudes of the time.

Some of the verses composed by poetesses throw light on an interesting feature of their own character. Thus, the song of Sevu, the wife of Nidalu Māfidi, indicates that women are jealous of each other.³ The wife of Mahamata, named Devā explicitly stated that she could not put up with well dressed beautiful ladies; they aroused her anger, because they looked like her rivals.⁴ We learn from another verse that a wife kept a watchful eye on attractive ladies, because they might succeed in captivating her husband's mind.⁵

In the light of such findings as those from the Sigiri graffiti and other sources it would appear

1. Sig. Graff., vv.158,172,323.
2. Ibid., v.664.
3. Ibid., v.41.
4. Ibid., v.152.
5. Ibid., v.618.
that it is quite difficult to arrive at a general conclusion about the attitude of the Sinhalese males towards women during the period under survey, just as in any other period in Ceylon or in the Indian subcontinent. There are, however, strong arguments to contest the view of M.B.Ariyapala, that most of the writers treated the women with contempt. Firstly, most of the unfavourable comments on women are inspired by the desire of the bhikkhus and other religious groups to divert man's mind from all worldly attachments. A clear example is that of a Sigiri verse composed by a young bhikkhu, named Riyansen: in keeping with his vocation, he beseeches the ladies not to speak, for he is already suffering from indifference to religious discipline; and, if he heard them speak the result would be disastrous.

Secondly, as has been noted, there were writers, who treated women both with sympathy and contempt. This

3. Sig. Graff., v.128.
is one of the characteristics of all complex societies. On the whole such differences of view are quite common in any society, especially about subjects like human nature.

On the other hand, Ariyapala's views are based on insufficient evidence, as this scholar has not utilised the Sīgiri graffiti at all in his study. On the contrary, in support of his argument he has quoted only from Sinhalese Buddhist literature which was written by bhikkhus mainly on the basis of stories which reflected one-sided ideas about women. In this connexion, it may further be added that no scholar so far has made an attempt to consider the Sīgiri graffiti from a sociological point of view.

As has been indicated at the beginning, it is now appropriate to examine the services rendered by women in the different walks of life. First of all, it would be interesting to find out what the attitude of parents was towards their daughters. There is no evidence to show that the birth of a girl was not longed for in the period under survey, and in this respect there is no clear difference, with the early period. In addition,

there is nothing to suggest that the emotional attachment of parents to their daughters was less strong than that to their sons.

Parents not only brought up their daughters well but they also extended their love and affection towards them in various ways. For instance, we find that some royal persons, after having erected religious buildings named them after their daughters. Thus, king Kassapa I (477-495 A.D.), restored the famous vīhāra called Issarasamañārāma, which had been built by king Devānaṁ-piyatissa (c. 250 B.C.),¹ and named it after his two daughters Bodhi and Uppalavānṇā and his own name.² It thus came to be known as Kassapagiri-Bodhi-Uppalavānṇa Vīhāra according to literary and archaeological evidence.³

Likewise, Aggabodhi I (575-608 A.D.) having constructed a pāsāda in the Hatthikucchi Vīhāra,⁴ named

---

2. Cv., XXXIX, 10-11.
3. This vīhāra is referred to in the inscriptions as Isurumenu-Ṇū-Upulvan-Kasubgiri, Ep. Zeyl., I, p.38; IV p.128. This is the so-called Vessagiri Vīhāra in Anurādhapura. For its identification with the ancient Issarasamañārāma, see CJSJ, II, 1928-33, p.182; IV, p.128; Mv. Tikā, I, p.407.
4. As has been pointed out by E. W. Adikaram this was a well known monastery in old days, Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon, 1949, pp.103, 122; see for further references to the vīhāra, Cv., XLVIII, 65; XLIX, 33, 76; Ep. Zeyl., I, p.56; JCBRAS (NS.), VI, 1963, p.93.
it after his daughter. The significance of these two
instances would have become clear if the chronicles
had recorded the attitude of these two monarchs towards
their sons as well. But unfortunately for us, the evidence
at our disposal does not even establish whether these
two kings had any sons at all.

Parents generally kept a watchful eye on their
daughters even after they were given in marriage.
According to the Visuddhimagga, there were a mother and
father at Vattakāla in the vicinity of the Girikaṇḍa
Mahāvihāra, who looked after their pregnant daughter.2

In this connexion, though, it would have been
interesting to know whether an uxorilocal (binna) marriage
had been contracted for their daughter, but we are told
nothing about this in the story. It seems, however,
more likely that the daughter had remained in her parents' house in a joint family, which was the main social unit

1. Cy.,XLII,21. Her name was most probably Dāṭhā referred
to in verse XLII,10.
Nicholas proposes that the said Girikaṇḍa Mahāvihāra
is the place which is referred to in the Tiriyaṇya
Sanskrit inscription of the seventh century A.D. and is
situated about thirty miles north of Trincomalee,
JCBRAS (NS.),VI,1963,pp.45-46. The reference could also
apply to a vihāra of the same name at Ambalantuṭa in
M.Wimalakitti, Simhala Āṇḍuva,p.8.
in Ceylon during the period under review.  

Some examples in the Cūlavamsa suggest that royal persons also looked after their daughters even after they were given in marriage. For example, king Aggabodhi VI (733-772 A.D.) made his daughter enter into the bhikkhu order when she had left her husband. It is explained in another passage that king Dhātusena (459-477 A.D.) put his own sister to death for the sake of his very beloved (pañisasamā) daughter, who had been given in marriage to his sister's son.

This may also suggest that men behaved more affectionately towards their daughters than towards their sisters. In support of this idea one may point to the above mentioned two passages which have been cited with reference to the attitude of Kassapa and Aggabodhi towards their daughters: They seem to have been preferred to name their foundations after their daughters' names, although they also had sisters.

As has already been seen marriage during the period under consideration was normally monogamous. In

1. Supra, pp. 30-32.
2. Cv., XLVIII, 57.
3. Ibid., XXXVIII, 81-83.
4. Ibid., XXXIX, 55; XLI, 6, 42, 6, 38 respectively.
such a type of marriage it is generally accepted that both husband and wife take more or less equal responsibilities in their family duties, though the former is considered the head of the family. While it was the husband's duty to provide livelihood according to his means, the wife had to be a good and diligent housewife. Yet this by no means suggests that the wife's life was limited only to domestic duties.

In spite of the lack of evidence as to the extent to which mothers would have exercised their authority in important events in their children's life like marriages, it is likely that they had enough opportunities to take part, in common with their husbands, in many decisions regarding their children.

According to the *Visuddhimagga*, there were parents who had their child admitted to the Sāsana. Since the boy had been sent to another vihāra, different from that to which he had been handed over by his parents in order to improve his knowledge of the Dhamma, his mother was unable to see him for some time; she became worried, went frequently to the vihāra to which the child had been handed over by them, and pleaded with
the mahāthera, who was responsible for their child, to bring him back so that she might see him. Consequently, the mahāthera went himself to bring him back.¹ This passage suggests that mothers not only brought up their babies but also they took care of them even after they had grown up. This idea is supported by another example from the same source: there were three people, who had been sentenced to death for committing a criminal offence. The day on which the punishment was carried out, neither their father nor any other male relative went to the place of execution, but their mother did.²

These examples show another aspect of the position of women: both these examples make it clear that there was no objection against women going about their business freely without being accompanied by any male member of their family. This is corroborated by some more examples: the daughter of king Aggabodhi VI (733-772 A.D.), Saṅghā by name, returned alone to her father after leaving her husband.³ Another wife walked unaccompanied from Anurādhapura to Mihintale, a distance of more than eight miles.⁴ A pregnant wife attended a public function held

1. Visuddhim., p. 91.
2. Ibid., p. 556.
3. Cv., XLVIII, 56.
at Girikanda Vihāra in the late evening.\(^1\) There were
a number of women who visited Sigiri with or without
their husbands and contributed poems in common with
others.\(^2\)

Thus, the women enjoyed a certain amount of
freedom as mothers and wives. Further, we come across
some references suggesting that wives sometimes used
their influence on their husbands by inducing them
to live righteously as far as the distribution of their
wealth was concerned.

The mahesī of king Mahānāma (410–432 A.D.), for
instance, persuaded the latter to offer a vihāra, which
had been built by him, to the Theravāda school (i.e.
the Mahāvihāra), because he had already offered three
viharas to the Abhayuttara Vihāra.\(^3\) This is probably
because the mahesī was aware that it was important to
win the goodwill of the bhikkhus of both fraternities,
although Rahula has suggested that she was a devotee
of the Mahāvihāra.\(^4\) The real reason was that Mahānāma
had become king in an improper manner.\(^5\)

---

3. *Cv.*, XXXVII, 213: *mahesīyā nayenādā bhikkhuṇām theravādinām*.
5. *Cv.*, XXXVII, 209–211.
However, the donation to the Mahāvihāra was undoubtedly a factor that not only the goodwill of the bhikkhus but also the mahāsī's confidence. In this connexion, it would be interesting to note that the winning of one's wife's heart was sometimes considered of utmost importance are by the ancient Indians as a means to achieve perfect conjugal harmony and understanding.¹

Besides, we find some wives who expressed the view that they had certain rights over their husbands even to the extent of controlling them. For example, a Sīgiri poetess wrote that her husband seemed amused when watching the beautiful ladies at Sīgiri, but she did not mind it, as she was conscious of her own power to control him whenever she felt that he had gone too far.² Further, we saw that women had in certain cases the right to choose their life partners and to get a separation. In addition, they were, by no means, expected to become satīs. On the contrary, they were permitted to conclude a second marriage or to become bhikkhunīs as they desired.³

3. Supra, pp. 118-122.
Women rendered valuable services to religion. Firstly, they contributed to the Sāsana as lay devotees. Secondly, they fully entered the Sāsana by becoming bhikkhunīs. As a lay person, a woman could serve the Sāsana in a number of ways such as by providing the Saṅgha with food, clothing etc., offering contributions towards the maintenance of the vihāras and constructing new pāsādas. It may be interesting to examine a few examples.

As far as the contribution made by women towards the maintenance of the bhikkhus is concerned, it appears that women acted mainly during the rainy (vassāna) season. We learn from a story in the Visuddhimagga of an ordinary woman who maintained a bhikkhu during the whole season.

A husband and wife built a shelter in order to house a bhikkhu during the rainy season. On the day of observing the vassa precept (sikkhāpada), a bhikkhu came to the newly built house and observed the sikkhāpada

1. The vassa (Sinhalese, vas) season, roughly from July to October, when the bhikkhus observed the vassa sikkhāpada retreat remaining in one place, was a period during which the whole country became religiously conscious. Particular arrangements were made for the maintenance of the bhikkhus during this period. Dv.,XXI,25; Ep. Zey1., I,pp.58-62. For the details of the vassa sikkhāpada, see Mahāvagga,pp.163ff.
in it. The husband learnt about that and informed his wife that their vihāra had been occupied by a bhikkhu, who should be looked after. She, being very pleased, supplied refreshments and every other requirement of the bhikkhu during the whole season. In addition, at the end of the period of the vassāna, when she was informed by the bhikkhu that the time of his departure had come she said, 'Venerable Sir, it would be a great pleasure for us if you could kindly stay with us till to-morrow as well'. As he accepted her invitation she was able to entertain him for one more day. At the end, as usual, she presented him with cloth and some other necessities.¹

Though this kind of story is found in some other sources as well,² there is no doubt that they contain sufficient data for historical use: at least they represent the ideal, if not the actual patterns of behaviour, of the people. If one wants to use such a passage in an historical study, first of all one has to examine the reason why the author included it in his work. It seems clear that the purpose of Buddhaghosa

---

2. See E.W. Adikaram, Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon, pp.52, 73, 98, 102.
including this story in the *Visuddhimagga* was to show that association with people did not necessarily constitute an impediment (*paññibodha*) to meditation. Buddhaghosa by no means intended to analyse the woman's attitude towards the bhikkhu by this example. For us, however, it may illustrate the woman's independent attitude towards the bhikkhus.

There are numerous references showing that there were women who served the *Saśana* by constructing *pāsādas*, granting villages and so on. Thus, Jetāhā, the *mahāsi* of king Aggabodhi IV (667-683 A.D.), built an *ārāma*, named after her, for the bhikkhunīs and endowed it with two villages as well as a hundred monastery assistants (*ārāmikas*).\(^1\) The *mahāsi* of king Udaya I (797-801 A.D.), built several *vihāras* on the Cetiya Pabbata (Mihintalē) and in some other places, which she granted to both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs.\(^2\) Likewise, villages which belonged to the *vihāra* she redeemed by paying money to

---

2. *Ibid.*, XLIX, 23-25: the authors of some religious works as well as works themselves mentioned in the *Cūlavamsa* with reference to this reign remain uncertain, but there is no space to discuss them here. See *Cv. Transl.*, Geiger, p. 129, notes 4-6, p. 130, notes, 1-6. However, verses 23-26 make the author and contents fairly obvious.
the vihāra and re-granted them to the same vihāra.\(^1\)

Sāṅghā, the queen (devi) of Sena I (833–853 A.D.), built an āvāsa,\(^2\) for the nuns, named Mahindasena in the Uttara Vihāra.\(^3\) Another Sāṅghā, the mahesi of king Udaya II (887–898 A.D.), built the Saṅghasena Pabbata\(^4\) in the Abhayuttara Vihāra (and endowed it) with all the necessary revenue. Also she placed a blue jewel diadem (nīlacūjāmapi) on the stone image of the Buddha and instituted a festival for the Buddha.\(^5\) A consort of king Kassapa V (914–923 A.D.), called Rājinī, honoured the Hemamālikā Cetiya (present Ruvanvāli Mahāsāya) by the dedication of a covering cloth (paṭṭakañcuka).\(^6\) One of the ladies of the harem of king Udaya IV (946–954 A.D.), named Vidurā, honoured the stone image made by the king with a network

---

1. Cy.,XLIX,26: Gāmā ye! sum purā kītā vihārā tattha sā dhanam—
   datvā te mocayitvānā vihārasa deva dāpayi

2. According to Buddhaghosa, āvāsa means either a single room or a parivena (cell or whole monastery.). Visuddhim., p.90 for further details see W.Rahula, History of Buddhism in Ceylon, p.132,notes,4-5.


4. The Cūlavamsa does not mention definitely what kind of building it was.


6. Ibid.,LII,67.
of rays (pädajäla),\(^1\) which glittered with jewels.\(^2\)

Not only mahesīs and other queens but also some other women made similar endowments. Thus, Vajirā, the wife of the Sakkasenāpati\(^3\) handed over to the theriya bhikkhus (i.e. Mahāvihāra Bhikkhus) a parivena\(^4\) bearing her name, which had been built by her, together with a village.\(^5\) Further, she built a home (upassaya) for the nuns of the theravāma. Similarly, the mother of the senāpati, Devā by name built an āvāsa named after her and presented it to the Aranāmaka Bhikkhus.\(^6\) The Tiṃbirivāva inscription of the reign of Sirimeghavāṇa Abhaya (303–331 A.D.), or Gōṭhābhaya (253–266 A.D.), states that a lady named Anulabi, the daughter of Mitaya, presented a monastery with the income from materamajī baka share of the tank which was the property of her family (kulasatāka, in Pali: kulasantāka).\(^7\)

---

2. Cv.,LIII,50.
6. Ibid., 52.64. For a discussion of the Aranāmaka Bhikkhus see R.A.L.H.Gunawardhana, op. cit., pp.53ff.
7. Supra, p.32, note 2.
Thus, it becomes clear from the cited examples that women belonging to different social strata (though normally to the highest strata) rendered an invaluable service to the Sāsana in various ways, such as by providing bhikkhus and bhikkhuṇīs of the three fraternities (nikāyas) with requisites, endowing dāgābas (stūpas) and images (paṭimās) with villages and other property so that they would be kept in good condition.¹

Besides, we hear of a woman, who took drastic action for the sake of the Sāsana: according to the Cūlavaṃsa and the Nikāya Saṅgrahaya, one of king Mahāsenā's favourite queens, the daughter of a scribe² killed the monk Saṅghamitta, who had come to destroy the Thūpārāma.³ Though killing is prohibited under any circumstances the above mentioned queen did not hesitate to kill even a bhikkhu. It is true that her intention was to protect the Mahāvihāra fraternity, but the way in which she acted cannot be justified.

1. The reason why women could afford to undertake these tasks will be discussed in connexion with the property rights of women.
2. Pali lekhakadhītā, in Sinhalese: lāmāpi duvak. But the Nikāya Saṅgrahaya, p.13, mentions that she was the mahēṣī and the daughter of a Lambakanna. For further details see UCEC, (vol.I,pt.)I, p.175; Soc. Hist. Early Ceyl., p.35.
The point which interests us here, however, is that this example shows the enthusiasm of women for the religious life of the country. Further, we know that a woman named Hemamālā, brought with her husband the Tooth Relic to the Island, just as Saṅghamitta and her train had brought the Bō Tree. Although Hemamālā's role receives little emphasis in the Chronicle there can be no doubt that it was an honourable one and may reflect the important part that some women could play in the religious life of the country.

In the next section it may be interesting to discuss the extent to which women were able to serve the Śāsana as bhikkhuṇīs. At the very outset it is necessary to give a brief outline history of the bhikkhuṇīs during the period under consideration. Unlike what we see in the preceding period, neither men nor women would appear to have entered the order in large numbers at a time. But there are references to individuals who became monks and nuns. Thus, a king of Kaliṅga, on account of some political trouble, arrived in Ceylon and became a monk during the time of king Aggabodhi II (608–618)

A.D.); 1 his queen and his minister followed him to Ceylon.
In the end they, too, entered order. 2 On the death of
king Jeṭṭhatissa III (632 A.D.), his mahesī became a
nun. 3 King Aggabodhi VI (733-772 A.D.) got his daughter
entered the order as she had been divorced from her hus­
band. 4

The bhikkhunīs appear to have occupied an
important place in society. The Sikkvalaṇḍa Vinisa of
the tenth century contains rules concerning bhikkhunīs
in common with those applying to bhikkhus. It also
explains certain reciprocal attitudes of both the bhikkhus
and bhikkhunīs. 5 In addition, king Kassapa V (914-932
A.D.), in his Anurādhapura Slab Inscription, laid down
rules for the administration of a nunnery. 6

Furthermore, we find a number of references
to nunneries both in the chronicles and in inscriptions,
as people made endowments to them. Thus, king Mahāṣena
(276-303 A.D.) built two shelters (bhikkhunīpāsāya)
called Uttara and Abhaya which he donated to the

1. H.W.Codrington suggests that it took place in 609 A.D.
when Pulakeśin II invaded Kaliṅga. See A Short History
of Ceylon, 1939, pp. 35, 51; L.S.Perera agrees with
2. Cv.,XLII,46-47.
3. Ibid.,XLIV,114.
4. Ibid.,XLVIII,57.
5. Sithav. V.,pp.29,35,37,49,50,56,60,61,70,89.
bhikkhus. 1 Moggallāna I (495-512 A.D.), having built an abode called Rājinī, handed it over to the Sāgaliya nuns. 2 The mahesi of king Aggabodhi II (608-618 A.D.) built a dwelling called Ratana, and presented it to the Kaliṅga bhikkhus, the former mahesi of the Kaliṅga king. 3 King Mahinda I (730-733 A.D.) built a convent named after himself and endowed it with the (village) Nagaragalla. 4 King Mahinda II (777-797 A.D.) made a Bodhisattva statue and placed it in the home for bhikkhus. 5 The mahesi of king Udaya I (797-801 A.D.) made several contributions towards the maintenance of the nuns. 6

According to the Mahakalattāva inscription, presumably datable to the reign of Kassapa IV (898-914 A.D.), Sena, the chief scribe, built the Nālārāma named after his mother, and granted it together with the village Gitalagama to the nuns. 7 The senāpati of Kassapa IV (898-914 A.D.), named Sena Ilāṅga, built a nunnery named Tissārāma. 8 This record of the Cūlavamsa is

1. Cv., XXXVII, 43.
2. Ibid., XXXIX, 49.
3. Ibid., XLII, 47.
4. Ibid., XLVIII, 36.
5. Ibid., XLVIII, 139.
6. Ibid., XLIX, 23ff.
corroborated by epigraphic evidence.¹ In the reign of Kassapa V (914-923 A.D.), Vajirā, the wife of the Sakkasenāpati, built a home for bhikkhuṇīs.² For the last time we hear of the nuns in the reign of Mahinda IV (956-972 A.D.), who, according to the Gūlavaṃsa, built the Mahāmallaka nunnery;³ also, according to an inscription, he constructed a residence, kitchens and a medical hall for nuns, and repaired the nunneries.⁴

In the light of the above findings from the chronicles and inscriptions it is clear that there were a reasonable number of nunneries in our period. And also there were a fairly large number of bhikkhuṇīs. In one particular case a single nunnery in Anurādhapura seems to have been occupied by a considerable number of them, for we hear of the mahesi of king Aggabodhi IV (667-683 A.D.), who endowed the Jetthārāma, which had been built by her, with two villages and had a hundred āramikas⁵ attached to it. Although the round figure in the chronicle does not inspire confidence, it must have been a large upassaya.

² See supra,p.16a.
³ Cv.,LIV,47.
⁵ Cv.,XLVI,28.
The bhikkhunīs engaged in some particular activities, in addition to their ordinary religious duties. Thus, according to the Mahakalattāva inscription, the bhikkhunīs of Nālārāma were entrusted with the task of watering and maintaining the Bō-Tree at the Mahāvihāra. We hear of nuns at the Tissārāma, who had the similar task of attending to the Bō-Tree at the Maricavāṭṭī monastery. Apparently nuns showed much interest in attending to the Bō-Tree mainly because it was a bhikkhunī i.e. Saṅghamittā who brought the Bō-Tree to the Island. And of course, duties involving care of plants and trees are often associated with women, as in India.

Besides, it is recorded that Sinhalese nuns were engaged in missionary activities in China. According to the Pi-chiu-ni-chuang ('Biography of the Bhikkhunīs') compiled by Pao Chang in 526 A.D. And Biographies of Guṇavarman and Saṅghavarman, the Sinhalese nuns gave the second upasampādā ('the Higher Ordination') to the Chinese nuns. The first known Chinese bhikkhunī was

Ching-chien who received the dasa-sīla ('Ten Precepts') from an Upādhyāyana, and in the year of 357 A.D. she received the upasampadā from a foreign monk based on a small Vinaya text which a monk had obtained in Central Asia. According to a Chinese record in 426 A.D., eight Sinhalese (Shih-tzū-kuo) nuns (pi-chiu-nī) arrived at Nanking, the capital of early Sung dynasty (420-477 A.D.), on board a foreign merchant ship owned by certain Nandi. By this time there were many Chinese bhikkhunīs in the Chian-nan area (i.e. south of the Yangtze River).

The Sinhalese missionary nuns appear to have discovered that the upasampadā of the Chinese nuns received only from bhikkhus was not valid because it had been established that a nun should receive her ordination first in a bhikkhu saṅgha in the presence

2. Ibid., p. 939; see also Seng-che-lío, Kao-seng-tchouang and Fo-tsou-t'ong-ki, quoted by M. Paul Pelliot in Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient, IV, 1904, p. 356; W. Pachow surmises that Nandi might be a Ceylonese; (see UCR, XII, 1954, p. 184). We read in the Sahassavatthuppakarana that there was a Sinhalese Buddhist merchant named Nandi who, lived at Mahātīththa, and had been away from home for about three years, having gone by his own ship in a trading venture. (pp. 145-146; cf. Rsv., II, p. 139). There is, however, no positive evidence to identify this Nandi with the one who took the bhikkhuṇīs to China.
of at least ten bhikkhuniṣ before proceeding to a bhikkhu saṅgha to undergo the ceremony of catutthakamma-upasampadā for the second time. Hence, the whole procedure of ordination of a nun is called atthavacaka-upasampadā. It is also recorded that at first a nun was ordained at a bhikkhu saṅgha, but after the organization of bhikkhunī saṅgha, the ordination took place in the presence of more than ten nuns.

These missionaries were, no doubt, aware of the manner in which Mahinda made the first nun in Ceylon enter into the bhikkhunī order and gave the upasampadā: the Samantapāśādikā explains that when queen Anulā and her companions showed interest in becoming bhikkhuṇīs bhikkha Mahinda explained that, according to the Vinaya, a woman should be ordained only a bhikkhuṇī. Therefore, king Devānapiyatissa despatched to the court of king Aśoka an embassy to bring the bhikkhunī Saṅghamittā to Ceylon. Anulā and her group awaited Saṅghamittā's arrival observing only dasa-sīla ('Ten Precepts') in a nunnery known as the Upāsikā Vihāra which had been built for

2. Vinaya Pitaka, II, p. 255; Taisho Tripitaka, 22, pp. 185, 471.
them on one side of the city.\textsuperscript{1} Saṅghamittā arrived in the Island with her train and made a group of Sinhalese women headed by Anūlä enter the order of bhikkhuṇīs.\textsuperscript{2}

There can be no doubt that the nuns who went to China explained these injunctions to the Chinese nuns. As a result, two Chinese nuns told an Indian monk, Guṇavarman, who went to China in 427 A.D. via Ceylon and Chō-po (Java), that the Chinese nuns who had met the Sinhalese nuns had some doubt about the authenticity of the ordination they had received from monks. They also asked him if they could receive the ordination again in the presence of qualified nuns. Guṇavarman replied that they could and that it would increase merit of precept and added that there ought to be more than ten nuns. So it was decided that more nuns should be invited from Ceylon.\textsuperscript{3} Consequently, three more nuns headed by Tie-so-ra (Tissarā?)\textsuperscript{4} arrived at Nanking.\textsuperscript{5} Thus, in the year of 434 A.D. more than 300 nuns received for the second time their upasampadā (Chū-(tsu)-chich) in the presence of over ten Sinhalese nuns headed by

\begin{enumerate}
\item C\textsuperscript{v}., XVIII, 9-11.
\item \textit{Ibid.}, XIX, 65.
\item \textit{Taisho Tripitaka}, 50, 1927, p. 341.
\item Cf. The Tissārāma nunnery in Anurādhapura which was constructed in the tenth century A.D. (See \textit{supra}), 169. Was this a building constructed in memory of Tissa?
\item \textit{Taisho Tripitaka}, 50, 1927, pp. 939, 944.
\end{enumerate}
Tie-so-ra at the Nanlin Temple. ¹ As Guṇavarman had already died, his disciple Saṅghavarman took the lead of this upasampadā ceremony. ²

The first group of Sinhalese nuns arrived in Nanking in 425 A.D. They must, therefore, have left Ceylon, at least, a year before 425. Fā-hiien arrived in the Island in 412 A.D. and he left the Island after two years. ³ Then the first expedition of nuns took place about ten years after Fa-hiien's departure from Ceylon. Thus, both these events happened in the reign of king Mahānāma (410-431 A.D.).

As has already been mentioned, nuns went to China during the reign of Mahānāma, in which also Fā-hiien's visit to the Island took place. It is also recorded that Mahānāma (Mp-ho-non) sent a letter to

---

1. This event has been described as 'their (i.e. Sinhalese bhikkhunīs) presence inspires Chinese women, for the first time, to seek to enter "Holy Orders"; ... With the help of a chapter of ten Sinhalese nuns headed by a President (the nun T'ie-so-lo), an "Ordination of Women" takes place for the first time in China', (JCBRAS, XXIV, 1916, pp. 107, 108 see also, UCHC, (vol. I, pt.) I, p. 21 and R.A.L.H. Gunawardhana, op. cit., p. 58. which may give a wrong impression.


Chinese emperor together with a 'model of the shrine of the Tooth' in 428 A.D. But no connexion of the king with the expeditions of bhikkhuśis to China is recorded in any sources. It seems, however, unlikely that this important mission took place without the knowledge of the king who not only undertook many religious works in the Island but also spent his early days as a bhikkhu. Above all, he had religious intercourse with the same country as mentioned above.

As Fa-hsien showed a great interest in Vinaya, he collected Vinaya texts from India and from Ceylon. W. Pachow maintains that 'As he (i.e. Fa-hsien) took residence in Nanking and devoted himself to the translation of Sanskrit manuscripts into Chinese, especially Vinaya literature, we think he had a large share in bringing about this mission of Sinhalese nuns'. This may be quite possible, though it is not supported by direct evidence.

It is certain that the above-mentioned embassy of Mahānāma to China in 428 A.D., with a 'model of the

1. 'History of Sung', Journal Asiatique, XV, 1900, pp.412ff.
2. A Record of the Buddhist Countries, pp.76, 87.
The relations between the Abhayagiri Vihāra and China may follow from a passage in the Fa-hsien's Record, in which we read that a Chinese merchant made an offering...
to the Abhayagiri Vihāra. This may suggest that merchants who came from China visited the Abhayagiri Vihāra. It is also to be noted that the Sinhalese nuns left the Island on a merchant's ship as has already been seen. Fa-hien, too, perhaps more closely associated with this vihāra. He mentions that he collected several Sanskrit Buddhist texts from Ceylon. These were most probably from the Abhayagiri Vihāra because this was the main vihāra in the Island in which the Sanskrit Buddhist texts appeared.

It is also to be noted that there were religious contacts between Ceylon and Java through the Abhayagiri Vihāra, at least, towards the end of the eighth century A.D. as attested by a fragmentary inscription from the Ratubaka Plateau in central Java. This inscription states that 'This Abhayagiri Vihāra here of the Sinhalese ascetics (?) trained in the sayings of discipline of the Jinas was established'. Commenting on this record, J.G.de Casparis observes:-

'The most important detail is the name of the foundation, viz. the Abhayagiri Vihāra. The name at once suggests that of the famous monastery at

1. A Record of the Buddhist Countries, p.79.
2. Ibid., p.87.
Anurādhapura, and the addition 'of the Sinhalese' proves that this is not just a coincidence. In fact the foundation is a second Abhayagiri Vihāra: either a more or less exact replica of the Ceylonese monastery or, more probably, a building which had enough in common with it—in form or spirit or both—to deserve the same name. Further excavations on the Ratubaka plateau may yield materials capable of giving an impression of this interesting building. In the present stage of research there is, however, one important conclusion that may be safely drawn from the inscription: the existence of cultural relations between Java and Ceylon in the Śailendra period.

From the foregoing examples it may be suggested that the religious intercourse between Ceylon and China during the reign of Mahānāma may also have been taken place through the Abhayagiri Vihāra and the bhikkhūniś who went to China to hold the second upasampāda ('higher ordination') of the Chinese nuns must, therefore, have belonged to the same vihāra.

With reference to the Kukurumahandamana Pillar Inscription showing that there was a hospital (vad-hal) in front of the nunnery known as Mahindārāma on the High Street (maha-veya) of the inner city (of Anurādhapura), D.M.de Z.Wickremasinghe argues that the location of this hospital in close proximity to the Mihind-aram (Pali, Mahindārāma) nunnery suggests that it was either

meant for the exclusive use of the nuns or that these devotees, like the nursing sisters of the present day, attended on the patients, succouring the sick, being a veyyāvaccā (Sinhalese, vatāvat), one of the ten meritorious acts which Buddhism imposed upon its votaries.\(^1\)

Rahula referring to the same inscription observed: 'One is tempted to ask whether the bhikkhunīs could have served as nurses in these hospitals'.\(^2\)

In this connexion, there is also a passage, though badly weathered, that deserves attention in the Abhayagiri Slab Inscription of Mahinda V (982-1029 A.D.). The legible part of the passage is as follows:— mehēni mahapel karā nimav gilan putakhu duṭa ...

... ... ...

... ... ...

mA multān vedhal karā.\(^3\)

This may be translated as ('the king) built a large residence\(^4\) for nuns; whenever a motherless sick

---


\(^2\) *History of Buddhism in Ceylon*, p. 197.


\(^4\) Mahapel, in Pali: Mahāpāli; Wickremasinghe translates this term as 'great alms hall'; (see *Ep. Zeyl.*, I, p. 228). The Sikhavalaṇḍa Vinisa (p. 54) shows that the term pāl is used in this period in the sense of a building; cf. diya pāl ('water-hut'; a hut meant for storing water pots etc. Even to-day this type of huts are by no means rare in rural Ceylon); gini pāl ('fire hut' i.e. kitchen or fire place); dahāti pāl ('tooth stick hut'; the word dāhāti is derived from danta kaṭṭha which means wooden tooth brush. 'Tooth stick hut' may mean a small hut meant for bath etc.).
child is seen ... built a kitchen, (and) a hospital'.

Thus, 'a large building for nuns', 'a kitchen' and 'a hospital' appear to have been constructed in the same nunnery. What is of particular importance to us is the existence of a hospital in this nunnery as in some other monasteries.

It is important to decide whether the hospitals belonging to the temples were meant for the public, too, or whether they were for the exclusive use of the bhikkhus and bhikkhuṇīs. It is also important to determine how far the bhikkhus and bhikkhuṇīs took part in the administration and maintenance of these institutions.

As to these problems, unfortunately, we find little evidence in our sources. According to the bhesajjakkhandhaka, 'the chapter on medicine', of the Mahāvagga, bhikkhus and bhikkhuṇīs are encouraged to acquire a knowledge

---

1. Wickremasinghe translates as kitchens and hospitals. (see Ep. Zeyl., I, p.228). But it is a common feature in the language of the tenth century A.D. that the neuter gender words in the second case singular end without a vowel unlike to-day; cf. saṅkaṃ: ganan, ālāhanaṃ: sohon and gocaraṃ gāmaṃ: godurasaranaṃ (Dh. A.G., pp. 47, 223 and 257 respectively); the well known royal hospital in ancient Ceylon situated in the High Street of the city of Anurādhapura is referred to in the inscription of Kassapa V (914-923 A.D.) found near the Abhayagiri monastery as raj-ved-hal, (Ep. Zeyl., I, p.6.).

of medicine and to cultivate experience in this field. But nevertheless, no monks were allowed to prescribe medicine nor were they allowed to give treatments to others except the members of their community, parents, parents'servants and their own servants.

The Visuddhimagga states that a bhikkhu or a bhikkhuni, first of all, should nurse his or her teachers, parents, brothers and sisters, brother's wife and sister's husband, and also sons and daughters of brothers and sisters, providing them with medicine and attending to them, because their ailments may constitute impediment to his or her meditation. Thus, it becomes clear that bhikkhus and bhikkhunis played an important role in this field. It is appropriate to surmise that at least the said categories of people were treated in the hospitals belonging to monasteries and nunneries.

According to the Vinaya rule, neither bhikkhus nor bhikkhunis were allowed to leave their residence during the rainy season. There are exceptions to this rule: the Sikhavalanda Vinisa, explaining these exceptions,

---
1. Sikhav., V., p.68.
2. If their brother's wife and sister's husband are collateral kin bhikkhus and bhikkhunis are allowed to treat them directly. If they are only affinal kin they can be given medicine but only through brother and sister. Visuddhim., p.94.
includes stipulation that monks and nuns are allowed
to leave their residence with the determination of
returning within seven days, for the purpose of begging
food etc., to maintain patients who were in their vihāras
depending upon them. It is therefore clear that there
were lay patients who were given treatment in the vihāras
by monks or nuns.

We learn from the Visuddhimagga that a bhikkhu
and a bhikkhunī cured their mother who was suffering
from a poisonous abscess (visaganda). Thera Mahārohana-
gutta was also attended by bhikkhus when he was ill.
Thus, the possibility suggested by Wickremasinghe and
Rahula that nuns could have served as nurses in the
hospitals in ancient Ceylon may be supported by this
passage.

1. Sīkhaṅga, V., p.76; biksaṅgaṇa vahal koṭā veherā gilāvā
vasannā haṭadu batādi ilvanu nisā ... sati karunen
yet vati.
2. Visuddhiṃ, p.91.
3. Ibid., p.155. As the last part of the phrase nimav gilan
putakhu duṭa ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ...
is illegible, its meaning remains uncertain. Does it
relate to the nuns of the above nunnery and, could it
mean that the nuns are advised that if they happened
to see a motherless sick child he should be admitted
to the hospital referred to in the same passage? As
has already been seen, bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs were
allowed to attend sick orphans. The word motherless
(nimav) may mean abandoned children by their mothers
or whose mothers no longer lived. Yet it is still a
problem why their father was not taken into account
in this matter.
At this stage it is necessary to examine the proprietary rights of women during the period under review. In order to present an accurate description of this topic, first of all, it is necessary to set out the rules which governed the property rights of women in the Island. Secondly, the extent to which such rules were applied in practice should be examined. Any serious study of these aspects is beset with certain difficulties. Above all, there are no writings which define the rules concerning proprietary rights of women (or even of men) before the Kandyan period. Our study is therefore restricted to the analysis of the available data on the properties owned by women during our period, subsequently we intend to investigate whether any Hindu or other rules would have been applied to them. Such an approach may enable us to add at least a few facts to our knowledge of the proprietary rights of women during our period.

There are some ancient Hindu writings which considered women as mere chattels. But many of the later Hindu writings and particularly Buddhism

2. Manu, IX, 194; Visnu, XVIII, 18;
considerably favoured women. It is true that there are some instances of girls and wives who were mortgaged by their parents and husbands respectively before the period under discussion, but, as far as the evidence goes, they had never been degraded to chattels. On the other hand, it is important to note that there appear to have been no injunctions preventing women from owning land and other property and freely disposing of such assets.

It has already been seen that there were a number of women belonging to different strata of society, who endowed monasteries with land and other properties. This suggests that women owned movable and immovable properties not just in name, but in actual fact. The Sīgiri graffiti, dated between the eighth and the tenth century A.D., furnish us with more material in support of this. Thus, according to the graffito of Agboy, lady (kalu) Sātā had a house (gē) in her possession. Another verse, too, speaks of a woman called Dalameysura, who owned a house (gē) at Mahaval.

3. See below, pp. 16 et seq.
5. Ibid., v. 620.
An important problem closely connected with the property rights of women is that of deciding how far female members of the family participated in the joint ownership rights of the joint family, viz. as wives, mothers, widows and married daughters etc., as compared with the male members of the family.

In the discussion of the position of women in the family, it was concluded that women, especially as mothers, held a strong position in family affairs. Further, we found some evidence of the practice of dowries given by parents when their daughters got married. It is true that the evidence found so far does not specify the conditions on which such endowments were made, but it is likely that the parents, as at present, made sure that their daughters would have control over such assets in common with their husbands.

There are examples showing that land grants were made by kings to men in order that their wives and children might also have control over them. For instance, the Rāṃbāva inscription deals with a land grant by king Mahinda IV (956-972 A.D.). Although the grant is issued to a man, a certain Kaliṅgurad, it is specified that

2. Ibid., pp. 124-125.
land should be enjoyed by his wife as well. Similarly, king Meghavança (303-331 A.D.) granted land to both Dantakumāra and his wife Hemamālā, who brought the Tooth Relic to the Island. Unfortunately, these examples do not show whether the rights of wives on these properties were real or nominal.

Our sources contain some interesting passages regarding rights enjoyed by women in the care of joint property. The Tiṃbirivāva inscription of the tenth century A.D., for instance, states that a woman called Anulabi granted to a vihāra a materamajjhaka share, belonging to her family (kulasataka; in Pali: kulasantaraka). This indicates that she was the member in charge of the common property of the family.

We come across examples of both husband and wife making joint offerings. Thus, king Sena I (833-853 A.D.), together with his queen Saṅghā (saddhip so Saṅgha-nāmāya), had two vihāras built and offered these to the Buddhist Saṅgha. It is, however, not recorded whether the property concerned was joint or

individual property. According to another passage, a husband (i.e. king Mahānāma 410-432 A.D.) built a vihāra on behalf of his wife (i.e. the mahesī), and presented it to the bhikkhus as desired. However, as in the second example, it is not clear whether this foundation was made from her own property or from that owned in common with the king or that owned by the king alone.

Also we come across a passage in the Visuddhimagga in which we are told that a husband and wife housed a bhikkhu for the rainy season (vassāna) in their newly built cell (senāsana). During the whole season the bhikkhu was attended to by the housewife herself. Finally, at the end of the rainy season, she also could afford to provide some necessities for the bhikkhu to take with him. In this case, too, it is not certain whether she used her individual or joint family property for the maintenance of the bhikkhu.

In spite of these examples, no clear picture of the rights of ownership of women in respect of family property emerges from the available sources. We have no information on such questions as the joint

1. Cv., XXXVII, 213.
2. Visuddhim, p. 92.
ownership rights of half-sisters vis-à-vis half-brothers, married female vis-à-vis unmarried male and married male vis-à-vis unmarried female etc.

Another important problem connected with the property of women is that concerning the nature and function of strīdhana. Manu is the first law-giver to present a detailed interpretation of strīdhana; he not only defined the items which formed strīdhana, but also pointed out that women should have absolute rights over it. Thus, strīdhana should consist of six types of gifts received by a woman, viz. the gifts received from her father; those from her mother; those from her brothers; those by her husband subsequent to her marriage; gifts made by anybody at the time of marriage; and finally those all other occasions where customarily gifts were made.¹ Viṣṇu added three more items: viz. the gifts received from a woman's son; those from other relatives; and thirdly the compensation given to the wife in the case of her husband's second marriage.²

It is true that the term strīdhana does not occur in Ceylonese sources, but the above mentioned items which formed the strīdhana can be found in them.

---

¹ Manu, IX, 194.
² Viṣṇu, XVII, 18.
Thus, minister Siva at Mahātittha offered 3,000 (kahāpanas) to a beautiful lady for the sake of winning her heart. Hemā, a young lady, received an invaluable diamond from a person as an award for her profound knowledge of the Dhammacakkappavattana Suttanta; she was also awarded 2,000 (kahāpanas) by the king on the same account. Though the round figures do not inspire confidence she would have received some wealth. A Sigiri graffito suggests that gifts were given to the bride by the bridegroom. It is not clear whether this was an exchange of gifts of a symbolic nature.

Further, we learn from the chronicle that princes were granted revenues when they were appointed to the rank of uparāja. It seems likely that a similar procedure was followed when queens were appointed mahesī and rājini. There is no doubt that at least the

2. This Suttanta enjoys a great reverence among Buddhists (see Ny., XV, 199; Dhammapadatthakathā, II, p. 600) as it is considered to be the first sermon of the Buddha which deals with the fundamental teachings of his doctrine; (see Mahāvagga, pp. 9ff; SN., pp. 420).
3. The name of the king is unknown.
5. Sig. Graff., v. 219.
6. Cv., XLIII, 32.
7. The Cūlavamsa states that Saṅghā, the queen of Sena II (853-887 A.D.) was, according to custom, given parihāra when she was consecrated mahesī (LI, 6.). Geiger renders parihāra as dowry (Cv. Transl., p. 147). But parihāra is a well known term for immunities, such as freedom from tax etc. (Cf. D.C. Sircar, Indian Epigraphical Glossary, s.v. parihāra; Ep. Zevl., III, p. 286, note, 1).
mahesis and other queens were sufficiently wealthy to make donations to the Sāsana as we saw earlier.¹

Women during the period under discussion worked as employees in monasteries. The Mihintalē Slab Inscription of Mahinda IV (956-972 A.D.) is quite informative in this connexion. It records not only the presence of women employees but also mentions the salaries drawn by them: a jetmava was paid one pava² of land (as divel)³ with one adamana and two pata of raw rice (daily ?). We are not told what kinds of duties were to be performed by the jetmava. D.M.de Z. Wickremasinghe suggested that jetmava would mean 'old mother' (in Pali: jetṭhamātā), probably a polite way of referring to an old woman charged with cleaning of the monastery.⁴ A batgelādiya, most probably the officer-in-charge of the kitchen or dining room, was paid one pava of land (as divel ?) and also a pata and adamana of rice (daily ?). A midivā-jārama, officer-in-charge of female slaves was paid two pava of rice (daily ?); there were twenty-four workers under her supervision. Each of these servants was paid one pava of rice (daily ?); they were also

---

2. For these measures see tables VIII, IX and XI in the appendix.
paid one kalañda of gold per each yearly for their clothing. A pārāñāndi, who supplied strainers to the monastery, was given one kari of land (as divei ?) and two paya of rice (daily ?). The same wages were drawn by a maḏavuva (who supplied shallow containers ? maḏakku in modern Sinhalese, 'saucepan made of clay'). These examples show that there was no obstacle against women to engage even in paid employment.

Further, we learn from the Visuddhimagga that women continued to follow their professions such as dress-cleaning, weaving and spinning. A Sigiri graffito speaks of a lady who was self-employed as dress-cleaner.

Additionally, we find an interesting passage in the Cūlavāmsa which may throw some light on the economic and social conditions of women: Mahānāga, who was wandering in the forest before seizing the throne, is said to have sent an iguana to his maternal aunt (māṭulānī), who then sent him a basket of corn in return.

4. The flesh of the land iguana (in modern Sinhalese: tala-goṆa 'varanus dracaena') is eaten. Vāgbhaṭa mentions that this was one of the delicious and nutricious foods during his time; see Astāṅgahṛdaya, VI, 66.
It is also said that his sister sent him bija ('seed corn') and a bijagāha at his request.\(^1\) Both these cases reveal firstly, that those women had control over the said items. Secondly, that there could be a sort of exchange of gifts between men and women. This is specially seen in relation to the first case.

Prostitution is everywhere a very ancient profession, but because of the lack of evidence we do not know how common it was in ancient Ceylon. Unlike what we read of the Indian subcontinent\(^2\) there is no evidence to show that women in the Island were encouraged towards this profession. There is, however, no doubt that prostitutes were not unknown there. The author of the Siyabaslakara of the tenth century A.D. records that an abisaru (in Sanskrit and Pali: abhisārikā) liyan walked along the roads in moon light.\(^3\) The Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gātavada of the same century refers to the term ganikā, which still the best known Sinhalese

1. Cv., XLI, 73–74; the meaning of the bijagāha remains uncertain. Geiger takes as 'bringer of the seed corn', L.C.Wijesinha translates as a 'slave (who might take him his food when it was necessary)'; see Cv. Transl., Geiger, p. 59, note 3 and My. Transl., Wijesinha, pt. II, p. 12 respectively.
term for the prostitute with some variations, such as giiyiya, gihiyiya and giiti.\(^1\) \(\text{Vesi}\), another synonym for the prostitute, occurs also, at least once, in this source.\(^2\)

Some Sanskrit law-givers define that these three terms (i.e. abhisarikā, ganikā and vēsyā) indicate different kinds of prostitutes. According to the Amarakoṣa, 'abhisarikā means the woman who goes to a rendez-vous to meet her paramour'.\(^3\) As Vātsyāyana pointed out, an abhisarikā becomes a ganikā only when she is versed in both sets of sixty-four kalās enumerated by him and is endowed with an amicable disposition, personal charm and other qualities.\(^4\) P.V.Kane has argued that every vēsyā was not considered a ganikā as the former was more or less a slave.\(^5\)

However, most Indian\(^6\) and Sinhalese sources use these terms without any distinction to indicate all kinds of prostitutes: while poets generally used abisaru, others used ganikā to indicate all prostitutes. Even in poems written after the Siyabasilakara, abisaru is the term used for all prostitutes. For example, the Kavsīlu-

---

1. Dh.A.G., pp.131, 187 and 222 respectively.
2. Ibid., p.222.
miṣa of the thirteenth century, and the Tisarasandesāya of the fourteenth century refer to courtesans by the term abisara.¹

It is interesting to note how the Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya employed the term gihiṇiya or gaṇīka: 'nagarasobhanā vaṇṇadāsi means vaṇḍās, who brought pleasure to the city, that is to say, gihiṇiya, the courtesan'.² (Vēsi nam giṇī) 'vēsi means giṇī'.³ These examples explicitly indicate that the definitions of these terms, as given in the Indian lawbooks, were not followed by our authors. Further, the Saddharma Ratnāvaliya and Pūjāvaliya used the term gihiṇiya or gaṇīka without any distinction for all courtesans.⁴ The way in which these terms in use in modern Ceylon by no means differs from that in ancient time.

The use of these terms in our sources raises problems. On the one hand, it is still an unsettled question how far the data in the Aṭṭhakathās reflect society of Ceylon.⁵ Therefore, one can argue that the above mentioned terms appearing in the Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya are nothing but literal translations of the

3. Ibid., p.222.
4. Saddharma Ratnāvaliya, p.746; Piy., p.552.
Pali words of the Indian stories appearing in the Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā. Also we know that the Siyabaslakara is a translation of the Kāvyādarśa with few additions. So the term occurring in the Siyabaslakara is evidently the Sinhalese equivalent of the Sanskrit term abhisārikā which appears in the corresponding verse in the Kāvyādarśa.¹

Yet it is obvious that the Dhampiya Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya gives not merely the translations of the Pali words, but adds at least a few more details. It is useful to examine some examples: the Pali phrase: nagarasobhanā vaṇṇadāsī is rendered as nuvarahobavana vaṇḍās; gihiniyā yū sēyī.² Again, he commented the phrase: nagarasobhiniṃ gaṇikāṃ as nuvarasobavana gihiniyak; nagarasobhiniṃ yannen āya rū guna kiyuḥu ('a courtesan, who brings pleasure to the city; by means of the qualification of nagarasobhiniṃ the quality of her beauty is indicated').³

In view of these examples it is clear that the Dhampiya Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya is not merely a Sinhalese translation, but is also a glossary of the Pali terms.

¹. Kāvyādarśa, I I , p. 215; Mallikāmālībhāriṇyāḥ sarvāṅgenārdracandanaḥ Kṣaumavatyo na lakṣyante jyotsnāyāṁ abhisārikāḥ.  
². Dh. A. G., p. 271; see for the translation of this quotation supra, p. 192.  
³. Dh. A. G., p. 64.
From the foregoing discussion it follows that courtesans were not unknown in our period. In the preceding period, however, there were no references to courtesans, but this does not necessarily imply that they were unknown to that period. Unfortunately, our sources do not permit us to determine the exact social status of the ganikās. Also the Sīgiri graffiti provide us with no material about this interesting topic.

Regarding women's rights of inheritance, there are some examples. Thus, the Tiṃbirivāva inscription refers to a woman called Anulabi, who had in her possession a share of the family property (kulasataka, in Pali: kulasantaka) which she subsequently granted to a temple. Yet the record does not inform us about the manner in which she inherited this property. Most probably, her father was no longer alive when she was making this donation; otherwise it is unlikely that she should have been able to dispose of the family property in her own name. It is interesting to note that, although the record mentions her father and grandfather, it does not refer to her husband. This would imply either that she

had remained unmarried or had no reason to mention her husband. Further, no mention is made of either her brothers or her mother. It is therefore difficult to understand how she inherited this property. According to Hindu writings, if a girl remained unmarried and survived her parents, having no brothers, she would be the heir to the patrimony.¹

It is questionable whether the right of inheritance of the people was based on similar principles as that of royal succession.² This may be true as far as the right of inheritance of the male members of the family is concerned. But it is uncertain to what extent this applied to the female members. We know that a king was not normally succeeded by a daughter or sister, but this does not necessarily imply that the female members were totally debarred from the right of inheritance.

The chronicle and some inscriptions seem to give equal importance to the king and the mahesi, at least, in some fields. This appears frequently in the Cūlavāṃsa accounts of religious activities of both the king and

1. Yājv. S., II, 135-136; Manu, IX, 130: A.M.Indra and Kapadia have discussed in detail these principles. See op. cit., pp.163,261 respectively.
the queen. The author of the Cūlavamsa was sometimes so impressed by the mahesīs that he stated that they were equal in fame with the kings. One such mahesī was the queen of Mahinda IV (956-972 A.D.). According to several inscriptions, most of the kings did not forget to trace their descent to mother's line as well.

Also we gather from the records that some princesses, if not all, were appointed rājini just as the princes were appointed uparāja or ādipāda. Thus, Udaya I (797-801 A.D.), for the first time in Ceylon, conferred the title of rājini on his daughters. King Sena I (833-853 A.D.), assigned the rank of rājini to Saṅghā, a daughter of his sister, acknowledging her, thereby, as a royal princess. Mahinda IV (956-972 A.D.) made his son ādipāda and his daughter rājini. It is possible that this practice was first established in the eighth century A.D., for the chronicle gives no earlier examples.

1. Compare the religious activities of king Aggabodhi II with those of his mahesi and also those of Udaya I with those of his mahesi as recorded in the Cūlavamsa.
2. C. LIV, 50: rāññō kittisamā devī.
4. C., XLIX, 3; L, 58 and LIV, 11 respectively.
From this discussion it follows that though the rules connected with the proprietary rights of women still remain in obscurity, there were women during our period who not only owned land and other property but also exercised unlimited rights over them.

In this connexion, it may be appropriate to examine the political achievements of women during the period under survey. Such a study is, however, seriously affected by the paucity of materials.

No women reigned as sovereign queens during our period. Even in the earlier or later period up to the present time we find only few queens who ruled the Island. Of these only Liññavatī and Kalyañavatī, each of whom succeeded their husbands in the later Polonnaruva period, had some importance. In earlier times, there were two periods in which queens ruled the country. Thus, in the first century B.C., Anulā seized the throne. She kept the country under her own control for five years; but she ruled directly for only a few months.  

1. Cv., LXXX, 30, 50 and LXXX, 34 respectively. Queen Liññavatī is dethroned twice. In fact, she ruled during three periods, viz., 1197-1200, 1209-1210, 1211-1212 A.D. Kalyañavatī from 1202 to 1208 A.D.
During the remaining period she enthroned a number of men but got rid of them by poisoning one after the other. The second sovereign queen during that period was Śīvalī, whose reign was limited to only a few months, as she was dethroned by prince Ilanāga.¹ The elevation of queen Śīvalī to the throne was probably due to the absence of a male heir.

During the period under review there is little evidence for women who attempted to seize political power. During the reign of king Sena I (833-853 A.D.), Rohaṇa was under the authority of Kittiṭagabodhi, a prince of the royal family of Rohaṇa. At the death of the latter, his sister seized the territory, together with the royal treasures, and had Mahinda, the eldest son of the deceased ruler, killed. But her reign did not last long, for the first younger brother of the late Mahinda, Kassapa by name, put her to death and recovered the territory with the assistance of king Sena I, his mother's brother.²

The assistance given by the king by no means suggests that her position was so strong that she could

---

¹ My., XXXV, 15; Pīy., p. 138.
² Cvi., L, 50-55.
not be defeated by Kassapa alone. The reasons are, first, that Kassapa was too young to lead an expedition against her. Second, that the rulers of Anurādhapura at this time generally intervened in political disputes in Rohaṇa and this happened frequently whenever the sister's sons of Anurādhapura rulers got involved in the political troubles of Rohaṇa. Neither her political achievement as a ruler of the territory nor the duration of her rule is known to us.

We are told in one instance that a mahesī in the latter part of the sixth century A.D. had other claimants to the throne killed with poison and made her son Kittisirimegha king in name, but carried on the government herself. The Cūlavamsa goes on to say: 'But in all enterprises the mahesī took the lead, thus everything in the kingdom was turned upside down. The royal officials and the high dignitaries thought only of bribery, and the powerful in the land terrorized the weak.' This political instability appears to have been one of the immediate causes for the decline of the so-called Silākāla dynasty.

2. Ibid., XLI, 64.
3. Ibid., XLI, 67-68, (Geiger's transl.).
In addition, there are other queens who took part in political affairs. One such queen is the mahesī of king Upatissa I (368-410 A.D.), who murdered her husband and thus enabled his younger brother Mahānāma, with whom she had an affair, although he was a monk, to become king.¹ We have already seen how Saṅghā, the daughter of Mahānāma, put her half-brother to death, and gave her husband who had been the king's umbrella bearer, the kingdom. Her act certainly created political problems. First, it was an immediate cause for the decline of the Lambakaṇṇa dynasty founded by Vasabha. Second, the conditions became rather confused to such an extent that the Damila Paṇḍu captured the capital which he held till Dhātusena regained it.

Another passage in the Cūlavāṃsa deserves the attention of all those interested in the political activities of women: when there arose a political conflict within the royal family of Anurādhapura, king Sena V (972-982 A.D.) betook himself to Rohaṇa and the queen mother being annoyed with the king, supported the senāpati to enable him to collect Damilas and to hand over the country to them.² The chronicle also would have us

¹. Cv., XXXVII, 209-213.
². Ibid., LIV, 63-64.
believe that the reason why she took such drastic action against her own son was that she had an affair with the senāpati, leading to a quarrel between the king and the senāpati.¹ Whatever the reasons, this unpleasant Damila episode had disastrous effects on the ordinary people: 'The Damilas now plundered the whole country like devils and, pillaging, seized the property of its inhabitants'.²

Thus women rarely seem to have succeeded in maintaining a position of power in the political field for any length of time.

There is little information available about the education of women. There is no doubt that there were, at least, some well educated women during our period. If we accept that the Sigiri graffiti which are referred to as having been written by women are indeed the compositions by those women themselves, it would follow that there were women of considerable literary accomplishments. It is of interest to examine some of them. Thus, Sevu, the wife of Nidalu Mihiṇḍa, expressed her feelings in a verse in the Duvaṅga gī metre as follows:— 'This

¹ Cv., LIV, 59-60.
² Ibid., LIV, 66: Damila te janapadam piḷētvā rakkhasā viya vilumpitvāna gaṇhanti narāṇaṃ santakaṃ tada.
look of yours from a corner of your eyes has verily been recognized by us as that of rivals of you whose hair laden with blue water-lilies, being combed in style, droops down on your neck.¹ The first two pādās of her song is full of alliterations. We read thus: 'mahanela bara varala gela hūṇa pihirāla rasan'. A similar idea is expressed in a different way in a different metre, (i.e. Kav gī) by another woman called Devu.²

Thus, while some women described features of the heavenly damsels, others turned to explain some aspects of men's behaviour. The conduct of men who visited Śīgiriya displeased Matvana Samanā. Therefore, she wrote: 'We are not women Yāgī and Sāhāli were composed by you having looked at these (women) who, by reason of separation from their lovers, go away without having (their) minds attracted (by you)'.³

Some women showed remarkable poetic gifts. For instance, the writer of graffito No. 580 explained that 'Lake Lady', when the clear water, the swans, and the flowers came into being, enticed away the minds of everybody who visited Śīgiriya, causing the ladies in the paintings to be neglected. On the other hand, some

1. Śīg. Graff., v. 41.
2. Ibid., v. 152.
3. Ibid., v. 504, (Paranavitana's transl.).
people composed stanzas, explaining that their life would no longer be of any value if they did not win the favour of these damsels. Nāl, the wife of Mahamet, made a sarcastic remark on this inconsistency of men at the expense of women in an interesting way: 'whatever thing', she writes, 'came (into being) of lake lady we do not know (why) this (stanza) was written down here and there by these persons, after having themselves proclaimed that their life would pass away'.

Both husband and wife at Mahapitiyā paid a visit to Sigiriya, having been attracted by the surroundings; the husband inscribed a song on the gallery wall. It is as follows:— 'The king, knowing, by means of a flower, what has been felt in the minds of those (women), left them (here) until my arrival, and passed away. I have, therefore, not been enamoured by the state of the king of gods'. A reply for this loose conduct of her husband was immediately made through a song written by the wife below that of her husband: 'Do you think so much (of yourself)? The yoke having been dropped, the bull who ran away and stood on the road, feels 'I shall dance'. (But) is there no noosing of bulls by people? She

1. Sig. Graff., v.543,(Paranavitana's transl.).
2. Ibid., v.681,II(1),(Paranavitana's transl.).
3. Ibid., v.681,III(1-2),(Paranavitana's transl.).
questioned. In what a beautiful manner this lady explained such a complex idea that her husband had been amused by Sīgiri ladies, and if he had gone too far she would have known how to control him! These examples show that there were women of considerable literary accomplishments.

Further, we learn from the Cūlavamsa that king Jeṭṭhatissa III (632 A.D.), dying on the battle field, requested his mahesi to recite the Dhamma and to learn the Abhidhamma. Consequently, she learnt the Abhidhamma together with its Aṭṭhakathās. If women were learned enough to undertake a study of such a profound and complex group of texts like the Abhidhamma, it would suggest that they had good preliminary education.

1. The Cūlavamsa mentions that during the reign of king Aggabodhi I (575-608 A.D.), there were many poets (Cv., XLII,13). The Sinhalese chronicles enumerate twelve of them. Of these, there is one called Daḷabisō or Bisōdaḷa (Nkg.,p.15; Piy.,p.145 respectively). The well known meaning of bisō is 'queen'. Daḷa is the Sinhalese equivalent of (Pali) Dāṭhā. Thus, can Daḷabisō or Bisōdaḷa be identified with Dāṭhā, the daughter of the above king, who was married to a Malayarāja? Cf. Other names of her contemporary poets such as Daḷasalakumaru ('Prince Daḷasala'), Puravaḍukumaru ('Prince Puravaḍu') and Kasupkoṭaḷpā ('Ādipāḍa Kasupkoṭa').

2. Cv.,XLIV,109,114.
Hemā, a young girl, living in the region west of Anurādhapura proved herself worthy of gifts for her profound knowledge of the Dhammacakkappavattana Sutta.

Her boy friend was a young merchant at Mahātīttha. In a night, she was desperate to see him and started to cross the sea as the journey by sea was shorter than by land. This example may suggest that she was trained in sailing, too.

Probably the bhikkhuṇīs were well educated not only in Buddhism but had sometimes learnt some foreign languages also. Otherwise, it would not have been easy for them to undertake missionary activities in foreign countries like China as we saw earlier.

Perhaps, the bhikkhuṇīs may have had influence on the education of the ordinary women. The Dipavamsa records a number of bhikkhuṇīs who taught Vinaya in the Island during the period between the third century B.C. to the

2. Sahas.,pp.126-127: mātugāmo rattiyam vānijjam sarivā thalamaggena gaccante dūrañcit cintetvā samuddam taritum ārabhi. No evidence is available for the existence of other highways from Anurādhapura to Mahātīttha in the Anurādhapura period except the one that ran from the city; (see JCBRAS (NS.),VI,1963,pp.17-19). Hemā lived in the region west of Anurādhapura, probably near the coast. It is therefore quite possible that the distance to Mahātīttha was longer by land than that by sea.
third century A.D.\textsuperscript{1} Nothing more, however, is known about this topic.

It is true that our sources are generally, silent about education in the early period of the history of the Island, but the above cited examples may suffice to indicate that women's education was also included to certain degree.

In the foregoing pages an attempt has been made at studying the position of women in the Island during the period from the fourth to the tenth century A.D., with which we are concerned. We have tried to pursue this topic by examining the important problems connected with women's social standing, \textit{viz.} the attitudes of men towards them, their religious and social activities, proprietary rights and rights of inheritance, political activities and, finally, their education and literary activities. We have tried to determine the individual functions and interactions of these elements as far as possible. It has also been necessary in some cases to describe the social background and the general conditions of Ceylon, and their apparent influence on the evolution of the history of women. As far as possible the data of

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{1} Dv.,XVIII,27-35.}
our period have been compared with those of the preceding and subsequent periods.

As indicated at the very beginning, this study is necessarily limited because of the nature of the available evidence. It may, however, be seen that the comparative study of the available data in the Sigiri graffiti, chronicles, inscriptions and other sources throw, at least, some light on the social life of women. In this connexion, it is worth mentioning that no earlier attempt has been made to assess the great importance of the Sigiri graffiti in any attempt to re-construct the history of social conditions of women. In the light of this survey, one may conclude that, as far as the history of the women in the Island up to the present time is concerned, our period marks a very important phase. Women certainly occupied a favourable position in the religious history of the Island. As bhikkhuni, they played a major role in the religious field and also in social and other organizations. They were courageous enough even to propagate the Dhamma in far eastern countries like China.

The religious activities of other women seem to have been of different kinds. In the early period most
of the offerings of women to the Sāsana were confined to alms and other such smaller items. But we saw that land and other valuable property was also at frequent intervals donated by women, who thus contributed towards the maintenance of the Sāsana during the period under survey. Even in the troubled days which followed the decline of the Anurādhapura kingdom, we hear, though very rarely, of big endowments made by women.

Undoubtedly, there were women who possessed landed properties and other resources during our period, rather more than in any other ancient or medieval period. A striking feature of the economic life of the country during our period is the engagement of women in paid employment. Also there were women who possessed considerable gifts in literary activities again more than in any other ancient or medieval period.

As in the other periods, women did not prove very successful in government. However, it is important to bear in mind that there were at least a few women who were courageous enough to take an actual part in politics directly or indirectly, irrespective of what success they achieved. The custom of the appointment
of princesses to the rank of rājinaḥ appears to have started during our period.

As in other periods, women could exert influence on family affairs and they enjoyed freedom to take part in social functions even without being accompanied by male members. Their freedom was never restricted by imposing satī rites and child marriages etc. On the whole, they occupied, undoubtedly, a favourable position in society during the period under consideration.
As the village is normally the main centre of social life, it is proper to examine the village as a social unit. For that purpose it is necessary, firstly, to determine the areas where village settlements existed in the Island during the period under survey and, secondly, to describe the patterns of settlements.

Any serious study of the emergence of new settlements is beset with certain difficulties. It is true that there are numerous texts, both literary and epigraphic, showing the existence of a large number of village settlements which are not mentioned before c. 320 A.D., but for only very few the dates and circumstances under which these settlements were established are known.

Many parts of the present Anurādhapura District (a part of ancient Rājarāthana) were populated well before our period. Yet we find in our sources a number of settlements for which there is no evidence in the earlier period.
It is, of course, possible that some of such settlements did exist in that earlier period. Inscriptions belonging to the period under review refer to the following villages in the Nuvaragam Palāta of the Anurādhapura District: Nikaviṭigama (modern Nikaviṭiya) is mentioned in the fourth-century inscription at Nabadagala, 1 mile north of the 36th mile stone on the Puttalam-Anurādhapura road.¹ The Bilibāva inscription of Kassapa V (914-923 A.D.), near the 26th mile post on the so-called Western Minor Road, states that the village Mahagāpiyova (modern Bilibāva) was granted to the Mahāvihāra at Anurādhapura.² Two inscriptions, attributable to the tenth century A.D., found at Eppāvala, near the 15th mile post on the Kākirāva-Talāva road, mention the Pamagalu Vihāra and the village of Sāgama.³ About 2 miles north of the 12th mile post on the same road, 2 villages are referred to by the names of Govīn-nāmāpiṭiya and Alutvāva in an inscription of Kassapa IV (898-914 A.D.).⁴ The inscription of Kumāradāsa (512-520 A.D.) at Nāgiri-

3. Ibid., III, pp. 190, 193.
4. Ibid., II, p. 233.
kanda, 5 miles north-east of Mādavacchiya, mentions the Bamanagariya Vihāra and the tanks Mahagariya, Cugariya, Kabuba, Kaṭacankapula, Tava, Nilaśa, Gaja and Pada. The Allēvāva inscription of Dappula IV (924-935 A.D.), near the 63rd mile post on the Anurādhapura-Trincomalee road, mentions the village Kulaviṭiya (present Allēvāva). Velangama is mentioned in the Ataviragollāva inscription of Dappula III (923-924 A.D.).

The well known village Kalavāva (Pali, Kālavāpi) in the Kalagam Palāta of the Anurādhapura District occurs for the first time in the chronicle during the reign of king Jetṭhatissa III (632 A.D.). But it is in the reign of king Dhātusena (459-477 A.D.) that the Kalavāva (Pali, Kālavāpi) tank and the vihāra of the same name were built. The identification of this great reservoir and the vihāra with the present Kalavāva tank situated 25 miles south-east of Anurādhapura and the present vihāra at the northern end of the bound of this tank respectively is beyond doubt. Evidently,

5. Ibid., XXXVIII, 23-25.
the area around the Kalāvāva tank derives its name from the tank. There is, however, a village tank called Kalubaha as attested by the inscription of the first century A.D. at the Avukana Vihāra, situated two miles away from the Kālavāpi tank.¹ The first part of the name of this tank (i.e. Kaḷu, Pali, Kāla) may suggest that this tank was derived its name from the Kāla Nadī. These tanks would have been constructed close by the Kāla Nadī and probably in the vicinity of the Kālavāpi tank. This may suggest that this area was inhabited by the Sinhalese well before the construction of the Kālavāpi tank.

In the centuries following the construction of the Kalāvāva tank we find a number of examples attesting further expansion of the vihāra founded by Dhātusena. Thus, Aggabodhi I (575-608 A.D.) founded an Upasatha hall there.² Likewise, Jetṭhatissa III (632 A.D.) assigned the village Lada to this vihāra.³ From these examples it follows that the vihāra in Kalāvāva increased its importance in the following centuries. Normally this would also imply some growth

¹ JCBRAS (NS.), VI, 1963, p. 167.
² Cv., XLIV, 101.
³ Ibid., XLII, 28.
of the village of Kalavāva and the neighbouring villages. Therefore, there can be no doubt that as a result of the completion of Kalavāva, not only the area around the tank but also some other parts of Rājaraṭṭha at a somewhat greater distance were brought into cultivation. The inscriptions of the later centuries speak of Sinhalese settlements in the area of Kalavāva. For instance, the inscriptions at Nagama, ten miles southwest of Kalavāva, and Tammanagala, attributable to the eighth century A.D., refer to the villages of Kolayuṃu and Piḷiyāna respectively.¹

No conclusive evidence is found for Sinhalese settlements in the Māṭombu Koraḷ and Tulāna Koraḷ till about the close of the period under consideration. The Pujāvaliya records the construction of Mahaṭombu tank by king Jeṭṭhatissa I (266-267 A.D.).² Again the same text mentions a tank called Māṭombu made by king Aggabodhi II (608-618 A.D.).³ An attempt has been made to show that these two passages refer to the same tank so that Aggabodhi's work would amount to a reconstruction of the former.⁴ Yet there is no

---

2. Pjv., p.141.
3. Ibid., p.145.
certainty because there is no other evidence for identification, except for the similarity between the two names. The Cūlavamsa mentions the construction of a practising house (padhānaghara, Pali) called Mātambiya by king Aggabodhi IV (667-683 A.D.). Nicholas attempted to identify these works with Mahaṭombuva, Māṭombu and Māṭambiya in the present Māṭombu Kōralē and Tulāna Kōralē. His argument is, unfortunately, only based on the similarity of the names and seems to us unconvincing. His inference would carry greater weight if there were at least a tank and a 'practising-house' by the name of Māṭombu in the present Māṭombu Kōralē or Tulāna Kōralē. Similarly, this scholar's identification of the Veluvāna Vihaṇa with an imaginary site in the same Kōralē is not supported by evidence. 'King Samāghatissa', he writes, 'defeated in battle east of Anurādhapura, went to Veluvāna Vihaṇa where he assumed a monk's robes; he was proceeding thence to cross the Mahāvāli Gaṅga and escape into Rohaṇa when he was detected and seized at Miṇneriya. It is

clear, therefore, that Veluvana Vihara was westward of Minneriya and probably in Matombuva Koralē. It becomes clear from the Cūlavamsa that the Veluvana Vihara was situated between Anurādhāpura and Minneriya. But how could this be in Matombuva? We are uncertain as to whether this vihara was near Anurādhāpura or near Minneriya. If it was near the latter it is obvious that it does not belong to the Matombu Koralē.

However, in other parts of the Hurulu Palāta in the Anurādhāpura District, there is evidence for settlements belonging to the period under discussion. Thus, the Aminicciya inscription of the fourth century A.D., about 1 mile north-east of the 28th mile stone on the so-called Eastern Minor Road, refers to the following villages and tanks: - Abagama, Davacaka-Patagama and Abamava-Patagama (villages), Vajiviya tank, Kada-aviya tank, Navada-aviya tank, Mahavāva tank and Vajagamaka tank. Unfortunately, none of these can be identified. The Devagiriya Vihāra and the village Niṭalaviṭṭiya are mentioned for the first time in two inscriptions of the fifth century A.D.

at Labuṭabāndigala, seven miles north of Horovupotāna on the road leading to Kapugallāva. ¹ Gāliṅdaru Gomāṇḍla (present Raṃbāva) is mentioned in the inscription in situ of Udaya I (797-801 A.D.), near the north-west corner of the Wāhalkaṭa tank. ² Another village in this area is Sulinnarugama (present Iripiniyāva) referred to in the Iripiniyāva inscription of the above mentioned king. ³ These widely scattered inscriptions in the Nuvaragam Palāta, Kalāgam Palāta and Hurulu Palāta of the Anurādhapura District suggest that Sinhalese settlements had expanded into most parts of this district by about the tenth century A.D. Yet there is neither literary nor archaeological evidence to show the existence of Sinhalese settlements in some other parts of this district till about the end of the period under review.

Some parts of Rohaṇa, in particular the Hambantoṭa District, appear to have been settled by Sinhalese several centuries before the beginning of the fourth century A.D. According to a legend, Rohaṇa

2. Ibid.,I.,p.172.
3. Ibid.,I.,p.169.
would have been built by a prince called Rohaṇa in the reign of Paṇḍu Vāsudeva. By the second century B.C. this village grew in importance and developed into the centre of a kingdom in the Island. It reached the peak of its glory by about the latter part of the first century B.C. As these points have already been elaborated by a number of scholars, there is no need to go into details.

There is no evidence of Sinhalese settlements in the Moravak Kūraḷē till about the latter part of the Anurādhapura period. Devanagara (Pali), Devundara (ancient and modern Sinh.), Dondra (English) in the coastal area of this Kūraḷē appears to have emerged during the period under consideration. Yet its founder remains uncertain because of the differences between the sources: both the Pūjāvaliya and the Rājāvaliya once mention that Devundara was founded by king Aggabodhi IV (667-683 A.D.). Yet in another instance they ascribe its foundation to king Mānavaṃma (684-718 A.D.). The first reference to Devanagara in the

1. My., IX, 10.
3. Piy., p. 146; Rīv., p. 63.
4. Ibid., p. 147; Ibid., p. 64.
Cūlavamsa is in the tenth century A.D. when we read a certain Vikkamabāhu, who ruled in Rohaṇa, died at Devanagāra during a battle with the Cūlas.¹

The Kihirāli (Khadirāli, Pali) Vihāra at Dāvundara is mentioned in an inscription of the eighth or ninth century A.D. in situ.² The Cūlavamsa mentions that Dappula (c. 659 A.D.), an independent ruler of Rohaṇa, built the Khadirāli Vihāra in honour of (the local ?) god.³ But unfortunately it does not give the location. It is believed that the name of the god of Devanagāra is also Khadirāli. In addition, the Pārakumbā-Sirita of the fifteenth century A.D. as well as local tradition attribute to Dāpulusen the installation at Devundara of a red sandal-wood image of Upulvan, which had been brought ashore by the waves.⁴ It seems likely that Dappula's pious works were confined to Rohaṇa. It is also to be noted that no other vihāra of that name occurs in the Island except that at Devanagāra. From these examples it may seem likely that the vihāra

built by Dappula sound be identified with the present Kihirali Vihara.

The present Galle District, situated in the wet-zone, was part of ancient Rohaṇa. Yet there is no evidence for the existence of Sinhalese settlements in this district during the early part of the Anurādhapura period. The earliest known inscription in this area can be dated back to the tenth century A.D.¹ In so far as irrigation works are concerned we are in a similar position. It was Parākramabāhu I (1153-1186 A.D.) who first started irrigation works in this area, as far as the evidence goes.² We find little archaeological remains in this area: the famous (Bhaiṣajyaguru ?) statue at Kuṣṭarajāgala near Veligama can be attributed to the ninth century A.D. These data may suggest that this district was sparsely populated during the Anurādhapura period, particularly in its early part. This may, however, seem surprising as Galle District is situated between Māgama and Kālaṇiya-two ancient centres—and, in addition, comprises the coastal areas where there are also some important sea ports.³

¹ CJSG, II, p. 198, no. 588.
² CV, CXVIII, 51.
³ See infra, p. 314.
What we can gather from our sources is that many parts of this district had remained unsettled till about the Daṃbadeṇiya period. It is interesting to see that the minister of Parākramabāhu II (1236-1270 A.D.) cleared the Mahālabujagaccha or Mahadelgas forest and founded there a village which was named after the forest. He completed the foundation of the village by erecting an image house, cetiya, enclosing walls and by making plantations there. He also opened the area between Kalutoṭa (modern, Kalutara) and Bem-toṭa for plantations.

There is no evidence for early settlements in the Kalutara district till about the fourth century A.D. The date of the first known inscription in this district found at Pokunuviṭa Vihāra at about 10 miles on the Pānadura-Horaṇa road. In an inscription of the fifth century A.D. at Diyagama, three miles up river from Kalutara, a vihāra named Kalaka Maha Vihāra is mentioned; but there now remains only ruins. The inscription also mentions a niyamatan. Therefore, it is clear that there was a permanent settlement in the area to the north of Kalu Gaṃga by about the fifth

---

1. Cey., LXXVI, 49-51; Piv., p. 49.
2. Ibid., LXXVI, 44-45; Ibid., p. 49.
century A.D. A tenth-century inscription speaks of another Sinhalese settlement named Pahanbunu at Vālmilla near Pokuṇuviṭa; it is identified with the present Pānadura Toṭamuna, an important area of Rayigam Kōraḷē. It mentions also Aruṅgam-peḷavaga which may be identified with modern Arugoda, 4 miles from Vālmilla.¹

However, no archaeological remains have so far been found to the south of the Kalu Gaṅga prior to the reign of Parākramabāhu I (1153–1186 A.D.). On the other hand, we are told in the Cūlavamsa that the area known as Paṅcayojana Raṭṭha (Sinhalese, Pasdunvaga), the present Pasdun Kōraḷē was a vast swampy, wilderness in Parākramabāhu's time. It was this king who drained the large swamp by leading the waters into the rivers, so made the land cultivable.² East of the river there are neither monuments nor inscriptions belonging to the period before the tenth century A.D. On the other hand, Vajrabodhi, an Indian monk who visited Ceylon on his way to China and went on pilgrimage to Adamś Peak (Pali, Samantakūṭa; Sinhalese, Samanola) in 719 A.D., records that the area around the mountain was

a wild region.\(^1\) By means of "wild" Vajrabodhi in fact indicated that the area was covered with jungle. But in the dry-zone section of Ratnapura District to the north of the Vāna Nādi (present Valavē Gaṅga) some pre-Christian cave inscriptions have been found.\(^2\) However, no other inscriptions have been found in this area until the last century of the period under consideration. This inscription is that of Galpēya, attributable to about the tenth century A.D., at a site six miles north-east of the 88th mile on the Pālmaṅḍulla-Ambalantoṭa road. This inscription mentions Girimaṅḍulu Vihāra.\(^3\)

Though some epigraphic evidence and monuments of a very early period (before the fourth century A.D.) can be found in the Mātalē District it is with the emergence of Śīgiri in the latter part of the fifth century that many areas were inhabited and cultivated in this part of the land.

The events which led to the founding of Śīgiriya, as narrated in chapters 38 and 39 of the Cūlavamsa,

\(^1\) Soun-g-kao-seng-tchoan, chapter, p. 71, column, 17.
\(^2\) JCBRAS (NS ), VI, 1963, pp. 125-126.
\(^3\) JCBRAS, XXXII, 1932, p. 178.
are well known, and need not to be recapitulated here. However, the following description merits consideration as it indicates the origin of the name Sīgiriya and proves that the area around this fortress remained uninhabited until its construction. The passage runs as follows:–

'He (Kassapa) cleared (the land) round about, surrounded it with a wall and built a staircase in the form of a lion. Thence it came to be known as by that name (Sīhāgiri).'

At present, however, not only the rock but also the village at the foot of the rock are named by Sīgiriya. Unfortunately, there is no evidence to define the precise year when the village came into existence; but we find the term Sihigiribim to indicate a sub-district in the Viyaulpota inscription of the latter part of the tenth century A.D., 6 miles north-west of Sīgiriya. The Sīgiri graffiti and inscriptions mention a number of villages in the vicinity of Sīgiriya. Thus, we find a village named Kivisi. This should perhaps be identified with the present Kibissa near Sīgiriya. Another graffito records the

name of the village of Budgamiya. The Mānikdena inscription of the tenth century A.D., at 2 miles west of the 40th mile post on the Mātalē-Daṁbulla road, mentions also a vihāra of the name Budugama. We are not certain whether these two records refer to the same village. Māgalamb is another name mentioned in the Sīgiri graffiti. In the Cūlavamsa there is a reference to a village of Maṅgalabegāma, a battle field situated in the territory of Gajabāhu II (1132-1153 A.D.). The village Maṅgalabegāma has been identified with the present Makul-ebē situated between Puvakgaha-Ulpota and Könduruva. However, we have no conclusive evidence to show that Māgalamb and Maṅgalabegāma denote the same village. A tenth-century inscription records the name of the village Panāvāli, present Māda-Ulpota, 6 miles south-east of Ālahāra. There are a number of inscriptions from the fourth to the seventh century A.D. at the Kukurumahandamana ruins, 9 miles north-east of the 20th mile post on the Ālahāra-Pallēgama.

1. Sig. Graff., v.49; cf. v.551.
3. Sig. Graff., v.532.
4. Cv.,LXVII,52; LXX,178,283,297; LXXII,161,207.
5. JCBRAS (NS ),VI,1963,p.112.
road. One of these speaks of the village of Tabarāya as the seat of the district chieftain. ¹ From these examples it follows that most parts of the area around Sīgiriya are mentioned in our records with reference to the period after the construction of the city of Sīgiriya. It is also revealed that a considerable part of this area was populated and under cultivation towards the beginning of the tenth century A.D. Yet it is important to note that there was, in the latter part of the Anurādhapura period, jungle which served as refuge for rebellious princes.² Even at present, some parts of this area remain uninhabited and uncultivated.

In the Kandy District the area around Kandy, Gampola and Teldeṇiya appears to have been populated in pre-Christian time as the inscriptions of that period at Dūlvala near Peradeṇiya, Gōṇawatta near the 5th mile post on the road leading from Kandy to Haṃguranketa, Vēgiriya devāla near Gampola and Baṃbaragala Vihāra near Teldeṇiya attest.³ About 13 miles from Kandy, in the Hiṃdagala Vihāra, there are fragmentary

¹. JCBRAS. (NS ),VI,1963,p.113.
². Cv.,XXXIX,45;XLI,19;XLI,28.
remains of paintings attributable to the 6th century A.D. An inscription of the seventh century A.D. at this vihāra records a joint grant made by a minister and a resident of Kanamuḍu for the purpose of building a Bodhi Tree shrine.

In some parts of the mountainous region such as the Nuvara Eliya and Badulla Districts there is no evidence to show a permanent population prior to the tenth century A.D. The earliest inscription has so far been found in this region is the Harasbādda inscription of the tenth century A.D. near Valapane. This inscription provides us with the names of three villages, i.e. Kohombagama, Ambunōra and Talagama. Even in the thirteenth century some parts of the upper mountainous region remained uncultivated and unpopulated, as now, for we are told that when Māgha invaded Polonnaruva the Sinhalese leaders betook themselves to Kotmalē which was covered with jungle.

2. JCBRAS (NS), VII, 1961, p. 227; UCR, XVI, 1958, p. 3.
3. JCBRAS, XXVI, 1917, p. 64.
4. Cy., LXXI, 17-29; Pijv., p. 153; Rijv., p. 70.
Many parts of the north and the north-eastern provinces appear to have been populated during the early part of the Anurādhapura period. Thus, we hear of Sinhalese settlements in Nāgadīpa (the Jaffna peninsula),¹ Jambukola, identifiable with modern Sambalturai and its suburbs,² Baḍakara (presumably modern Vallipuram near Point Pedro),³ Piyangudīpa (modern Pūṅgutīv)⁴ and Sūkaraṭittha or Ürātoṭa (modern Kayts).⁵ It is to be mentioned that though at present the majority of the people settled in the above provinces are Tamilas, K. Indrapala has rightly pointed out that Sinhalese constituted the main population there till about the thirteenth century. The first Tamil settlements in this part of the Island appear, however, in the tenth century A.D.⁶

The inscriptions and the villages mentioned in the literary sources prove that several parts of Vavuniya District were inhabited by Sinhalese even before the period under consideration. Nearly a hundred Brāhmī inscriptions scattered in the area of Mahākaccaṭkōdi,

---
¹ Mv., I, 47; XX, 25; XXXVI, 9, 36; Samv., p. 475; Rijv., p. 49.
² Mv., XI, 23; XX, 25; Samv., p. 446.
⁴ Mv., XXIV, 25; XXV, 104; XXXII, 52; Sahas., pp. 40, 56, 165, 185.
⁵ Rijv., p. 22.
⁶ K. Indrapala, op. cit., p. 79.
Erupotāna and Periyapuliyanākalam\(^1\) suggest that the area was inhabited by Sinhalese since very ancient times. Vedikinnari-malai, in Mēlpattu East of North Vavuniyā in the Vavuniyā District; 2 miles north-east of Ariyamaḍu, is another site with pre-Christian cave inscriptions.\(^2\) The famous Kurundi Vihāra in Karikaṭṭu-malai of the south division of the Vavuniyā District is mentioned in the Āṭṭhakathās and chronicles.\(^3\)

A number of village names and tanks occurring in our sources with reference to the period under discussion suggest that there were more village settlements and further expansion of Sinhalese activities in this district. A Sīgiri graffito mentions a village called Kokalā identifiable with modern Kokkilāy.\(^4\) The Māmaḍu inscription of the ninth century A.D., 8 miles north-east of Vavuniyā refers to the tank and the village by the name of Mahidavāva.\(^5\) The tank may well be identified with the Mahindatāṛaka Tank restored by Parākramabāhu I (1153-1186 A.D.).\(^6\) Unfortunately,

\(^3\) Manorathapurāna, I, p. 59; Mv., XXXIII, 32; Pjv., pp. 28, 42.
\(^4\) Sig. Graffi, v. 230
\(^5\) CJSC, II, p. 117.
\(^6\) Cv., LXXIX, 28.
the date of its foundation is unknown. A place named Nāgirigala is mentioned in the Buddhannehāla inscription of the tenth century A.D. about 7 miles north of modern Padaviya.¹

As attested by archaeological ruins, tanks and inscriptions, a considerable part of the Trincomalee District appears to have been settled by Sinhalese from pre-Christian times. We intend to discuss the emergence of Gokāṇṇagāma (modern Trincomalee) in connexion with the paṭṭansagāmas. Among other villages, Abagamiya is mentioned in a pre-Christian cave inscription at Nāccēri-malai, near Kuccavēli.² There are inscriptions of the first century A.D. at Nīlapānikkan-kulam-malai about 5 miles north-west of Kuccavēli. One of these inscriptions refers to the Kakelakuvahanaka Vihāra and registers a grant of the Hayigaraya Tank to this vihāra.³ Near the 50th mile post on the road running from Batticaloa to Trincomalee there are a number of pre-Christian insessional sites.⁴ In an inscription of Bhāṭika Tissa (19 B.C.-9 A.D.) on the

³. JCBRAS (NS.), VI, 1963, p. 45.
hill near Periyakulam refers to the Abagara Vihāra at Velagama. \(^1\) It is believed that the ruins at Nātānār Kovil, near Periyakulam, are those of the Abagara Vihāra. \(^2\) There is evidence to show that this vihāra was in existence during the Cōla occupation in Rājarāṭtha. The Cōlas made donations to the shrine of the Buddha in this monastery, renovated its other buildings, and re-named the vihāra Rājarāja Perumpalli after the name of king Rājarāja I. \(^3\) The Cūlavamsa mentions that Niśānākamalla (1187-1196 A.D.) restored the Velagāma Vihāra, \(^4\) probably the Rājarāja Perumpalli. There is another ancient ruined building at Kalkulam, about 4 miles to the south-west of Kiliveṭṭi. An inscription, attributable to the fourth century A.D., found at this site, reveals that the site was known as Garimahalaka Mahaharara and ascribes its foundation to Duṭṭaka Gamaṇī Aba Raja (Duṭṭhagāmaṇī Abhaya ?). \(^5\)

Nācciyar-malai in Kāṭṭukulam Pattu East in the Trincomalee District, a mile and half south-west

---

1. CJSG, II, p. 199.
3. JCBRAS (NS), VI, 1963, p. 45.
4. CV., LX, 62.
5. JCBRAS (NS.), VI, 1963, p. 45.
of the 19th mile post on the road running from Trincomalee to Pulmoṭṭai, is also a pre-Christian Sinhalese settlement.¹ Tiriyāy in the same pattu, a mile south-west of the 30th mile post on the same road, appears to have been an ancient coastal village. A cave inscription in early Brāhmi script found at this site states that a daughter of a certain Parumaka² granted a cave to the Buddhist Saṅgha.³ According to a legend, two merchants named Tapassu and Bhalluka enshrined the Hair Relics of Gautama Buddha, which they had received from the Buddha himself,⁴ in a cetiya at Girikanḍa in Ceylon.⁵ An inscription attributable to the seventh century A.D. at Tiriyāy states that Trapuṣyaka (Pali, Tapassu-ka)⁶ and Vallika (Pali, Bhalluka) founded the Girikanḍa Cetiya.⁷ At present there are

6. See for a discussion of additional ka which has been combined with the name Tapassu, W. Rahula, *History of Buddhism in Ceylon*, p. 241, note, 5.
ruins of a *vaṭadāgē* 'circular relic shrine', attributable to the seventh or to the eighth century A.D. at this inscriptionsal site. The *Visuddhimagga* speaks of a village called *Vattakāla* in the vicinity of Giri-kaṇḍa Mahāvihāra. Puḷmaṭṭai, in the same *pattu*, a mile south-west from the 35th mile post on the same road another Sinhalese settlement existing from pre-Christian times as attested by an inscription *in situ*. We come across another Sinhalese settlement existing from pre-Christian times in *Kallakulam Pattu* of the Trincomalee District about 18 miles south-west of Trincomalee. There was a village called *Saṅgilla* where prince Mahānāga lived before his becoming king.

A large reservoir called Gangātaṭa or Gantāḷā (present Kantalāy), situated about 15 miles south-west of Trincomalee, constructed by Aggabodhi II (608-618 A.D.), is interesting as evidence for the existence of Sinhalese settlements in that area during the time of Aggabodhi II or perhaps even earlier. As attested by

---

an inscription this area was in flourishing condition during the twelfth century A.D.¹

The greater part of the Pānama Pattu, the southernmost division of Batticaloa and Ampārai Districts, is still covered with forest, but this area was settled by Sinhalese in pre-Christian times and also during the period under review as inscriptions and archaeological remains attest. In this area more than thirty pre-Christian inscriptional sites have already been found. Nāmaluva is one such site, situated near the boundary between Pānama Pattu and Badulla Districts and close to the north bank of the Hāḍa Oya, where there are several inscriptions dating from the first century B.C. to the fourth century A.D. Two of these inscriptions can be attributed to Sirimekavāṇa Abha Maharaja (Sirimeghavanṇa 303-331 A.D.).² Akurukėţūgala, about 20 miles north of Kūmuma is a ruined site, which has not yet been excavated. It contains a number of inscriptions of the fourth century A.D. which provide us with the name of Karapavata Maha-vihara, and of the villages Garadara and Mayulavila,

¹  JCBRAS (NS ), VI, 1963, p. 23.
²   Ibid., loco cit.
which cannot be identified at present.\(^1\) The village Mayulavila again occurs together with another village named Citagala in an inscription of the fifth century A.D. situated 20 miles south of the above mentioned inscripational site.\(^2\) Kiri\(_{\text{kunu-hela}},\) about 2 miles south of Bambbaragas-talāva, is another inscripational site where there are five inscriptions attributable to pre-Christian times and one to the fifth century A.D. The latter mentions the village Kunarivata.\(^3\)

Pānamavāva Viha\(\text{r}a\), close by the Pānama tank and about 2 miles from the village Pānama appears to have been a pre-Christian village as there are early Brāhmī cave inscriptions in situ.\(^4\) There are references to this village in the inscriptions of the fifth and seventh century A.D., too.\(^5\) Bōvattēgala, 3 miles north-west of Kumuna, is another inscripational site where there are pre-Christian inscriptions as well as inscriptions of the seventh century A.D.\(^6\)

---

2. Ibid., loc. cit.
Many parts of the Gal Oya valley appear to have been settled by Sinhalese in pre-Christian times. One of such parts was the village Dīghavāpi and its outskirts.¹ Rājagala or Rassahela, on the eastern side of the Divulāṇa Tank, was another such village.² In this village there are three inscriptions of the reign of Mahinda II (777-797 A.D.).³ Similarly, Ampāraī and its vicinity appear to have been settled by Sinhalese in pre-Christian times as attested by inscriptions.⁴ Verapadāva, near Toṭṭama was a Sinhalese settlement at least from the second century A.D. to the seventh century, as we find inscriptions in situ attributable to these two centuries.⁵ There are also inscriptions attributable to the third and to the fourth century A.D. at Pokunudeka, 6 miles from Uhana. Close by this site, there are a pre-Christian cave inscription and a pillar inscription at Koṇḍavaṭṭavan.⁶

---

5. JCBRAS (NS ) VI, 1963, p.28.
6. Ibid., loc. cit.
Near Batticaloa, there were Sinhalese settle-
ments in pre-Christian times and onwards. Kusalānakanda,
2 miles north of the 3rd mile post on the road running
from Badulla to Batticaloa, is one such settlement.¹
There was another village at Kalūquotāna-malai, about
4 miles west of the above mentioned mile post on the
same road.² Henannegala was another one situated about
6 miles north-west of the 67th mile post on the above
mentioned road. Cave inscriptions found at this site
are attributable to the third or to the second century
B.C.; these inscriptions contain the following villages:-
Kaśabanagara, Giritiṣagama, Karajhini-Tiṣagama, Vilagama
Mulugama and Nokapika.³ Nuvaragala, about 6 miles
south-east of the 63rd mile post on the above mentioned
road contains inscriptions of Saddhātissa (137-119 B.C.).⁴
About 2 miles north of the above mentioned mile post
on the same road another Sinhalese settlement appears
to have been in existence from pre-Christian times.
Now this village is known as Veheragala. Ōmuṇagala,
about 7 miles north of the latter,⁵ and Niyaṇdavarā-

². Ibid., p. 31, nos. 396-398.
³. Ibid., p. 32, no. 406.
⁴. Ibid., p. 31, no. 404.
⁵. Ibid., p. 31, no. 403.
gala, 4 miles north-west of the 77th mile post on the above mentioned road are some other pre-Christian inscriptionsites.¹ An inscription of Vasabha (65-109 A.D.) has been found at Kūmacōlai, about 1 mile south-west of the 92nd mile post on the above-mentioned road.² At Vehera Uḍa-malai, about 3 miles north-west of the 89th mile post on the above mentioned road we find also an ancient inscription which registers a grant of an irrigation canal to the Dakapahanaka Vihāra.³ In addition, Katiraveli at the 44th mile post on the road from Batticaloa to Trincomalee contains pre-Christian ruins.⁴

Many parts of the Mannar District, particularly, the area of both sides of the Malvatu Oya appear to have been populated towards the beginning of the fifth century A.D. The ancient route from Anurādhapura to Mahātīttha was built along the south bank of the Malvatu Oya.⁵ It has convincingly argued that the earliest Sinhalese colonies such as Tambapanni and Upatissagāma were situated in the Mannār Dis-

¹ Inscr. Ceyl., p.31, no.399-402.
² JCBRAS. (NS.), VI, 1963, p.32.
³ Ibid., loc. cit.
⁴ Ibid., p.33.
trict in the vicinity of the extreme northern part of the Malvatu Oya.\textsuperscript{1} Mahātiththa (present Māntai), the main port of ancient and medieval Ceylon, by about the sixth century A.D. became the centre of Sinhalese sea-borne trade in the Indian ocean.\textsuperscript{2} Apart from the above-mentioned coastal towns and villages there were some other settlements in the interior of the district. Thus, two mutilated inscriptions attributable to the second century A.D. at Tonikallu, 6 miles from Periyakaṅcikulam, off the Akattimurippu road, refer to the grant of fields and money to a monastery.\textsuperscript{3}

There are a few references in inscriptions of the first century A.D. to the third century to a place called Magana Nakara situated to the south of Mahātiththa.\textsuperscript{4}

It becomes clear from our sources that there were many more villages and tanks in this district in existence during the period from the fourth to the tenth century A.D. Among these are the Mānamatta Tank, probably identical with the Giant's Tank, 6

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{JCBERAS (NS.), VI, 1963, pp.74-75.}
\item See \textit{infra, pp.3044.}
\item \textit{JCBERAS (NS.), VI, 1963, p.76.}
\item \textit{Ibid., pp.81-82.}
\end{enumerate}
miles south-east of Mahātīttha, constructed by king Dhātusena (459-477 A.D.)\(^1\) and the Pahangama Tank, present Pānakkāmam Kulam in the division of Māntai, constructed by the same king.\(^2\) It is probable that with the construction of these irrigation works many more areas were opened for cultivation and habitation.

There are two inscriptions of Kassapa V (914-923 A.D.) at Māntai, which refer to seven villages in Uturukuru (northern province).\(^3\)

In the north-western province, comprising the Puttalam and Kurunāgala Districts, we find only few examples of villages, monasteries and tanks other than those known already from the early part of the Anurādhapura period. A short examination of these references would reveal that most parts of this province were under the occupation of Sinhalese before the period under review. At Piccanḍiyāva, 9 miles south-east of the 9th mile on the Puttalam-Anurādhapura road there are a number of Brāhmī inscriptions.\(^4\) In the vicinity of this site there are also monuments at

---

1. Pjv., p. 27; Nks., p. 23.
2. Pjv., p. 27; Nks., p. 23; JCBRAS (NS), VII, 1961, p. 53.
Mullegamakanda.¹ There are a number of Brāhmī inscriptions on the rock of Tōṇigala near the 39th mile post on the Kurunēgala-Puttalam road.² At Virañđa-ogda there is another cave inscription attributable to the second or to the first century B.C.³ We find an inscription attributable to the second half of the eighth century or the first half of the ninth century A.D. at this site.⁴ The third-century inscription of Malasnegala, about 5 miles from the 17th mile post on the same road, refers to the Tisaviya Tank and the Kaladigevi Town (nakariya) as well as to a vihāra.⁵ There are more pre-Christian inscriptions at Vera-gala, 7 miles east of the 10th mile post on the road to Puttalam from Kurunēgala.⁶ Könvāvakanda and Kīnagaha-vāvakanda are other pre-Christian sites situated about 6 miles to the east of the 13th mile post on the above road.⁷ There are more inscriptiveal sites near the 15th mile post on the same road.⁸

1. Inscr. Ceyl., p. 84, nos. 1069-1074; p. 100, no. 1234.
2. Ibid., p. 82, nos. 1051-1052.
3. Ibid., p. 85, nos. 1088-1098.
5. JCEBAS (NS), VI, 1963, p. 90.
7. Ibid., p. 85, nos. 1081-1082.
8. Ibid., p. 100.
Uruvela, one of the earliest Sinhalese settlements in Ceylon, has recently been identified by an inscription with a site near the mouth of the Kalā Oya.¹ The Galgē Vihāra Cave Inscription of the first century A.D. records the Vāhalkaḍa Tank. This may be the breached tank near the ruins at Galgē Vihāra, about 8 miles south-east of Pomparippuva.² The Pattī-eliya Inscription of the tenth century, a few miles north of the Galgē Vihāra suggests further expansion of Sinhalese settlements in this area.³

Similarly, according to epigraphic and archaeological evidence, most parts of the Kurunāgala district appear to have been settled by Sinhalese before the beginning of the period under consideration. The Vanni Hatpattu in the dry-zone, situated between the Kāla Nadī or Goṇa Nadī (present Kalā Oya) and the Jajjara Nadī (present Dāduru Oya), was well irrigated in ancient times by larger tanks, river diversions, dams and canals.⁴ Also there are a number of pre-Christian inscriptive sites in this Hatpattu: at the Veragala

¹ Dv., XXI, 47; Mv., VII, 45; IX, 9; JCBRAS (NS), VI, 1963, p. 89.
³ Ibid., 1954, p. 38, no 44.
⁴ JCBRAS (NS), VI, 1960, pp. 52-53.
Vihāra in the modern village of Giribāva of the Mī-Oyen Egōḍa Kōralē, there is a Brāhmi inscription.\(^1\) There are fourteen cave inscriptions at Gallena Vihāra, 2 miles west of the 47th mile post on the Kurunāgalā-Anurādhapura road.\(^2\) The Kāḍigala Inscription records another pre-Christian site at about 3 miles north-west of the 49th mile post on the above mentioned road.\(^3\)

One more pre-Christian inscription is found at Pāḍi-pancāva, 2 miles east of mile stone 44 on the same road.\(^4\) Also 2 miles east of the 48th mile stone on the same road there are archaeological remains with an inscription of king Mahāsena (276-303 A.D.).\(^5\)

Along the Galgamuva-Minnēriya road, too, there are inscriptions and archaeological remains attributable to an earlier period. For instance, there are ruins with inscriptions of the first century B.C. at Tōṅigala and Pāḍigala, 1 mile south and 3 miles south-west respectively of the 6th mile post on the

---

1. JCBRAS (NS), VI, 1963, p. 92.
4. JCBRAS (NS), VI, 1963, p. 94.
5. Ibid., Loc. cit.
above-mentioned road.\(^1\) Also there are inscriptions of the second century B.C. and of the second century A.D. at the Tōravāva-Mayilāva Vihāra, 2 miles south of the 7th mile post on the same road.\(^2\) Another inscription of the second century A.D., at Saṅghapālakanda, 3 miles north of the 6th mile post on this road records the donation of shares of the Narivigamaka Tank to Girimalaka Vihāra.\(^3\) King Sūratissa of the second century B.C. is said to have built the Nagaragana Vihāra in the southern division of the Anurādhapura kingdom.\(^4\) An inscription of the second century A.D. at the Āsvādduma ruins, 2 miles east of Aṁbanpola refers to the Nakaragana nunnery,\(^5\) identified by C.W.Nicholas with the vihāra.\(^6\)

There is evidence to show that there were Sinhalese settlements at and around Nikavāraṭiya also by about the first century A.D.\(^7\) However, it was in the time of Mahāsena (276-303 A.D.) that some large

\(^{1}\text{Inscr. Ceyl., p.82, nos.1051-1052.}\)
\(^{2}\text{JCERAS (NS ), VI, 1963, p.93.}\)
\(^{3}\text{Ibid., p.94.}\)
\(^{4}\text{MV., XXI, 1.}\)
\(^{5}\text{JCERAS (NS ), VI, 1963, p.95.}\)
\(^{6}\text{Ibid., loc. cit.}\)
\(^{7}\text{CJSIG, II, p.126.}\)
reservoirs were made in this area. The Sulugalu tank built during his reign\(^1\) can be identified with the present Hulugalla tank, five miles north-east of Nikavāraṭiya. A tenth-century inscription informs us that this tank was then called Sulugalu.\(^2\)

Along the Māhō-Nikavāva road there were also some Sinhalese settlements dating back to the pre-Christian centuries. Diyabāṭṭa is one such site situated about 2 miles to the south of the 18th mile post on the above mentioned road.\(^3\) Dikgala, near Tiṁbiriyāva, 2 miles north of the 6th mile stone on the same road, is a first-century inscriptive site.\(^4\) Hinukvāva, 3 miles south of the 14th mile stone, is a second-century A.D. inscriptive site.\(^5\) In this area the only inscription belonging to the period under discussion is the Nillakgama inscription of the eighth-or ninth-century.\(^6\)

However, on the Hiripitiya-Polpitigama road

1. Piy., p. 24; Riv., p. 52.
4. CJSG, II, p. 126.
5. JCBRAS (NS.), VI, 1963, p. 96.
we find inscriptions belonging to only later times: the earliest inscription, i.e. the Karambāva inscription, about 4 miles west of mile stone 22 on this road, belonging to the sixth century A.D., it mentions the donation to a vihāra of the village Kadaragamaya and Cahanagamaya. ¹

Most parts of Hiriyāla Hatpattu appear to have also been occupied by Sinhalese well before our period. Sāssēruva, on the boundary of the present Anurādhapura and Kurunagala Districts, 8 miles north-east of the 8th mile post on the Galgamuva-Nikavāva road,² Kaduruvāva, about 3 miles north-east of the 8th mile on the same road,³ Gaṇekanda Vihāra, 3 miles north-east of Polpitigama,⁴ Akuruketiūgala, about 2 miles west of the 29th mile stone on the Ibbāgamuva-Polpitigama road,⁵ Kottala-Kīmbiyāva, 6 miles north of Hiripitiya,⁶ Eruvāva, near Aṃbanpolā,⁷ Dāgama, near the 15th mile post on the Ibbāgamuva-Polpitigama road,⁸ Tittavela,

---

1. JCBRAS (NS), VI, 1963, p.96.
5. CJSG, TI, 1926-1933.
8. CJSG, TI, 1925-1933.
near the 7th mile post on the same road,\(^1\) Rangirimada, 1 mile west of the 6th mile post on the same road\(^2\) Mādiriya and Arangama, near the 2nd and 3rd mile post respectively on the same road,\(^3\) Periyakaḍu Vihāra at Nālava, 3 miles north of the 7th mile stone on the Kuruṇāgala-Dambulla road,\(^4\) Mahamūkalan-yāya, near Dolukanda,\(^5\) Uturupav Vihāra, 1 mile north of the 12th mile on the above mentioned road,\(^6\) Sangama Vihāra, 2 miles east of the 14th mile stone on the same road, Raṇagiri, near Devagiri, 4 miles north-west of the same road\(^7\) are all sites in the Hiriyāla Hatpattu where Sinhalese had settled down before the period under review.

Pūjāgala, 2 miles west of the 8th mile post on the Ibbagamuva-Polpitigama road is mentioned for the first time in the inscriptions of the fourth century A.D.\(^8\) Another village by the name of Kihapuya

---

3. Ibid., p. 226.
is mentioned in a sixth-century inscription at Gal-kătiyāgama, 4 miles south-west of Polpitigama. Fālu Hangamuva, about 2 miles east of the 11th mile post on the Ibbāgamuva-Polpitigama road is one more Sinhalese settlement referred to for the first time in an inscription attributable to the sixth century A.D.²

There is also evidence for major irrigation works which were undertaken in this area during the period under consideration. The Mahāeli Tank of Dhātu-sena (459-477 A.D.), has been identified with the present Māeliyavāva near the 12th mile post on the Ibbāgamuva-Polpitigama road.³ This may be a correct identification because as the inscription of king Sena II (853-887 A.D.) by the side of this tank mentions the site as Māeli Arama.⁴ This also suggests that there were a tank and also a vihāra by the name of Māeli just as in the case of Kalāvāva. It also seems quite possible that the Kumbālaka Tank of Mahāsena (276-303 A.D.) can be identified with the large

1. CJSAS, II, p. 102.
3. JCBRAS (NS), XII, 1960, p. 51.
4. CJSAS, I, p. 124.
breached reservoir on the Kiṃbulvāna Oya.\(^1\) The identifi-
cation of the Sirivādamāṇaka Tank of Aggabodhi I
(575-608 A.D.) with the present Siridunna Tank, 3
miles north-east of Vāllaṅa seems also justifiable,\(^2\)
because in addition to some similarity between the
two names of the tanks, the Čuḷavamsa indicates that
this tank was built in Dakkhiṇadesa.\(^3\)

The sites of earlier inscriptions, widely
scattered in the Dēvamādi Hatpattu suggest that
village settlements had already emerged there before
the fourth century A.D. As these examples have already
been discussed by others,\(^4\) no recapitulation is needed
here. The only inscrptional site belonging to the
period of the present study where there is no ins-
cription of the preceding period is Gonnāva, 2 miles
north of the 8th mile post on the Kurunagala-Nārammala
road.\(^5\) It is, however, worth noting that Gonāva is
situated only about 3 miles distance from Amaragalaka
which is a first-century (B.C.) inscrptional site.\(^6\)

---

2. Ibid., loc. cit.
3. Cv., XLII, 8.
4. JCBRAS (NS.), VI, 1963, pp.102-104; Inscr. Ceyl., pp.71-72,
nos.910-931a; p.96, no.1193.
5. Ep. Ceyl., IV, p.190; this record is attributable to
the tenth century A.D.
Similarly, in the Vāuḍavilli Hatpattu, most inscriptional sites belong to an earlier period. The sites of pre-Christian inscriptions are at Vilbā Vihāra close to Kurunāgala,¹ Kuṁburulena, near the 9th mile on the Ramboḍagalla road,² Rāgala Vihāra, near the 12th mile post from the Ridī Vihāra, on the Ramboḍagalla road, Delvita, near the 14th mile on the same road, Bāoruva Vihāra and Kandēgedara Vihāra near Delvita.³ The Yaṭīvila inscription of the second century A.D. near Vauḍa refers to a tank by the name of Cakora.⁴ But only two new inscriptional sites are found during the period under consideration from this Hatpattu, viz. Alavva, 6 miles east of Kurunāgala and Diya Vehara at Pallegama near Vauḍa.⁵

There are neither archaeological remains nor inscriptions at Katugampola Hatpattu that are attributable to the Anurādhapura period. Nor is there any evidence in literary sources to determine whether there was any Sinhalese settlement there in that

1. CJSG., II, p.212.
2. Ibid., p.194.
4. Ibid., p.220.
5. Ibid., pp.213 and 219 respectively.
period. There is only a legend that it was at Pañduvas Nuvara (in the Giritalan Kōraḷē, 3 miles from Hēṭtipola towards Kuruṇāgala) that Cittā, the mother of Pañdu-kābhaya, was arrested.

Despite the lack of more direct evidence there can be no doubt that part of this area was populated in at least the latter part of the Anurādhapura period. We are told in the Cūlavaṃsā that king Vijayabāhu I (1055-1110 A.D.) restored a tank by the name of Pañḍava-vāpi.¹ The same text also describes how Parākramabāhu I (1153-1186 A.D.) enlarged the Pañḍavāpi,² which was thenceforward known as the first Parakkamasamudda or Pāna Samudda at Parakkamapura (i.e. Pañduvas Nuvara).³ It therefore follows that the Pañḍavāpi at Pañduvas Nuvara was already in existence as it was restored by Vijayabāhu I. The original tank must therefore belong to the Anurādhapura period. Unfortunately, none of our sources mentions the founder of this tank.

¹ Cū., LX, 48.
² Ibid., LXVIII, 39-42.
³ Se for his second vāpi by the same name which was constructed at Polonnaruva: Cū., LXXIX, 24-26; see also for a detailed study of his irrigation works, CHJ, IV, pp. 52-68.
Similarly, we are told nothing about the foundation of the Seṭṭhivāpi, to be identified with the present Heṭṭipola Vāva, which was restored by Parākrambāhu I (1153-1186 A.D.).

Some pre-Christian inscriptional sites situated at Nārammala, Giriulla and Alavva of the Daṁbadeṇī Hatpattu suggest that these places have been occupied by Sinhalese from the pre-Christian centuries. Also a first-century (A.D.) inscription at Māṭiyangana Vihāra near the 16th mile stone on the Kuruntagala-Giriulla road refers to the grant of the Kandaka Tank to the Mati Vihāra. This Hatpattu became politically of importance after Daṁbadeṇīya became the royal residence of king Vijayabāhu III (1232-1236 A.D.).

In so far as epigraphic evidence is concerned the first Sinhalese settlements at Polonnaruva do not go back to earlier than the first century A.D.

Yet, according to the chronicles Vijitagāma was one

2. CJSG, II, pp. 191, 209, 210 respectively.
of the earliest settlements,¹ which has been identified with a settlement at or very near Polonnaruva by H. Parker, S. Paranavitana and C. W. Nicholas.² Mandalagiri Vihāra (modern Mādirigiriya, Mādirigiri in inscriptions),³ ten miles north-east of Minneriya, is another ancient site where king Kānīṭṭhatissa (164-192 A.D.) built an Uposatha house.⁴ A Malayarāja, son of Aggabodhi IV (667-683 A.D.), built the dhātugeha (most probably vaṭadāge) for the cetiya at Mandalagiri Vihāra.⁵

Thus, it becomes clear that there are stray references to the Sinhalese settlements in and around Polonnaruva before the period with which we are concerned. But it appears to have taken some time before large irrigation works were completed in this area, enabling the people to clear the jungle for cultivation and habitation in some parts of this area. We read in the Pūjāvaliya and Rājāvaliya that king Upatissa I (368-410 A.D.) built a tank by the name of Topāvāva.⁶

¹. Dy., IX, 10; X, 1-6; My., VII, 45.
². Ancient Ceylon, pp. 237ff; A Concise History of Ceylon, p. 20 respectively; see also UCHC, (vol. I, pt.) I, p. 158.
⁵. Cv., XLVI, 29.
⁶. Piv., p. 26; Riv., p. 54.
An attempt has been made by C.W. Nicholas to identify this work with the present tank of this name at Polonnaruva. He writes as follows:

'The Sinhalese Chronicles, *Pūjāvaliya* and *Rājāvaliya*, state that this king built Tōpāvāva, the original reservoir at Polonnaruva: this tank is called Thusavāpi or Toyavāpi in the Cūlavamsa'.

From the way in which Nicholas argued one would get the impression that the *Pūjāvaliya* and the *Rājāvaliya* indicate not only the construction of the Tōpāvāva Tank but also its precise location. Yet, as mentioned above, this is by no means the case. Nicholas called attention to the Cūlavamsa 50,73 and 79,40-53 in support of his argument that the three tanks (i.e. Tōpāvāva, Thusavāpi and Toyavāpi) refer to one and the same work. Yet, there seems to be no evidence in these verses in support of his argument. In 50,73 we read only that '(Sena I) built the tank Thusavāpi at Pulatthinagara' (Pulatthinagare'kāsi vāpi Thusavāpiyam). Although he has referred to several verses of chapter 79 as mentioned above, it is only one (i.e. verse 49) which is relevant to the matter. But regretfully, this

1. *I.e.* Upatissa.
3. Ibid., p. 52, fn. 35.
also contains no basis for a conclusion such as that arrived at by Nicholas. This stanza just records that Parākramabāhu I (1153-1186 A.D.) made a canal from the Toyavāpi. Thus, the way in which our scholar argued to identify the Tōpāvāva of the Siṃhalese chronicles, unfortunately, does not prove satisfactory. It is, however, not possible but probable that the said Tōpāvāva is situated at Polonnaruva. There is no conclusive evidence to identify the present Tōpāvāva with the tank built by king Upatissa. Similarly, it is doubtful whether one and the same work is meant by Tōpāvāva, Thusavāpi and Toyavāpi. Moreover, it is doubtful whether we have a reference to a tank by the name of Tōpāvāva made by order of Upatissa. Because firstly, as has already been seen, this reference is confined to the later sources. Secondly, though the author of the Cūlavamsa provides us with a list of irrigation works by this king, the tank Tōpāvāva does not appear in it. The first reference to a tank at Polonnaruva in the Cūlavamsa falls to the reign of Sena I (833-853 A.D.). Before then, it appears to have been

1. For his tanks see Cv., XXXVII, 185-186.
2. Cv., L, 73.
emerged two large reservoirs i.e., the Manihira by king Mahāsena (276-303 A.D.) and Giritaṭa by king Aggabodhi II (608-618 A.D.), but about 15 miles distance from Polonnaruva. 1

It is to be noted that Polonnaruva became important in the political field from about the latter part of the seventh century. By the close of the period under review it had developed into one of the main administrative centres of the Island. It may seem curious that Polonnaruva was the place where some kings of the latter part of the Anurādhapura period spent the last years of their life. Aggabodhi IV (667-683 A.D.) was the first king who thus died at Polonnaruva. 2 No particular reason is given in the chronicles to explain for this change of the seat of government from Anurādhapura to Polonnaruva on the eve of his reign. Moreover, there is no trace of any serious political disturbance during this reign. Aggabodhi VII (772-777 A.D.), Sena I (833-853 A.D.) and Sena V (972-982 A.D.) were others who followed this example. 3

1. MV.,XXXVI,12 and 42,67 respectively.
2. Ibid.,XLVI,34.
3. Ibid.,XLVII,74;L,73-85 and LIV,68-72 respectively.
Some scholars are of the opinion that from the reign of Sena I, Anuradhapura ceased to be the capital of Ceylon and Polonnaruva became the capital, except for a brief interval during the reign of Mahinda V (982–1029 A.D.). But this is no longer a valid argument.

It is true that Sena I had to face a Pāṇḍya invasion and Sena V had to overcome some internal difficulties but there appears no connexion between these events and the change of residence to Polonnaruva by these kings. The Cūlavamsa would have us believe that they moved to Polonnaruva only when they had overcome the troubles that they had to face. In addition, there is nothing to suggest that they concentrated on any security measures while they were in their new residence. Instead, they appear to have retired in the last part of their life concentrating on various meritorious works. Whatever may have been the reasons for these kings to choose Polonnaruva as

3. Some of them seem to have enjoyed peace drinking surā see *Cv.*, LIV, 70–72.
the last residence of their life, it is clear that their action greatly contributed to the development of Pulatthinagara (Pali) into an important town. It is also likely that these new developments influenced the whole area. We learn from the chronicles that a hospital (vejjasāla), alms halls, vihāras and pari-venas emerged in and around Polonnaruva during this time.

In the previous pages an attempt has been made to examine the extent to which Sinhalese had expanded their settlements in the country by about the close of the tenth century A.D. It is evident that there are many examples in our sources demonstrating the existence of numerous village settlements widely scattered over the Island which were not recorded in an earlier period. It is possible that only some of these indicate the emergence of new settlements, but even so they deserve consideration because they constitute the first available evidence for the existence of these villages.

1. Mv., L, 75; LII, 25.
2. Ibid., L, 73-74; 76-81; 83-84.
3. Ibid., L, 83.
In the light of these findings it follows that a considerable part of the Island had become open for Sinhalese habitation by about the close of the Anuradhapura period. In fact, most parts of the Anuradhapura, Hambantoṭa, Jaffna, Trincomalee, Puttalam, Kurunāgala and Mātalē districts were settled by Sinhalese during about two centuries after the fourth century A.D. The many parts of Polonnaruva, Kalutara, Nuvara Eliya and Badulla districts seem to have been populated only towards the close of our period. It was revealed that there are some parts of the Island, particularly the upper mountainous-zone over 3,500 feet, that were still left uncultivated and unpopulated even after the period under review, although some of these were populated in the following centuries. It also seems that the area north of Vavuniyā, Mannār and the eastern coast from Polonnaruva to Rohaṇa, and especially South-western Ceylon shows only few remains.

It is possible that some village settlements, which had been ruined in the course of time by invasions floods or famine had to be re-established.
There are, however, several village settlements mentioned in the chronicles which still remain unidentified because of lack of evidence.

The available inscriptions, literary works and archaeological discoveries in our study have proved inadequate in the reconstruction of a comprehensive history of the emergence of new settlements. Moreover, a study like this presents a number of problems that cannot be solved purely with the help of the above mentioned materials. Other branches of studies such as study of place names and Historical Geography have an important role to play in the solution of these problems.
Chapter Six

PATTERNS OF VILLAGE SETTLEMENT

In the light of the foregoing survey of the Sinhalese settlements existing in the Island by about the close of the tenth century A.D. it follows that the settled area was considerable in extent and complex. Village or town life differed not only from settlement to settlement but also within the individual settlements. On the other hand, a network of relationships, constituted mainly on the basis of caste affiliations or occupation, connected one village with some of the others. It is for these reasons, that a study of the patterns of settlements is of great value for the understanding of social conditions.

Local groupings of one sort or another such as (Pali) gāma, nigama, nagara; (Sinhalese) gam, niyam-gam, paṭun-gam, nuvara, the differences between which are not always clear,

require elucidation. According to the Vinaya, gāma means a place which may have consisted of even one single kuṭi or two, three or four kuṭis.¹ The Samantapāsādikā, the commentary to the above text, makes it clear that kuṭi in this context means a house (geha). It also explains that there were hamlets of a single geha in the Malaya Janapada ('Central Hill country').² It is certain that the foundation of villages in Malaya was seriously handicapped by its rocky mountains (giridugga) and forest strongholds (vanadugga).³ As has already been seen,⁴ most parts of this region had remained unpopulated and uncultivated till about sixteen centuries after the first arrival of Sinhalese in the Island. Hence, the paucity of homesteads and therefore of village settlements in this region in the time of Buddhaghosa causes no surprise.

N. Wagle pointed out that in the Vinaya the

expression 'a gāma of one kuṭi' indicates dispersed settlements in the Gangetic valley in India. ¹ In addition, we are told in its Ṭṭṭhakathā that there were such hamlets in Ceylon, too, as mentioned above. Wagle also pointed out that this type of gāma would probably refer to a hamlet of one house, perhaps surrounded by a smaller buildings in which the dependants and servants of the family dwelt. ² In Ceylon too, some hamlets, the earliest Sinhalese settlements in particular, were most probably confined to a few houses or perhaps to a single one. According to the chronicles, the ministers of Vijaya established their own settlements and dwelt there. ³ Similarly, the brothers of Bhaddakaccānā dwelt in their own residences (nivāsa) and these residences were thereafter called gāmas. ⁴ In addition, as we shall see, ⁵ there were gāmas, particularly, those received as pamunu 'heritable property', which were occupied sometimes only by members

2. Ibid., loc. cit.
4. Ibid., IX, 9-10.
5. Infra, p. 394.
of a single joint family. Thus 'a one-kuti gāma' may also mean a hamlet confined to a single household. It is also worth noting that dispersed settlements confined to a limited number of houses, perhaps even to a single homestead, are by no means rare, not only in the 'Central Hill country' but also in some other areas in present Ceylon.

It is, however, considered that the ideal village should consist of several homesteads. Thus, the Jātakas maintain that the average gāma should consist of houses numbering from thirty to one thousand. 1 According to the Arthasastra, a village was not to consist of fewer than one hundred or more than five hundred families. 2 The Visuddhimagga considered the village a unit of at least thirty families. 3 As we shall see, generally, the families of people belonging to a single kin-group who carried out a similar occupation lived in a separate village. 4

Yet again the Vinaya defined: samanusso πι

4. See infra, pp.388ff.
There can be no doubt that by *amanusso gāmo* 'a village with human beings', i.e. an inhabited place, is meant. The phrase *amanusso gāmo* has been interpreted by Buddhaghosa as follows:-

"*Amanusso gāmo* means a village haunted by yakkhas as it is by no means occupied by human beings or is deserted (by them) with the intention of coming back".2

This interpretation would apparently have been influenced by the myth that the deserted villages were often the haunts of non-human beings such as yakkhas and petas. We know that in English 'ghost village', 'ghost town' indicate empty villages or towns, possibly because these were regarded as inhabited by ghosts.3 If one leaves out the mythical part from the above information it may suggest that Buddhaghosa speaks of nothing but a deserted village in the above passage. We should not forget ourselves that the Aṭṭhakathās in common with many other ancient literary

1. *Vinaya Piṭaka (PTS ),III, p.46.*
3. There are many ghost towns in the USA.
sources are by no means free from legends, myths and also misinterpretations. Moreover, grammatically the phrase *amanusso gāmo* can only mean 'a village without people'.

In addition, a careful examination of the context in which the phrase *amanusso gāmo* is used may indicate that the term *amanussa* in this case carries the meaning of 'without people' ('devoid of people') rather than 'with non-human beings'. Firstly, the word *amanussa* is used here in contrast to the word *samanussa* 'with people' as in the case *parikkhitta-gāma* 'surrounded village' and *aparikkhitta-gāma* 'unsurrounded village'. When we see that an inhabited village is expressed by the phrase *samanusso gāmo* it would seem likely that *amanusso gāmo* denotes the opposite. Secondly, one would expect that if it had been the intention of the *Vinaya* to describe a village with non-human beings he would have used the compound *sāmanussa* (*saha-amanussa* 'with non-human beings') instead of the term *amanussa* alone, because he did

---

1. E.W. Adikaram has discussed this point in detail, see, *The Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon*, 1949, pp. 23ff.
not use only the simple term *manussa* to mean 'with people'. For the above reasons, as has been proposed by N. Wagle, the phrase *amanusso gāmo* means 'a deserted village'.

It is also necessary to examine as to whether places once occupied by people and deserted afterwards were still called by the term *gāma*. The *Vinaya* explains that a place where caravan traders lived for at least four months before they abandoned it was called a *gāma*. Similarly, *gāmas* destroyed by fire or floods were still called by the same term. The *Samyutta Nikāya* speaks of a *gāma* which was deserted because of fear for robbers. This type of village as also known as *suñña-gāmas* ('empty villages'). In Ceylon it is recorded that certain villages were destroyed by famine or abandoned on account of Tamil invasions. Thus, the *Aţţhakathās* and other sources inform us that both *bhikkhus* and laymen fled here and there (diso disaṇ̃ palāyimsu) as their villages.

---

5. *Visuddhimag.* pp. 484 and 647.
were attacked by the Brāhmaṇa-Tiya famine. Some bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs are recorded to have betaken themselves to India. Thousands, both bhikkhus and laymen, died; some bhikkhus went begging around but found only deserted gāmas. During the Tamil occupation of Rājarattha in the period between (c.) 433 and 459 A.D., Sinhalese nobles who had lived in that part of the Island left their homes and took refuge in Rohaṇa.

Thus, the local grouping gāma means not only an inhabited village but can denote a deserted village, too. Pran Nath preferred to use the term 'land' for deserted gāmas, but this term does not clearly carry the connotation of a deserted gāma. Therefore, we prefer to use 'deserted village' for this type of gāma.

It is also worth noting that some scholars believe that the gama sometimes means 'estate' or

---

1. Three other famines are recorded during the reigns of Duṭṭhagāmaṇi (c.161-137 B.C.), Kuṇcanāga (c.194-195 A.D.) and Saṅghabodhi (c.251-263 A.D.), Mv.,XXXII, 29; XXXVI,20 and 74-90 respectively.
'land'. For instance, S. Paranavitana pointed out that the gāmas mentioned in the edicts of Ceylon of the ninth and tenth centuries as the property of institutions or of nobles indicating 'estates' or 'land'.¹

In support of his argument Paranavitana quoted Pran Nath, who argued that grāma in some Indian contexts does not indicate a village but 'an estate or survey village which can pay government taxes'.² But P.V. Kane has rightly argued that the grāma in the passages, which were quoted by Pran Nath in support of his argument, can only mean 'village'.³ A.K. Choudhary agrees with Kane.⁴

Paranavitana also refers to a particular gama named Gaṅgaḍaṇṭī appearing in the so-called Colombo Museum Inscription of the ninth or tenth century. This gama consisted of two portions called pamunu kābālla and Demel kābālla, Paranavitana takes Gaṅgaḍaṇṭī gama as 'an estate' and considers the above two allotments as two shares of this 'estate'.

---

But unfortunately, he failed to substantiate his argument with evidence. Nor is there anything in the inscriptions to suggest that Gaṅgamaṇi has to be interpreted as an estate. These two कङ्गमाणि भाग्यांमा may well be two parts of the village of Gaṅgamaṇi. As K.Indrapala has pointed out, Demel कङ्गमाणि भाग्यांमा may be the part in which Tamils settled down and the भाग्यांमा मरु भाग्यांमा may well have been the part which belonged to Sinhalese.¹

The Polonnaruva Raja-māligāva Pillar Inscription also mentions two such parts of a village named Kiṅigama, viz. Demel Kiṅigama and Kiṅigama without further qualification. D.M.de Z.Wickremasinghe has rendered the Demel Kiṅigama as 'the village Demel Kiṅigama'.² Kiṅigama was probably the original name of this village and was settled by Sinhalese and it was occupied later on by Tamils, too. For that reason, the village would have split into two, while the part inhabited by Tamils would have been called the village (or hamlet) Demel Kiṅigama.³ It appears,

---

1. Indrapala, op. cit., p.74.
however, from some later edicts that there were a few hamlets in some villages. Thus, we learn from the Ga\d{a}l\d{a}de\={n}i inscription of Bhuvanekab\={a}hu IV (1341-1351 A.D.) that the village Ga\d{a}l\d{a}de\={n}i consisted of two hamlets (gamdebh\={a}gaya), known as Ga\d{a}l\d{a}de\={n}i and Handessa.¹ Significantly, this village still consists of these two hamlets. According to the Vēragama Sannasa of the fifteenth century A.D., a half (bhāgayak) of the village Vēragama was accorded to a scholar called Dhammālaṁkāra.² The presence of several hamlets in some villages is a notable feature of present Ceylon.³

Since Paranavitana also observed that 'in many of the edicts of the ninth and tenth centuries, the word gama has to be similarly understood' (i.e. in the meaning of 'land'), it is necessary to examine a few edicts attributable to those centuries. In the Nāgama Pillar Inscription of the tenth century, it is stated that immunities were granted to the Kolayunugāma.⁴ Similarly, the Kukurumahandamana

Pillar Inscription of the same century states that the officers were authorized to grant immunities to Keralāgāma.¹ This is the stereotyped expression which, in detailed form, occurs again as follows:—

'These immunities and right of asylum are granted to the area included within the four boundaries of the gama named Mahagāpiyova'.² The meaning of gama as found in other edicts quoted by Paranavitana is almost the same as in the above records. Hence, one finds nothing in these to suggest that gama merely implies 'estate'. Gama in the above context, too, would, therefore, mean nothing but settlement and also the fields etc. belonging to it.

Geiger and Jayatilaka have also translated the gama in the context of gamvara as 'land'.³ Julius de Lanerolle supports this interpretation.⁴ But none of the Dictionaries, Pali or Sanskrit, explains these extensions of the term. Geiger and Jayatilaka referred to the Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gaṭapadaya in support of their

---

2. Ibid., p.42.
3. Sinhala Sabdakoṣaya, s.v. aṭa.
4. JCBRAS, XXXIV, 1938, pp.112-113.
translation. This text used the phrase atagamvara corresponding to the atṭhadhamma in the Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā. Unfortunately nothing more is mentioned that enables us to elucidate the meaning of gama in this context. This is the case in the Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā as well. On the other hand, the Pali-English Dictionary interpreted the atṭhadhamma as 'eight excellent villages'.

If there was a chance of ambiguity terms were generally explained in the Dhampiya Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya. For instance, having translated Pali jātassara as jasara (‘lakes’), Kassapa (V), the author of the above text, defined it by using a well known term i.e. vanavil. In making this further elucidation he again wrote: ‘Jātassara means lakes which are made without digging (kāṇā no kāla vil jātassara nam). Similarly, he defined the term panhal (‘halls made by leaves’, i.e. dwellings of ascetics) as follows:–
'Dwellings of ascetics the roofs of which are covered either with tiles or with grass (but) made in the form

3. Dh.A.G., p.35.
of panhal are called by the name of panhal' (ulusiyantanasiyan hotuj panhal ăren kala senasun panhal namvē).\(^1\) Therefore, one would have expected that Kassapa would have explained the term gama in the above context if it had been ambiguous. But no explanation is, in fact, given. On the contrary, he used the term just as in other contexts where it carries the meaning of village.\(^2\) It would therefore seem likely that the term was used in the meaning of village, rather than of land, in the above context.

W. Sorata interpreted also gamvara as 'a land granted as vassalage by the king etc.'\(^3\) In support of his explanation he referred to the Butsaraṇa and the Pūjāvaliya. The passages in question suggest that the term there corresponds to the Pali term gāmavara.\(^4\) No further details are given apart from the statement

---

1. Dh. A. G., p. 13; see for similar passages, pp. 88, 132-208, 209, 215 and 249 etc.
2. Cf. Kasī raṭa gamak (Pali, Kāsi gāmake), 'village in Kāsi', gamat vherekhi (Pali, gāmake vihāre) 'in a village temple', and mahajanāvas āti gamak (Pali, mahajanāvāsamaṃ gāmam) 'a village with a large population') pp. 98, 101 and 219, see for more examples, pp. 28, 94, 96, 257 and 265.
3. Sri Sumangala Șabdakoșaya, s.v. gama.
that king Brahmadatta granted gamvaras to the Bodhi satta. Therefore, in the absence of conclusive evidence, the present author adheres to the older established translation/gamvara as 'excellent villages'.

In addition, we are told in our sources that kings granted inhabited villages to persons and institutions. Thus, the village Mahāgāma in Rohaṇa was once granted to the minister Mahāsaṅgha as his bhuttagāma,¹ and subsequently, to Tissa, another minister, when the former could no longer enjoy this village as he had abandoned it on account of a rebellion of the villagers.² In yet another instance we learn that the village Muggāyatana in Malaya was granted to a noble. In this village there was a vihāra, too.³ The Mannār Kaccēri Pillar Inscription of the ninth century A.D., records that there were inhabitants in the three villages named Pepodatuḍa, Kumbalachala and Tumpokura belonging to the meditation hall (piyangala) named Bahadurusen of the Mahāvihāra.⁴ Fa-hsien mentioned

---

2. Sahas., pp.66 and 188.
3. Ibid., p.124.
that the king (Mahānāma ?) ceded a piece of land to the bhikkhus (of Abhayagiri ?) with all inhabitants, fields and houses on it.

In this connexion, it is also important to examine the implications of bim (Sanskrit and Pali, bhūmi) and watta (Sanskrit, vāstu; Pali, vatthu). As these terms used in connexion with land grants have already been discussed by many scholars, it is not necessary to go into details. It is, however, worth emphasizing that these grants were different from those of gāmas. Thus, the Mihintalē Slab Inscription of Mahinda IV (956-972 A.D.) indicates villages and land belonging to the Cetiyagiri Vihāra at Mihintalē by means of gam and bim respectively. It also mentions some of those gam and bim by name.

Similarly, an Abhayagiri/Pillar Inscription of the

1. A Record of the Buddhist Countries (translated by Li Yung-hsi), 1957, p. 84.
ninth century A.D. refers to gam and bim belonging to the Abhayagiri and Cetiyagiri Vihāras. The slab inscription of Mahinda IV (956-972 A.D.) records some gam and bim belonging to Tamils.

In the Buddhannēhāla Pillar Inscription attributable to the ninth or to the tenth century A.D., it is recorded that there were wattas and gamas belonging to the Cetiyagiri and Nāgiri Vihāras. The Kiribat-Vehera Pillar Inscription of the tenth century A.D. states that a watta was granted to construct a medical house (behed-gah). The Oruvala Sannasa of Parākramabahu VI (1412-1467 A.D.), leaves no doubt that gama means 'village' and watta 'homestead' or 'estate'. It states, in fact, that this watta of Prince Kapura was situated in the middle of the village Aturugiri (Aturugirigama māda Kapura kumārayage watta), it was subsequently granted to a brāhmaṇa called Avuṣjjhala.

There are, however, references to show that gama could mean 'land', 'landed property' or 'estate'.

---

3. Ibid., I, pp.194ff.
4. Ibid., I, p.158.
5. Ibid., III, p.65.
in the later periods. For example, D'Oyily reports that 'the Sinhalese word *gama* properly signifies "village": but in the Kandyan country is also frequently applied to single estate or a single field'.

This statement is in agreement with the *Niti-Nighanduva*, which uses the term very frequently in the meaning of 'landed property' or 'estate'. In colloquial usage this meaning is still attached to the word at present.

In the light of the above discussion it follows first, that an average *gama* (village) was considered to consist of a certain number of homesteads, and all kinds of land attached to it, but the term also indicates dispersed settlements which may have consisted

2. The term *gama* in this text has been translated as 'Estate' and 'Landed property' or 'land': J.A. Armour, *Niti-Nighanduva or Grammar of Kandyan Law*, 1860; T.B. Pandebokke and C.J.R. De Mesurier, *Niti-Nighanduva or the Vocabulary of the Law as it Existed in the Days of Kandyan Kingdom*, 1880.
of even one single house with land. Second, it was established that a village could sometimes be abandoned or left unoccupied for another reason. (We use in our discussion the term village to indicate an inhabited gama; in its other implications it will be defined).

Third, though the term carries the connotation of 'landed property' or 'estate' in the later periods, as in colloquial usage to-day, no conclusive evidence is available for this interpretation of the term during the period under discussion.

The Sinhalese term nivam-gama is equivalent to Sanskrit nigama-grāma or Pali nigama-gāma. In the Sinhalese sources, it is the term nivam-gama which always occurs for the Pali term nigama or nigama-gāma. This is gleaned from the following cases of the Dhampiyā Atuvā Ġātapadaya. Nigamo, nivam-gama ('nigamo means nivam-gama').

2. Nigame, nivam-gamekhi ('nigame means in a nivam-gama').

3. Nigama-gāme, nivam-gamekhi ('nigama-gāme means in a nivam-gama').

4. Sakkara nāma nigamo,

---

1. Cf. (Pali), jagata=(Sinh.), diyal ('world'); see Parevi Sandēsāya, v. 191; Guttila Kāvyava, v. 181; (Pali), nāga=(Sinh.), nayi; see Dh.A.G., p. 249.
3. Ibid., p. 70.
4. Ibid., p. 94.
Sakkara nam niyam-gama ('the nigama-gāma named Sakkara').

In the Indian sources, both literary and epigraphic, the term nigama is found in different contexts. Therefore, no uniform rendering of the term is possible. Thus, the term appearing in one of the Bharhut inscriptions attributable to the third or second century B.C., written in Prakrit, has been rendered by Lüders as 'town'. But this meaning is by no means necessary in the context. The passage runs as follows:— Karahakata nigamasa dānam. There is nothing exact to suggest that Karahakata was a town. Another pre-Christian inscription at the Bhattiprolu Stūpa in Andhra Pradesh mentions a grant made by a nigama-puta (Sanskrit, nigama-putra). G. Bühler translated nigama in this context as

1. Dh. A. G., p. 113; cf. the Cūlavamsa states that king Vijayabahu IV (1270–1272 A.D.) restored the Nigamaggāma-pāsāda-vihāra and the Pūjāvaliya, recording the same; used the term Niyam-gam-pāya-vihāra; see Cv., LXXXVIII, 49 and Piv., p. 172 respectively.
2. H. Lüders, Appendix to Epigraphia Indica and Record the Archaeological Survey of India. A list of Brāhmi Inscriptions, X, 1912, p. 67, no. 705.
3. Cf. A. Cunningham translated as "gift of nigama of Karahakaṭa"; see The Stūpa of Bharhut, 1879, p. 131, no. 16.
guild or town. But Lüders maintained that the term here stands for a hamlet. D.C. Sircar rather carefully treats the term nigama-putra in this context as 'inhabitant of a nigama (township); a merchant'. Another inscription from the same place records several names of nigama of Sagati. Bühler takes nigama in this inscription as 'members of a guild'. R.K. Mookerji suggests another possible implication of the term in this context, viz. town. In a number of inscriptions at Kanheri the term nigama appears, which has been translated by Lüders as 'merchant'. In one of the Nasik inscriptions there occurs the expression of nigama-sabha which, according to Mookerji, indicates 'the town-hall'. Sircar pointed out another possible meaning of the term, viz. 'a public hall or the assembly of the town Pancañyat, the city council'.

The local grouping nigama as mentioned in the

Buddhist texts has also been understood in different ways. Thus, *nigama* mentioned in different contexts in the *Majjhima Nikāya* and *Vinaya Pitaka*, has been taken by I.B. Horner as market town.¹ E.M. Hare in the translation of the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* considered it as town.² Rhys Davids on the other hand took it to mean township.³ F.L. Woodward, in his translation of the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* rendered the term *nigama* as district.⁴ N. Wagle, having examined a reasonable number of contexts in which the terms *nigama* and *gāma* are used, observed:

'We feel that if we take *gāmas* as settlements of kin-groups or occupational and professional groups the *nigama* should be taken as a *gāma* composed of members of various groups, more or less integrated. The *nigama*, therefore, should be considered as a large and complex *gāma*, a bigger economic unit.'⁵

In the sources of Ceylon the term *nigama* (Sinhalese, *nivam-gama*) occurs but rarely. It is mentioned that *nigama* is a village not surrounded by an enclosing

wall but provided with a market or with shops (pākāra-parikkheparahito āpaṇasaḥihito gāmo). Therefore, nigama is a market village. It is interesting that a gāma (village) was described as either surrounded by a parapet wall or not, whereas nigama was necessarily an unfortified place. In fact, a market town is described as an open place where traders and customers from different parts of the Island could meet for their transactions. It is, however, uncertain whether the nigama referred to in the above passage was one of the kind existing in the Indian subcontinent or in Ceylon, if there were differences. It is also not clear whether this passage relates to an actual nigama or to the expected pattern of a nigama.

On the other hand, Kassapa (V) defined the term nigama as follows:— 'Niyam-gam mean villages larger than other (ordinary) villages' (sesu gamaṭa vāḍi gam niyam-gam). In addition, the text explains: 'Niyam-gam

3. Supra, p. 266.
mean villages in which many people live (bahujanavāsa
gam niyam-gam). Kassapa therefore explained the term
not as a market town, but as a large village with
many inhabitants. The implication may well have been
that nigama is a gama composed of various groups which
occupied a relatively large and complex territorial
unit, as pointed out by Wagle on the basis of the
Indian sources. 2

However, in the sphere of common activities,
the terms gama, niyam-gam, nagaras (sometimes gama, niyam-
gam, paṭun-gam, rājadhāni) are often mentioned together.
That which is applicable to other local groupings, is
also generally applicable to nigama. Thus, the Visuddhi-
magga speaks of gama, nigama and nagara as places where
kahāpanas were issued. 3 The Nikāyasangrahaya and
Saddharmaratnakaraya state that Vijayabāhu I (1055-
1110 A.D.) defeated the great multitude of Tamils all

1. Dh.A.G., p. 94; see also p. 101: mahāvāsam gamaṃ; mahā-
janāvas āti gamak (‘mahāvāsam gamaṃ means a village
which consists of a large population’); cf. mahāgrāma
in the Sūtra literature, Ram Gopal, India of Vedic
Kalpasūtras, 1959, p. 150ff.
2. Supra, p. 28.
3. Visuddhim., p. 437; cf. D.R. Bhandarkar, Lectures on
the Ancient History of India, 1919, p. 176.
spread over the gamas, niyam-gamas and rājadhāni. 1 Niśaṅkamalla (1187-1196 A.D.) mentions in his inscriptions that he visited gam, niyam-gam, paṭun-gam and rājadhāni. 2 Though it is generally believed that niyam-gam in these contexts indicate towns 3 or market places 4 there is no strong evidence to support this view. If we assume that these local groupings are enumerated in an ascending order 5 niyam-gama must indicate a unit between gama and paṭun-gama, or between gama and rājadhāni or between gama and nagara, either in size or importance or both. It is, however, needless to emphasize that 'there was, of course, no hard and fast line between the grāma and nīgama' 6 in Ceylon, as in the Indian subcontinent.

Thus, there are different explanations of nīgama, which can, however, easily be reconciled: a market village is almost always much larger than an ordinary

1. NKS., p.20; Saddharma Ratnakaraya, p.255; cf. K. Indrapala, op. cit., p.91.
6. Ibid., p.299.
village and naturally comprises people of the trading classes and craftsmen etc. It is very important in this connexion that we should try to identify some villages that are actually called nigama. Yet there is little information available. In the Pujāvaliya it is stated that a vihāra by the name of Niyam-gamu was built by king Kāvantissa of Rohaṇa.¹ Nothing more precise is known about this vihāra. In any case the same source as well as the Cūlavāṃsa state that the Niyam-gam-pāya Vihāra (Pali, Nigamaggāmapāsāda Vihāra) was restored by king Vijayabahu IV (1270-1272 A.D.).² The Cūlavāṃsa also explains that this is an ancient (purātana) vihāra. The identification of this vihāra with the present Niyam-gam-pāya Vihāra, situated about 1 mile north of Gampola and north of the lower valley of the Mahāvāli Gaṅga,³ admits of no doubt. This vihāra 'of which considerable remains are yet preserved, was in the ancient Anurādhapura type of architecture'.⁴ Therefore, it was in the Anurādhapura period that this

1. Piv., p. 133.
2. Ibid., p. 172; Cv., LXXXVIII, 49.
monastery was originally constructed. No such a vihāra in this period is, however, mentioned except that referred to in the reign of Kāvantissa mentioned above. Unfortunately, the location of Kāvantissa's vihāra remains as yet uncertain as has already been shown. There can, however, be no doubt that Kāvantissa and his father built vihāras on the banks of the Mahavāli Gaṅga. The Dhatuvamsa states that Goṭhābhaya, the father of Kāvantissa, erected a number of vihāras 'on thither and hither side of the Mahavāli Gaṅga'. Kāvantissa undertook also religious and political activities on both the banks of the Gaṅga. Yet there is no precise information that enables us to identify the vihāra made by Kāvantissa with that restored by Vijayabāhu. Probably, in these two instances Niyam-gama may also mean a village in which a vihāra was built. Yet there is nothing enabling us to determine the pattern of this village. The present Niyamgampāya is only a hamlet of Gampola.

1. The Vēgiriya inscription attests that this area was inhabited by Sinhalese in pre-Christian times, see supra, p.226.
In some inscriptions we find the term *niyamatana* which has been rendered as 'market town' or 'assembly of merchants'. In the Tönigala inscription dated the third year of king Sirimeghavāṇa (303-331 A.D.), for instance, we find a *niyamatana* called Kalahumana situated in the northern district of the city (of Anurādhapura). A certain Deva deposited two cart loads and ten *amūpas* of paddy, six *amūpas* of *uṇḍu* (a species of Fleminga) and ten *amūpas* of beans in this *niyamatana*. It is also laid down that the capital could not be spent or decreased, but the interest thereon should be used to cover the expenses of the Ariyavaṃsa-festival¹ held annually at a new monastery called Yahisapavata.² Similarly, the Labuṭabāṇḍigala inscription attributable to either the fourth or to the fifth century A.D. states that a person called Sirinaka, the son of Minister Sagaya, deposited one hundred *kahāpaṇas* with the *niyamatana* named Mahatabaka. It is further stipulated that the interest thereon should be expended for the purpose of conducting the Ariyavaṃsa-festival at the Devagiriya Vihāra.³ C.W. Nicholas

---

3. Ibid., III, p. 250.
opines that \textit{niyamatana} is a market town.\footnote{JCERAS (NS.), VI, 1963, p. 155.} S. Paranavitana translates Kalahumana Niyamatana as 'the assembly of the merchants' guild at Kalahumana and Mahatabaka Niyamatana as the 'guild of Mahatabaka'.\footnote{Ep. Zeyl., III, pp. 178 and 250 respectively; cf. the note on \textit{niyama tana}, p. 181; Rahula prefers Kalahumana as the name of a person after whom the guild was designated, \textit{History of Buddhism in Ceylon}, p. 241, note, 5.} It is quite possible that the term \textit{niyama} in the above contexts is derived from (Pali or Sanskrit) \textit{nigama}, but its meaning in these contexts by no means clear. The derivation and the meaning of the \textit{tana} in these contexts remain equally uncertain. It becomes, however, clear from these contexts that these \textit{niyamatanas} were kind of local banks in which people could deposit their properties in the expectation of certain profits.

Some scholars are of the opinion that in the north Indian seals and coins the term \textit{nigama} appears to have been used to mean 'guild'. Thus T. Bloch, J. H. Marshall and D. B. Spooner described the term \textit{nigama} appearing in the seal inscriptions found at Basarh (identified with \textit{Vaisāli}) and Bhīta, near Allahabad.
as guild. Similarly, G. Bühler, A. Cunningham and E. J. Rapson explained the same term written on coins discovered at Taxila as guild. D. R. Bhandarkar disagreed and maintained that the term in the above contexts and generally everywhere could hardly be explained as 'guild' but should be interpreted as 'town'. R. K. Mookerji did not criticize the view of Bhandarkar and adhered to the view put forward by Bloch and others.

It is, however, certain that there were guilds in the Indian subcontinent with which people deposited properties so that the interest thereon could be expended for charitable purposes. Thus, according to a Nasik Cave Inscription attributable to the latter half of the first century A.D., Usavadāta, the son-in-law of king Nahapāna, invested 2,000 kahāpaṇas in one guild (śreni) and 1,000 in another. These kahāpaṇas were

1. A. R. Arch. Surv. India, 1903-4, p. 104; 1911-12, p. 47 and 1913-14, p. 122 respectively.
not to be repaid, but the interest arising from this sum had to be spent towards the maintenance of the Buddhist monks residing in the above cave.\(^1\) The Indor Copper Plate Inscription of Skandagupta of 466 A.D., too, provides us with similar information in respect of a temple for the sun.\(^2\) The Tamil inscription at Tirunāmanallūr in the South Arcot District, dated the third year of Kṛṣṇa III (939-966 A.D.) of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty, registers that a chief of Milāgu deposited ten kalañju of gold with a guild and entered into an agreement that the guild should supply every year 100 nāli of ghee for the perpetual lamp of the above mentioned temple.\(^3\)

In the light of above examples it may be suggested that the term niyama in the Tōnigala and Labuṭabāṇḍigala inscriptions indicates a guild. S. Paranavitana maintains that the word tana suffixed to niyama in the above documents may mean either 'assembly' or 'headquarters'.\(^4\) We feel that Kalahumana

---

2. Ibid., pp. 31ff.
and Mahatabaka mentioned above were probably trading quarters. It may be interesting to add that Kalahumana and Mahatubaka were situated in the north (uturu pāsa) and west (pajina pāsa) of the city (of Anurādhapura) respectively. We read in the Ummagga Jātaka that in the four gates of the capital Mithilā there were four nigamas.¹

Known market towns in the Island do not, however, appear to have been designated by nigama or niyam-gama. A typical example for a market town during the period under review is Hōpiṭigamu, near present Badulla in the valley of the Mahavāḷi Gaṅga. The pillar inscription of king Udaya IV (946-954 A.D.), found at the above site and now standing at the junction of Kandy and Bandāravela roads in Badulla, contains the rules for the management of this market town.² It may be useful to discuss in brief this inscription that may give an idea of the formation of a market town. This market town is designated in the edict as Hōpiṭigamu-padī. This is the only document so far known to us in which

---

the term padá is found. Although its etymology remains as yet uncertain, the context leaves no doubt that it indicates a trading centre. Paranavitana concluded that the term should be connected with Sanskrit patha. In this connexion it should be borne in mind that the term replaces padá in many passages of the edict, a detail which has so far been overlooked. It is interesting to note that while padá is used only five times, gama appears no less than seventeen times. Thus, padá in this edict has, apparently, been used as a synonym of gama. In the Indian inscriptions the word padā or padā often suffixed to the names of villages inhabited by particular groups of people. Thus, the Bhatera Plate of Govindakeswadeva (c.1049 A.D.) refers

2. Lines A17, 21, 40, B49 and C44.
3. Lines A28, 41, B2, 6, 9, 11, 19, 37, 39, 43, 45-46, C10-11, 36, 43, D13 and 35; compare also the passage Padá vadana badu pere-magaṭa gos no gamā (i)sā (lines B49-C2)'Goods being brought to the market shall not be taken by having gone to the road ahead' (Paranavitana's transl.) with Gam van baḍu gāmā vikka misā genā yat sut vat no gamā(lines C10-13) 'Only if goods brought to the village are sold in the village (shall toll dues be levied; if they are being transpotted through the village, no toll dues shall be levied' (Paranavitana's transl.).
to a village called Bhāṭapāṭa, which was inhabited by brāhmaṇas. 1 Paḍā and pāḍā are explained as corrupt forms of Sanskrit pāṭaka. 2 This may be supported by the fact that the name Bhattapāṭa has sometimes been used instead of Bhāṭapāṭa in the Bhatera Plate itself. 3 Pāṭaka is defined by Hemacandra as 'a half of grāma'. 4 A.K. Choudhary has pointed out that the pāṭaka 'became a prominent type of village settlement in the early medieval period'. 5 The Tamil word pāṭi (Teliṅgu pāṭu, Kanarese and Malayālam pāḍi) means 'town', 'city', 'hamlet' and 'pastoral village' etc. 6 Pāṭi in our record may be derived either from Sanskrit pāṭaka or Tamil pāṭi. 7

5. A.K. Choudhary, op. cit., pp. 46; cf. Skt.-Eng. Dict., s.v. pāṭaka, 'the half of village', 'part of a village', 'a kind of village'.
6. Madras Tamil Lexicon, V, s.v. pāṭi.
7. Hōpiṭigamupadda may be compared with the present villages ending with badda such as Udubaddāva in North-Western Ceylon, Maggonabadda and Lūlbadda in Southern Ceylon. Cf. pa in some Sanskrit and Pali words changes into ba in Sinhalese; (e.g. kapāla, (Sanskrit & Pali)=kabala (Sinhalese), 'shell'). In some Sinhalese words themselves this change occurs; (e.g. mūṇupuru=mūṇuburu 'grandson').
As to the formation of a market town we get some information in the inscription with which we are now concerned: the state levied excise duty on goods brought for sale in this market. In case of goods for sale that were not shown (to the authorities) double toll dues were charged. ¹ Probably, as a measure to prevent the state being defrauded of its dues, commodities should be sold only at places which were designed for that purpose. ² Commodities which were seen being sold at unauthorized places were to be removed by the royal officers. ³ No excise duty was levied on transit goods. ⁴ Illicit trade (sora veḷañḍām) was prohibited. ⁵ Only authorized weights and measures were to be used. ⁶ Royal officers were not permitted to accept gifts such as liquor (raha), meat (was), curd (dihi) and oil (tel) (from merchants). ⁷

2. Ibid., C21-22, 27-29.
3. Ibid., C29-32.
6. Ibid., C8-9, 17-18.
7. Ibid., B20-21: the contents of this inscription, which relevant to other aspects of our study are respectively discussed.
Paṭṭana-gamā (Sinhalese), paṭṭana-gāmā (Pali), paṭṭana-grāma (Sanskrit), appears in this order of local groupings after niyam-gamā (Sinhalese), nigama-gāmā (Pali), nigama-grāma (Sanskrit). This indicates a sea port. A brief look at a relief map of the Island may show that there are many bays which can be used as harbours; it is important to examine which of these bays were indeed used as harbours in the past, and what features they possessed. Marcian of Heraclea records that there were four notable ports and two great bays in the Island of Taprobana (i.e. Ceylon). Unfortunately, these are not defined by him. Among the ports known to us, Mahāṭitttha (Pali), Mātoṭa (Sinhalese), (present Mantai or Tirukēṭīśvaram) continued to flourish as the largest sea port in the Island before Polonnaruva became the capital of Ceylon. Archaeological excavations

1. See below, p.
2. Nānā-paṇya-dhanākīrṇam sāgarāṇūpa-saṃsritaṃ
   Saṃyānika-vaṇij-juṣṭam paṭṭanaṃ paricakṣate
   'It is said that the paṭṭana is a place, situated by the sea shore, full of various merchandise and wealth, and frequented by travelling merchants' P.K.Acarya, Dictionary of Hindu Architecture, s.v. dvīpāntara quoted from the Silpaśātra.
3. K.A.N.Sastri, Foreign Notices of South India from Megasthenes to Ma Huan, 1963, p.64.
4. See for the importance of Mahāṭitttha as a sea port in the early period of Ceylon (c.600 B.C. to 300 A.D.), Soc. Hist. Early Ceyl., pp.115ff.
have so far been made up to about twenty feet depth at this site, reveal that this was a fairly large town covering about 300 acres. This was a walled city like Anuradhapura. Its main road constructed from the eastern gate to the western gate was almost 40 feet wide. There were vestiges of buildings on each side of the road. The plan of the town appears to have comprised a burial ground as well.¹

A.M. Hocart argued that the brick-work so far excavated in this site cannot be earlier than the thirteenth nor later than the fifteenth century A.D. He prefers the earlier to the later date.² It should be borne in mind that archaeological excavations at this site have not yet revealed its stratification.

If we can rely on the Dāṭhāvaṃsa, written in the early part of the thirteenth century A.D.,³ on the basis of an ancient Sinhalese Dalaḍāvaṃsa⁴ of the fourth century A.D., but now lost, it would appear

³ Dāṭhāvaṃsa, vv. 4-7; cf. UCHC, (vol. I, pt.) I, p. 55.
⁴ Dāṭhāvaṃsa, v. 10.
that there existed some buildings at this port, for we are told in this source that, when the Kalinga prince Dantakumāra and his wife Hemamālā landed at this sea port,¹ they took shelter for that night at a Brahmin Temple there.²

We do not know whether there were then any Buddhist Temples at this port although we find allusions to Buddhists such as the merchant Nandi who lived in this nagara with their families.³ However, the decision of the above mentioned couple to spend that night in a Brahmin Temple seems quite understandable because it was in the guise of Brahmans that they made their journey till they were led before the Sinhalese monarch.⁴ Unfortunately, nothing more is known about this temple.

In addition, the present Tirukēṭīśvaram Śiva Temple at this port appears to have existed in the latter half of the seventh century A.D.: the Tevāram

---

² Dāṭhāvamsa, v.340; Daḷadāsirita, p.35.
³ Sahas., pp.145ff; Rsv., II, p.139.
⁴ Dāṭhāvamsa., v.298; Piv., p.142.
explains that a Hindu Brahmin of the Kauṇḍinya gotra named Sambandar composed two hymns on the god of Tirukkētiśvaram when he visited Rāmeśvaram in South India.¹

Sambandar, according to the Periyapurāṇam was a junior contemporary of Appar Nayanar,² who was a contemporary of the Pallava king Mahendravarman I (600-630 A.D.).³ Sambandar, in the course of his itinerary, met Siruttontar at Tiruccenkatankūṭi and referred to his devotion in a hymn.⁴ Sekkilar mentions that Siruttontar was the commander-in-chief of a Pallava king and raided the city of Vātāpi, from where he carried away treasures.⁵ An invasion of Vātāpi is mentioned in the Kunram Plates of Parameśvaravarman (670-680 A.D.) which gives a detailed account of the battle in which Parameśvaravarman defeated the Cālukya king.⁶ This fact may also be substantiated by the inscription of Rājasimha at Kāncīpura.⁷ This invasion,

2. Ibid., v. 890.
5. Ibid., v. 3665.
according to many scholars, must have taken place between 647-680 A.D.¹

The *Periyapurāṇam* makes it clear that Siruttontar after his Vātāpi invasion voluntarily retired from the post of commander-in-chief and spent his time in worshipping Śiva and entertaining the devotees of Śiva at his native place *i.e.* Tiruccenkattankūṭi.² This must have taken place after 680 A.D. and during this time he must have had the opportunity of entertaining Sambandar when the latter visited him. On the other hand, Sambandar, according to the *Periyapurāṇam*, converted the Pāṇḍya king Ninrasir Netmāran (*i.e.* Arikkēśarī Māravarman 670-700 A.D.) from Jainism to Śaivism.³ From these examples it follows that Sambandar lived in the latter half of the seventh century, so that the Tirukēṭiśvaram Hindu Temple must have been in existence at that time.

In addition, according to the *Sahassavatthuppa-karana*, written in the period between the fifth to

---

ninth century A.D., and the Rasavāhini, written in the fourteenth century A.D., Mahātittha was a nagara consisting of large buildings. Thus, the Sahassavatthuppakarana mentions that there was a minster in this nagara, who had the nagara decorated on a festival day (chaṇḍadivase), when he himself made a state drive in the streets. The Rasavāhini, based on the above work, gives more detailed account on this event: "At that time the king appointed of his minister, named Siva, as the governor of Mahātittha. The minister, having got all the streets properly cleaned and decorated beautifully and having caused flags and banners to fly on the buildings, mounted on a beautifully decorated chariot accompanied by a powerful army of soldiers and made a state visit along the streets encircling the entire Mahāpaṭṭana. From these two sources it is also revealed that the city consisted of storeyed residences owned by wealthy merchants."

In fact, the presence in this port of governors, as mentioned above, is supported by the Mannār Kaccēri

2. The name of the king is unknown.
4. Sahas., pp. 126ff and 145; Rsv., II, p. 139.
Pillar Inscription of the ninth century A.D. This Pillar has been found at Māntai. It mentions the officers in charge of Mahātīttha as mahapuṭuladdan. 1 Mahapuṭu is the Sinhalese equivalent of Mahāpaṭṭana. The literary meaning of laddan is 'receivers'. Thus, "Mahapuṭu-receivers" may mean the officers in charge of Mahāpaṭṭana. We find in the Cūlavajasya that king Mahinda II (777-797 A.D.), before becoming king, performed an official function at Mahātīttha. 2 He may also have been an officer like Mahapuṭuladdan.

Cosmas, 3 who wrote in the early part of the sixth century A.D., explained that 'the Island being, as it is, in a central position, is much frequented by ships from all parts of India and from Persia and Ethiopia, and it likewise sends out many of its own. And from the remotest countries, I mean Tzinista and other trading places, it receives silk, aloes, cloves, sandalwood and other products, and these again are passed on to marts on this side, such as Male, 4 where pepper grows, and

2. Cv., XLVIII, 81.
3. Cf. supra, p. 66.
to Calliana\(^1\) which exports copper and sesame-logs, and cloth for making dresses, for it also is a great place of business. And to Sindu\(^2\) also where musk and castor is procured and androstachys,\(^3\) and to Persia and the Homerite country, and to Adule.\(^4\) and the island receives imports from all these marts which we have mentioned and passes them on to the remoter ports, while, at the same time, exporting its own produce in both directions\(^1.\)\(^5\)

This account of Cosmas is corroborated by ample evidence and it is established that Ceylon developed as an important entrepot in the extensive sea-borne trade which linked Europe in the west with the Chinese empire in the east in the sixth century A.D. if not

---

3. McCrindle regards this word as an error in transcription, see *Christian Topography*, p.336, note,7.
earlier. The commercial importance of Ceylon was certainly an important factor in the development of the sea ports in the Island.

It also follows from the account of Cosmas that there was a great port in the Island in which custom officers received foreign merchants. These officers may well be compared with those mentioned in the inscription of Mahātīttha, but the port to which Cosmas referred cannot be identified with certainty. Many scholars believe Mahātīttha is meant. There can, however, be no doubt that Cosmas refers to the principal sea port of the Island at that time. As far as the evidence goes this is Mahātīttha. In principal, the geographical location of this harbour was the most favourable one on account of its proximity to the capital, Anurādhapura. In addition, this is the only port which had a direct link with the capital along a river i.e. the Kadamba Nadi.


Finally, it seems that this was the port which was used most frequently by people for their voyages. Thus, Dantakumāra and Hemamālā after arriving from Kālīṅga would have disembarked at this port.¹ A group of sixty bhikkhus left the island from this port on a pilgrimage to India.² A rebellious Pañḍya prince, viz. Varaguna-Varmān II, the son of Śrīmāra Śrī Vallabha (815-862 A.D.),³ betook himself to Ceylon to obtain military aid from king Sena II (853-883 A.D.), in order to seize the throne from his father.⁴ As in many other cases,⁵ There is no mention

---

1. Supra, p. 18^4.
2. Sahas., p. 36.
4. CV., LI, 27.
5. Cf. the arrival of Buddhaghosa from South India (CV., XXXVII, 215-227; Rīv., p. 60; Rīv., p. 143; Saddharamaratnākaraya, p. 25^1), arrival of Fā-hsien from China and departure (A Record of the Buddhist Countries, pp. 7^8 and 87 respectively), departure of Sinhalese nuns to China (supra) departure of Moggallāna to South (?) India and his return (CV., XXXVIII, 8^6 and XXXIX, 20 respectively), arrival of Pāṇḍu and others from South India (CV., XXXVIII, 11), departure of Sīlākāla to North India and return (CV., XXXIX, 4^6 and 49 respectively), departure of Jetṭhatissa III to South (?) India and return (CV., XLIV, 70 and 7^1 respectively), departure of Aggabodhi III to South (?) India and return (CV., XLIV, 10^5), departure of Dāṭhapātissa I to South (?) India and return (CV., XLIV, 10^6), the second departure of Aggabodhi III to South (?) India and return (CV., XLIV, 12^6), departure of Hattadhāṭha to South (?) India and return (CV., XLIV, 14^5 respectively), departure of Hattadhāṭha to South (?) India and return (CV., XLIV, 15^4 and XLV, 18 respectively), departure of Mānavamma to the Pallava country and return (CV., XLVII, 4 and 3^5 respectively), his second departure and return (CV., XLVII, 4^1 and 5^3 respectively), invasion of Pāṇḍya king Śrīmāra Śrī Vallabha and departure (CV., L, 2^4 and 4^2 respectively), arrival of the troops of Kassapa V from the Pāṇḍya country (CV., LIII, 7^8), invasion of Parāntaka Cōila and departure (CV., LIII, 4^2 and 4^5 respectively), departure of the Pāṇḍya king Rājasiṃha from the Island to Kerala (CV., LIII, 9), invasion of Rājarāja Cōila (CV., LV, 1^4).
of the port of the Island where Varaguna landed, but it is Mahatittha from where he left the Island in order to return to his country and wage war against his father with the troops provided by the Sinhalese king.¹

The victorious Sinhalese senāpati named Kuṭṭhaka,² having placed Varaguna on the throne returned to Ceylon with his troops at the same port, where they were accorded a warm welcome by the king.³ In addition, when the Pāṇḍya ruler Nāravarman Rājasimha II sent gifts to the king of the Island in the hope of obtaining military aid the Cūlavamsa writes:— 'The king, the Ruler of Lankā, took counsel with his officials, equipped military forces, appointed his Sakkasenāpati as leader of the troops and betook himself to Mahātittha. Standing at the edge of the coast he spoke of the triumph of former kings and having thus aroused their enthusiasm, he made his troops embark. With his army the Sakkasenāpati thereupon safely crossed the sea and reached the Pāṇḍu

¹ Cv.,LI,28.
² Ibid.,LI,88. He is referred to in the inscriptions as Kuṭṭhā, see the Iripiniyāva and Rāmbāva Pillar Inscriptions, Ep. Zeyl.,I,pp.164 and 175 respectively.
country'.

In yet another instance we learn that the Pāṇḍya king Rājasimha II, defeated by the Cōlas, sailed to Mahātittha in the reign of Dappula IV (924-935 A.D.). Though Dappula was ready to give military support as requested by Rājasimha, the latter did not remain in the Island but betook himself to the Keralā court, his mother's home, leaving his crown and other regalia behind.

Therefore, Mahātittha appears to have been used very frequently as a port. This is further supported by Sundara Mūrti Nayanār, the third hymnist of the Tevāram of the ninth century A.D., who describes Māntoṭṭam (i.e., Mahātittha) as a port where many ships arrived. His description may be quite acceptable because he had first-hand knowledge of this port as a priest who composed hymns on the god of Tirukēṭṭīśvaram.

As a result of these foreign contacts, the population of Mahātittha probably comprised many foreign

1. Cv.,LII,70-73 (Geiger's transl.)
2. Cv.,LIII,5-9; cf.44, see also W.Geiger, Cv. Transl., p.172, note,3.
3. See supra, pp. 299 ff.
residents. The coins and pottery found there suggest close connexions between this port and foreign countries. Thus, at one site from the surface to about twenty feet depth a vast number of pot sherds of Rome, Persian Gulf and China have already been found, which, however still require systematic dating and identification.

Some coins found at this site have now been satisfactorily identified. For example, a Chinese coin found there has been identified as one of king Jen Tsun of the Sung dynasty, who reigned between 1023-1036 A.D.¹ Similarly, some coins of the Śrīhāṃsa line of the Pallava dynasty have been found at or near the Tirukētiḻvaram Śiva Temple. These coins show a bull on the obverse and a pūrṇaghaṭa on the reverse.² In some coins the figure on the obverse is withered.³ Codrington

---


tentatively suggests that this figure represents a
tiger; in that case they are probably early Cōla coins. ¹

Direct contacts between the Simhavishya line and
Ceylon are attested during the reign of Narasimhavarman
(630-668 A.D.), when a Ceylonese prince named Mānavamma
resided in the Pallava court. Having fled to South
India he was put in charge of Pallava troops and joined
the campaign led by Narasimhavarman against the Cālukyas.
Out of gratitude Narasimhavarman gave military assistance
to Mānavamma, providing him with an army which he
subsequently used to capture the throne of Ceylon. ²
Thus, Mānavamma, having become king of the Island,
reigned for a long period between 684-718 A.D. His
dynasty, the so-called second Lambakappa dynasty, lasted
for many centuries, viz. till the end of the Anurādhapura period. In order to consolidate his victory and
to achieve the foundation of a dynasty it seems quite
possible that Mānavamma kept many of his Pallava
mercenaries, whom he would have stationed in key points,
especially coastal areas, but the chronicles are silent

¹. Ceylon Coins and Currency, p.83.
². Cy.,XLVII,4-62.
on this point.¹

In addition, a large number of coins of the fourth and fifth centuries A.D., have been found at this port. Most of these are made by special kind of metal known as 'Third Brass'.² In this connexion, it is interesting that Cosmas records how a merchant from his own country named Sopater, together with an anonymous Persian merchant, brought the current coins of respective countries with them when they arrived in Ceylon for trade transactions.³ It is not certain that there were Roman or Persian settlements in Mahā­tittha as there were in Pondichery in South India.⁴ Cosmas, however, writes: 'The Island has a church of persian christians who have settled there'.⁵ There is, however, no confirmation as to the location of this church and the settlement.

¹ Thus, Moggallāna and Silākāla appear to have been constituted a guard for the sea coast in order to protect their power from threatening invasions (Cv., XXXIX,57 and XLI,35 respectively), see also C.W. Nicholas, 'Sinhalese Naval Power', UCR, XVI,1958,pp.78-92; Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, pp.16-17.
² H.W.Codrington, Ceylon Coins and Currency, p.32.
³ McCrindle, Christian Topography, p.369.
⁵ McCrindle, Christian Topography, p.365,see also J.Emerson Tennent, History of Christianity in Ceylon, chap.1.
Judging from the above examples it may be concluded that Mahātīttha was a very complex settlement with officials, both Ceylonese and South Indian, as well as Persian, Roman and Chinese merchants.

Gokanna, modern Trincomalee, is less frequently mentioned in ancient times. During the reign of Mahāsena (276-303 A.D.), there was a Hindu Temple at this port which was destroyed by the king, who built a Buddhist vihāra at this site.1 As has been seen above there was a Hindu Temple at Mahātīttha, too, at least during the reign of the immediate successor of this king.2

Despite the destruction of the shrine, the present Koneśvaram Śiva Temple at Trincomalee is mentioned as early as the latter half of the seventh century A.D., for according to the Periyapurāṇam, Sambandar Nayanār who lived in this period,3 composed hymns in praise of the god of this temple as well as of the god of the

3. See for his date *supra*, pp. 299 ff.
This may be a consequence of relations between the Indian subcontinent and the Island. But no such relations appear to have been recorded in the available sources for the latter part of the Anurādhapura period. It is only in the second half of the thirteenth century A.D. that we hear of such contacts. Thus, a passage of an inscription of Jatañvarman Viśāṇḍya (accession 1253 A.D.), states that this king planted there the Paṇḍya flag with the double fish emblem of Koṇamalai, i.e., Gokarn. This is no doubt a reference to his invasion during the reign of Parākramabāhu II (1236-1270 A.D.).

A Buddhist vihāra also existed during the second and third decades of the eighth century A.D. at this port, as we are told that king Ajjabodhi V (718-724 A.D.) erected a practising-house (padhānaghara) in the Gokarna Vihāra. This vihāra may be identified, as suggested by Geiger, with that built by Mahāsenas referred to

3. See for a comprehensive study of this invasion, A Liyanagamage, op. cit., pp.140-159.
5. Cv. Transl., p.110, note,3; cf. JCBRAS (NS), VI, 1963, p.44.
above. It therefore appears that both the Hindu devāla and Buddhist vihāra were in existence at least from the second half of the seventh century A.D. Thus, Gokaṇṭa appears to have been a place inhabited by both Hindus and Buddhists, as was the case at Mahāṭittha.

If we believe the Pūjāvaliya and Rājāvaliya, Hurātoṭa or Urātoṭa (Pali Śukaratittha, modern Kayts) was another port which appears to have had foreign contacts in the latter part of the Anurādhapura period. We read in these sources that king Kuḍā Mihidel, identifiable with Mahinda IV (956-972 A.D.), defeated a Tamil ruler who had landed at Hurātoṭa coming from the Cōla country. This invasion is corroborated by the inscriptions of Parantaka II/Rājarāja Cōla. It can therefore be established that the invasion took place probably in the reign of Parantaka II.

Nothing more is known about this sea port during our period of study.

---

1. The Rājāvaliya gives but a mythical origin of this sea port, see p.25.
2. Midel Sala in the Rājāvaliya, see p.65.
3. Pjv., p.48; Rjv., p.65.
4. SII, XIII, no.197; V, no.980.
Godāvāya is another less known port which is situated at the mouth of the Vañc Gahga. It is mentioned for the first time in an inscription of Gajabāhu I (114-136 A.D.) in situ. This inscription states that the custom duties (sukiya, Pali, suñkha)\(^1\) collected from this port (Go(sukiya; paṭanahi) were granted to the Goḍapavata Vihāra, probably the monastery situated near the port.\(^2\) The inscription would therefore suggest that this port was under the charge of custom officers, as Mahātittha. In a later sixth-century inscription the place was named as Godāvā Vahera\(^3\) which suggests the continued existence of the above vihāra. As C.W. Nicholas pointed out, 'the appearance of the little bay at Godāvāya to-day does not suggest that it could have been more than a hazardous anchorage for an occasional sailing ship in times past, and the revenue lost by the religious benefaction was probably trifling'.\(^4\)

As has already been mentioned, there were many rebellious princes who fled to South (?) India and

---

2. CJSG, II, 1928-33, pp.178,197.
returned with mercenaries particularly in the fifth and seventh centuries A.D. But the ports in the Island that they used for their actions are unknown. Of these Moggallāna, the son of Dhātusena (459-477 A.D.), is said to have returned from Jambudīpa with mercenaries and encamped at the Kūṭhāri Vihāra in the Ambatṭhakolādesa.\(^1\) Although the Kūṭhāri Vihāra cannot be identified it is certain that the Ambatṭhakolādesa was the area around modern Ridi Vihāra (ancient Rajatalena) near Ṁatālē.\(^2\) If Moggallāna had landed at one of the ports in the northern or eastern part of the Island it seems rather unlikely that he should have advanced such a long distance passing through the rivers and jungle. If he had landed at Trincomalee he should have by-passed the Śīgiri fort or crossed the upper mountainous region covered with thick jungle, and where there are rivers, too.

Ambatṭhakolādesa is situated very far from the ports of Southern coast of the Island, too. In addition, it does not seem that the Anurādhapura area was unfavourable for him because he was a favourite

of all bhikkhus, irrespective of sect not excluding the mugganṭhas. ¹ These data may suggest that Moggallāna landed at some other port on the western or north-western coast.

The ports along this part of the coast situated in approximity to the Ambaṭṭhakola-desa are Kālaṇiya and Chilaw (ancient Salāvata). It is to be noted that Chilaw is situated at the mouth of the Jajjara Nādi and the Ambaṭṭhakola-desa itself is situated on the banks of this river. Therefore, Moggallāna perhaps landed at Chilaw and proceeded to the interior along the river. But the chronicles are silent on this point.

According to the paraphrase of the Sasadāvata, written soon after the composition of the poem,² the Gōlas who invaded the Island during the first reign of queen Līlāvatī (1197-1200 A.D.), would have landed at this sea port,³ but nothing is mentioned about this invasion in the chronicles. As it is beyond our scope,

---

¹ Cv.,XXXIX,20-21,33,41,43.  
³ Sasadāvat Sannaya, (edited by Aturuvälle Dhammapala) 1934, pp. 4-5.
we do not intend to go into details of this invasion. On the other hand, it has already been discussed in great detail by others.¹

The Cūlavamsa explains that Kassapa I (477-495 A.D.), out of fear for Moggallāna, set guards in different places in the Island.² It seems likely that Kassapa should have taken some counter-measures, particularly at major sea ports, to thwart his opponent's plans. The latter perhaps came to know about the situation in the Island from nissagathas who served as spies for him and informed him of the right time for him to return to the Island.³ There can, however, be no doubt that at least major points on the sea coast were guarded in ancient times. We learn from the Cūlavamsa that king Silākāla (522-535 A.D.) entrusted his second son Dāthāpabhuti with the task of protecting the sea (coast).⁴

---

² Cv.,XXXIX,5: rakkhāma datvā tahim tahim; cf.XXXIX,19.
³ Ibid.,XXXIX,20. The employment of spies in the guise of religious mendicants and ascetics was by no means rare in ancient days, see Arthāśāstra, IV,4; Manu,p.256.
⁴ Cv.,XLI,35: rakkhāpattaya samuddassa majjhimaṃ tu niyojayi; cf. Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, pp.16-17.
the sea (coast). This may indicate a similar function as that discussed above.

In addition, Cosmas informs us that when a certain Sopater and a Persian merchant landed at a port which is not specified, they were taken to the king by the officers there. His account also describes that when the king questioned both, they explained that they were merchants from Rome and Persia. This suggests that the officers in the ports kept a watchful eye on those arriving at the ports. It is also to be noted that there is no evidence for any invasion at the major sea ports such as Mahātittha or Trincomalee during our period. But Sinhalese kings used Mahātittha for their expeditions to South India, and also South Indian refugees, who came to Ceylon seeking military aid, landed at this port. Perhaps this port, i.e. Mahātittha was not chosen by foreign invaders, as it was guarded by the local army.

2. See for the identity of this sea port, supra, p. 304.
4. Ibid., pp. 368-369.
5. Supra, pp. 305 ff.
We come across at least one occasion on which a paṭṭana was used for pleasure in the period under consideration. Thus, the Cūlavāma mentions that king Sena I (833-853 A.D.) went for pleasure to a port on the sea.\(^1\) In addition, the Sahassavatthuppakaraṇa speaks of a minister named Siva who had Mahatittha decorated for a festival (chāna).\(^2\) Unfortunately, nothing more is known about this festival.

It may be interesting to note that there were some sea ports which were associated with superstitious beliefs. Thus, during a famine in Ceylon a certain man skilled in magic spells (mantadharo naro) went around begging for alms in the guise of a bhikkhu. Prince Mahānāga, who was a wanderer at that time, happened to see him, and offered alms. 'He (the magician) thought: "I will make him (Mahānāga) worthy of the kingdom on the Island"'. He took the prince with him and arrived a moment later at Gokappa.\(^3\) Sitting there and murmuring an incantation formula in the usual way, he conjured

\[\text{\underline{1. Cv.,L,8: kīlanattham samuddassa gate rājini paṭṭanam}}\]
\[\text{\underline{2. Sahas.,p.145.}}\]
\[\text{\underline{3. Gokappa was the ancient name of Trincomalee, see supra,p.31.} Therefore Gokappa sea may mean the bay of Trincomalee, see Cv. Transl.,p.59,note.4.}\]
up the Nāga king in the night of the full moon of the month Phussa. "Touch the Great Nāga", he commanded Mahānāga. In the first watch of the night, through fear, he did not touch the Nāga who had appeared. It was even so in the middle watch of the night. But in the last watch he caught him by the tail, but (immediately) let him go. (Only) with three fingers had he touched him, when the magician made the prophesy: 'My effort succeeds: after thou hast had war with three kings and slain the fourth, thou shalt be king in thy old age and live yet three years'.

In yet another instance, we hear that a prince named Mānayamāma sat down on the banks of the river in the neighbourhood of Gokāṇṇa, and 'had made full preparations according to custom for an incantation. He began after taking the rosary (akkhamālā) in his hand to murmur the magic verse. To him there appeared

2. December to January.
4. I.e. Kittisirimegha, see Cū, XLI, 91.
5. Cū, XLI, 75-84 (Geiger's transl.).
Kumāra on his riding bird.\(^1\) ... he (Kumāra) granted the Prince his prayed-for wish.\(^2\)

According to the **Sahassavatthuppakaraṇa**, a magician (**bhūtavejjakο** at Mahātītha uttered an incantation and sent a spirit to kill a merchant named Nandi who was abroad at that time.\(^3\) **Saṅghamitta** who lived at Kāvēripaṭṭana in South India is described as one who was well versed in the teachings concerning the exorcism of spirits, and so forth (**bhūtavijjā-dikovido**).\(^4\)

In addition, Hiuan-Tsang describes that there was a bay in the Island rich in gems and precious stones. The king and the ordinary people made annual offerings at this harbour for the spirits there in order to get such assets from them.\(^5\)

---

2. Mānavamma perhaps asked a boon of making him king in the Island, but he did not become king as one of his eyes was destroyed by the pea-cock of Kumāra! see, *Cv.*, LVII, 7-9, 11-13.
From these examples it follows that there were a certain number of paṭṭanas which maintained foreign contacts during the period under consideration. Although we do not hear very much of other ports Mahātīttha was a cosmopolitan centre with foreign and Ceylonese merchants and government officers. On the whole, a paṭṭana was a very complex local grouping.

The terms nagara and pura are used in the chronicles as synonyms in the sense of either town or citadel. Thus, we find that Anurādhapura\(^1\) and Pulatthinagara\(^2\) (i.e. Polonnaruwa) are mentioned as either pura or nagara. The term nagara appears, however, to have been the more general term for town or city.\(^3\)

It seems that nagara also denoted a townlet or a temporary royal residence. This may be gleaned from the following cases. According to the Cūlavamsa king Mahinda V (982-1029 A.D.), who was forced by the Keralā mercenaries to flee from Anurādhapura, founded

1. See Cv., XXXIX, 28; XLI, 12, 17, 21 etc. and XLIV, 7, 23; XLVII, 37; XLVIII, 125.
2. See Cv., L, 73; LII, 25; LV, 22, 29.
3. See Cv., XXXVII, 71, 74; XLIV, 122; XLVI, 34; LVIII, 34; XLIX, 18; Ep. Zeyl., II, p. 22; III, pp. 177, 250 etc.
a *nagara* in the village Kappagallaka in Rohana, from where he carried out the government only in that part of the Island. Nothing more is known about this *nagara*. Nor is there any indication enabling us to locate it. It probably was only a small fort used by Mahinda as a hiding place before he was captured by the Colas. The account of the chronicle would also have us believe that Mahinda was unable to reside in a big town for the peasants stopped paying their taxes when they discovered that the king no longer did his duty.

Another obscure *nagara* called Giri was built by king Mānavamma (684-718 A.D.); it was apparently no more than a small town of which nothing more is known.

In studying the *nagara* in ancient Ceylon Anuradhapura is the best example. It is, however, not necessary to go into great detail as this great city has already been discussed by many scholars. In the present context

1. *Cy.*, LV, 11-12.
it is of great interest to examine its new development during the period under review.

There is no doubt that there were many religious buildings belonging to the vihāras such as the Mahāvihāra, Abhayagiri and Jetavana. The important buildings of these monasteries and the royal palace were constructed well before the period of our study. But the Dāṭhādhāṭu-ghara, the temple of the Tooth Relic, was founded after the arrival of the Tooth Relic in the Island during the reign of king Sirimeghavanna (303-331 A.D.). In fact, this was not a new building, as it is said in the Cūlavamsa that this was originally built by Devānampiya Tissa and was called Dhammacakkageha.¹ However, ever since the Tooth Relic was kept in this building it was known as Dāṭhādhāṭughara and from time to time it was repaired. Thus, Dhāṭusena (459-477 A.D.) is said to have repaired the Dāṭhādhāṭughara and Aggabodhi I (575-608 A.D.) decorated it with brightly gleaning precious stones.²

In the first part of the seventh century A.D. Hiuan-Tsang gave an interesting description of this

1. Cv., XXXVII, 92.
2. Ibid., XXXVIII, 70 and XLII, 33 respectively.
By the side of the king's palace is the vihāra of the Buddhist Tooth, several hundred feet high, brilliant with jewels and ornamented with rare gems. Above the vihāra is placed an upright pole on which is fixed a great padmarāga (ruby) jewel... The Temple of the Tooth, along with the Mahāpāli, was burnt by the Cōlas who invaded Ceylon during the reign of Udaya IV (946-954 A.D.) but was reconstructed by Mahinda IV (956-972 A.D.). The remains near the inscribed slab in the citadel have been identified with those of this temple and a number of strata of this site have already been unearthed.

The annual Tooth Relic festival, which attracted great crowds of people, was a relatively late feature of the city of Anurādhapura. Both laymen and bhikkhus gathered there; the streets were decorated and many other preparations for the festival were made well...

---

1. This figure is no doubt an exaggeration.
3. Cy.,LIV,45; see also LIII,41.
in advance.¹ Many people took part in celebrations for ninety days of every year.² This passage gives also information about the streets in the city. This is elaborated by another passage, when Fa-hànien wrote:—

'... The roads level and trim, preaching-halls have been built at the cross-roads.'³ He also referred to the main road and explained that it was along this road that the annual Tooth Relic procession moved.⁴ The chronicle mentions a Mahāvīthi along which bhikkhus walked chanting the Ratnasutta during the reign of king Upatissa I (368-410 A.D.).⁵ Two inscriptions of the ninth and tenth centuries A.D. respectively mention the Maṅgul-maha-veya (Pali, Maṅgala Mahāvīthi) along which there stood some religious buildings, hospitals etc.⁶ This may have been the same street as that indicated as Mahāvīthi in the chronicle. Perhaps the name of the Mahāvīthi (i.e. Maṅgul) was

---

1. A Record of the Buddhist Countries (translated by Li Yung-hsi), p.82.
2. See for a detailed account of the Tooth Relic festival, Rahula, History of Buddhism in Ceylon, pp.280ff.
4. Ibid., p.82.
5. Cv.,XXXVII, 195; cf. 149.
6. Ep. Zeyl., I, p.43; II, p.23. See for other hospitals constructed in the city during the period under review, Cv., L, 75; LII, 25, 57; LIV, 53 etc.
given to it only after the reign of Upatissa. Some other roads such as Vāluka, Candamukha and Siṅguruvāli are also mentioned in the sources.¹ The location of these streets is unknown. We hear only that the Mahāvīthi was situated in the inner city.² It is equally uncertain where precisely ran the boundaries between the inner and outer city.³

For a description of the city of Anurādhapura Fa-hien provides us with more materials. He writes that there were wealthy merchant house-holders and other citizens belonging to the different strata of society. Thousands of bhikkhus lived in the vihāras there. People of many quarters met together in the preaching halls of these vihāras to listen to the sermons.⁴

---

¹ Sahas., p. 70; Saddharmālaṅkārāya, p. 390.
² Cv., XXXVII, 195; Ep. Zeyl., II, 23.
³ JCBRAS (NS.), 1963, VI, p. 138; Geiger identifies the Mahāvīthi with the present 'Sacred street' (Suddha Māvata, modern Sinh.), see Cv. Transl., p. 19, note, 4.
⁴ A Record of the Buddhist Countries (translated by Li Yung-hsi), p. 81; Sahas., p. 127.
Generally speaking, being the capital of the country for over a thousand years Anurādhapura was bound to be a city inhabited by members of the royal family and administrative officers, nobles, merchants and many other people belonging to different strata of society. This was the main centre of the Theravāda Buddhism in the Island. Therefore a large number of bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs must have concentrated there, some of whom originated from foreign lands.

Similarly, as has been pointed out by K. Indrapala, there were a considerable number of Tamils in the city by about the close of the tenth century A.D. It is also to be noted that among the buildings which were constructed by Pañdukābhaya in the city there was a separate house for the brāhmaṇas. In addition,

1. From (c.) the sixth century B.C. to the beginning of the tenth century A.D. only eighteen years (i.e. 477-495 A.D.) in which Sigiriya was the capital. Although some kings in the latter half of the seventh century A.D. and the following three centuries lived for some years at Polonnaruva they continued to regard Anurādhapura as their capital. See, supra., p.257.
2. Cy., XXXVII, 213-246; XLII, 35-37; XLIV, 44-47; A Record of the Buddhist Countries (translated by Li Yung-hsi), p.85.
3. Indrapala, op. cit., p.79.
the *sivikāsālā* and *sotthisālā*, which were built by the same king in the city, were probably two Hindu shrines.¹ The location of neither of these buildings is known. However, as has been seen, in the northern quarter of the city there were *brāhmaṇa* residences and also Śiva Temples in which *liṅgas* have been discovered.² No attempt has so far been made to reveal the stratification of the sites of these monuments. Only the ruins on their surface can be dated to either the ninth or the tenth century A.D. The Pallava monuments found in the city have already been discussed in great detail.³

Foreign merchants such as Chinese,⁴ Roman and Persian⁵ appeared in the city from time to time. As inscriptions attest there were at least two market places in northern and western parts of the city containing guilds which acted as local banks.⁶ As we have indicated above,⁷ the plan of this great city has already been discussed by many scholars; it is therefore not necessary to repeat it here. But it is necessary to

2. Cf. infra, p.348.
7. See supra, pp.323, note 5.
examine, in brief, the plan of the City of Sigiriya.

In the survey of the village settlements in the Kalāgam Palāta during the period under review the construction of the palace and fortress at Sigiriya was mentioned. Therefore, we confine ourselves here to examine the archaeological remains there in order to get an idea of this city.

Sigiriya is a rock rising abruptly to the height of about 600 feet from the ground. To the north of the foot of the rock there is a small tank. East and the west a rectangular area had been enclosed by ramparts and moats. The base of the rock itself was used as the defence on one side. The ramparts on the western side, still standing to an average height of 30 feet, extended on three sides to a distance of over one and half miles. The masonry wall, for which the ramparts of earthwork served as the base, crumbled down centuries ago and the broad moat which broaded it on the out side has been largely silted in. The depth of the moat is about 14 feet; it is 72 feet broad at the bottom and 82 feet at the top.
Two gateways, one on the northern and other on the southern side, pierced the walls. There was another entrance through a drawbridge in the middle of the western rampart. Thus, around the rock an area covering over 100 acres in extent was well fortified. In this area there are remains of five pavilions, each of which surrounded by moats. There are also a number of ponds within the ramparts.

In order to climb the rock two flights of stone steps were built. One runs for some 160 yards on the face of the rock at an average height of 50 feet above the ground, and along this has been constructed a gallery with a parapet wall, popularly known as 'mirror-wall' because of its glass-like plaster, which is still preserved. This was an attractive feature of Sigirya as it was one of the subjects of Sigiri poets.¹ and it is this wall on which the Sigiri poets wrote their verses, now popularly known as Sigiri graffiti.

Another striking feature of the archaeological remains is the figure of the lion whose body was the

¹ Nos. 398, 425, 608 etc.
path-way leading to the summit of the rock. 'The problem of overcoming', Paranavitana explains, 'the sheer verticality of the rock at this point had been solved by the old engineers, by building the fore-part of an immense figure of the lion'. ¹ It is also to be pointed out that the lion is an ubiquitous motif in the Indian subcontinent and particularly in Ceylon. This figure would have been a symbol imparting dignity and majesty to the royal palace. After all, the figure of the lion is the Sinhalese crest. The lion figure at Sīgiriya remained intact during the ninth century A.D. as it is mentioned in a number of graffiti.²

The summit of the rock, nearly three acres in extent, contains the remains of the royal palace. The Sīgiri graffiti do not provide us with material capable of giving an impression of the palace. But it follows from a graffito attributable to the ninth century A.D. that the palace was in decay at that time. This verse mentions a ruined wall on the summit (girihiṣa naṭbita).³

¹ JCBRAS (NS ),I, 1950, p. 130.
² Nos. 45, 174, 205, 476 etc.
³ No. 71.
The area enclosed by remparts on the eastern side does not appear to have been contained any solidly built edifices. It is believed that this section was occupied by ordinary people, while the pavilions and probably a garden attached to the palace on the summit.¹

The most interesting archaeological remains at Sigiriya are the paintings, commonly called the frescoes, appearing in one rock-pocket on the western side of the rock.² There are only 21 paintings (including that which was recently damaged by a vandal) that have survived to this day.³ Sigirí graffiti,

¹ JCBRAS (NS.), I, 1950, p. 131.
³ These paintings are figures of ladies. H.C.P. Bell is of the opinion that these ladies represent the queens of Kassapa. (See A.R. Arch Surv. Ceyl., 1905, pp. 16-17. P. E. P. Deraniyagala agrees with Bell. (See JCBRAS, XXXVIII, 1961, p. 88). Ananda K. Coomaraswamy believes that they are goddesses. (See Medieval Sinhalese Art, p. 178). S. Paranavitana made an attempt to identify them with 'Lightning princesses' (vījjuḷḷatākumārī) and 'Cloud damsels' (meghalatākumārī). (See India Antiqua, A Volume of Oriental Studies presented to Jean Philippe Vogel, 1947, pp. 264-269; 'The Significance of the Paintings of Sigirí', Artibus Asiae, XXIV, 1961, pp. 382 ff.)
attributable to the ninth century, speak of hundreds of them.\(^1\) Graffito no. 71 of the same century mentions that there were paintings on a ruined wall of the palace on the summit which suggests that the palace was also decorated with paintings. There are also some badly withered frescoes on the cave known as Nayi-peña-guhā ('Cobra-head Cave').\(^2\)

It is interesting to point out that there were some cities in later times built after the model of Sīgiriya with a fortified rock as nucleus.\(^3\) Of these, Subhagiri, now Yāpahuva in the Kurūṇāgalā District, comes first as far as the chronology and also its architecture are concerned. This was constructed by a senāpati named Subha in the beginning of the thirteenth century A.D. during the rule of Māgha in Rājaraṭṭha, and later became the royal residence of Bhuvanekabāhu I (1272-1284 A.D.).\(^4\) Jambudoṇi, now Daṁbadeṇiya, was a similar town which was built by king Vijayabāhu III (1232-1236 A.D.).\(^5\) Hattiselaṇura, now Kurūṇāgalā, is

---

1. Nos. 44, 249.
another one. None of these can, however, be compared with Sigiriya as far as engineering accomplishment and artistic value are concerned. Probably 'the palace on the summit of the rock (of Sigiriya) was actually intended to be a miniature Ālakamandā' as has been argued by S. Paranavitana.

It is to be pointed out that Kautiliya and Manu speak in the highest term of a rock-fortress and Manu makes a particular reference to the numerous advantages of a rock-fortress which surpassed every other kind of fortress. In Ceylon, the rocks appear to have been used as fortresses well before Kassapa I. For instance, the Dhūmarakkhapabbata (present Dimbulāgala in Egoḍa Pattu of Tamankaḍuva in the Polonnaruva District; 6 miles to the south of Manampitiya on the Polonnaruva-Batticaloa Road) and the Ariṭṭhapabbata (present Ritiṇigala in Ugli and Māṭombuva Kōralēs of Hurulu Palāta in the Anurādhapura District; close to the 10th mile post on the road to Ramboḍagalla from Kurupāgala)

2. JCBRAS (NS ), I, 1950, p. 136; see also UCR, XIX, 1961, pp. 95-94; see for some comments on Paranavitana's argument, JCBRAS (NS ), I, 1961, pp. 382ff.
are said to have been used as fortresses by Abhaya, a semi mythical king.\textsuperscript{1} Similarly, Dolapabbata, also called Dolaŋgapabbata, (present Dolaŋgala, a large hill about 10 miles eastward of Kambarava on the Mahawâli Gânga) was used by Paṇḍukâbhaya as his fortress.\textsuperscript{2} These probably were only natural rock-fortresses.

As it is revealed from the above discussion there were different kinds of towns in ancient Ceylon. Of these, the royal residences were the most splendid. In fact, Anurâdhapura, the capital of the Island (except during the reign of Kassapa I) till (c.) 993 A.D., was the greatest city in ancient Ceylon. In addition, two principal royal residences emerged during the period under review, i.e. Sîgiriya and Polonnaruva. The former was the royal seat of Kassapa I who reigned between (c.) 477 to 459 A.D. and the latter was a temporary residence of a number of kings who ruled in the ninth and tenth centuries A.D. as mentioned above.

Most of the towns in ancient Ceylon including of course Anurâdhapura and Polonnaruva, were of religious interest. They were often visited by pilgrims. Thus,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1} Mv., X, 46, 65.
  \item \textsuperscript{2} Ibid., X, 44; Mv. \textit{Tikā}, p. 287.
\end{itemize}
Mahiyanga (near Badulla) was visited by Udaya IV (946–954 A.D.) who worshipped the stūpa there as stated in the Badulla Pillar Inscription. 1 Similarly, Nāgaripa (in the Jaffna Peninsula) was frequently visited by both bhikkhus and laymen. 2 Old centres of religious interest such as Mahāgāma (Tissamahārāma), 3 Dīghavāpi, 4 Cittalapabbata 5 (Situlpavuva) and Mihintalā continued to exist during the latter part of the Anurādha period. Devundara is an important town of similar interest which emerged during the period under our present study. 6

It is interesting to note that Sīgiriya was one of the most attractive places used for pleasure towns in Ancient Ceylon as it is to-day. As it is revealed from their own writings — the so-called Sīgiri graffiti — many 'tourists' from different parts of the Island visited this site to admire the paintings, the 'mirror wall', 'the great statue of lion' and to climb the

5. *Visuddhīn.*, I, p. 120.
rock. The Sigiri graffiti belong to the period from the latter half of the fifth century A.D. to the thirteenth century. This suggests that people started to visit Sigiriya soon after it ceased to be a royal residence and continued until it was covered with jungle and consequently abandoned.

Evidently, the ports were mainly settled by people with commercial interests. Particularly, Mahātittha, as it was the principal sea port in ancient Ceylon, was mainly inhabited by merchants. There can be no doubt that the same was the case with Gokana (Trincomalee) and Gaḍavāya. However, we receive hardly any information about internal trading centres, except that of Hōpiṭigama (near Badulla).

In this chapter an attempt has been made to examine the patterns of village settlements. There was no definite limit of the number of families which could live in a gama. In many cases land is denoted as gama, at least if it was inhabited by members of a

2. See supra, p. 310.
single extended family. On the other hand, a gama which was deserted by its inhabitants for some unknown reason was still called by the term gama. However, gama was not merely an estate, nor a piece of land, nor an inhabited area, but combined all these aspects. Basically, the gama was a unit of a kin-group or of an occupational group. But there were, of course, mixed gamas.

The nigama, a local unit bigger than the gama and smaller than the pattun-gama or nagara, was a centre of internal trade where traders and customers from the neighbouring villages came together. However, every market centre was not necessarily indicated by this term. The pattun-gama was quite clearly an urban settlement situated by the sea shore and comprising a harbour, which was visited by merchants both local and foreign. Pattun-gamas generally were small towns. But certain pattun-gamas like Mahātittha had developed into fairly big settlements. The nagara was the largest settlement in the order of gam, niyam-gam, pattun-gam, nagara; it was inhabited by ordinary citizens, merchants, religious groups and so on.
It is true that there was no hard and fast line between these local groupings but there were some different features of them which may distinguish one from another. This is illustrated in the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gama</th>
<th>nigama</th>
<th>pāṭun-gama</th>
<th>nagara or pura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kin-group</td>
<td>mixed villagers and local traders.</td>
<td>mixed villagers and local merchants.</td>
<td>mixed citizens, foreign and local merchants, administrative officers and other groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or occupa-tional group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homesteads, vāva and attached land and a market.</td>
<td>townlet with a harbour and attached land.</td>
<td>town or city with an enclosure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gam vāva, attached land and perhaps a vihāra.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kula is used in a number of different connotations. Thus, in some passages where the brahmanic theory of caste system is discussed it means varṇa. For instance, in a passage of the Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya, it signifies the khattiya, brāhmaṇa, vessa and suddha. In the inscriptions the term is often used in the same connotation. In many cases, however, the term stands for the Sākyas, the khattiya clan of the solar line, in which the Buddha was born. In addition, whenever the kings claimed that their father belonged to the khattiya-vāṇṇa (Pali) we find that kat kula is used as a Sinhalese equivalent. Similarly, we find that eme kula used to indicate that their mother belonged to the same class or caste.

---

2. Dḥ. A. G., pp. 216-217: Kāṭ mahasal kula hayi bamumu mahasal kulan ... Vessa kula süduru kula ...
The term kula appears to have been similarly used in the Pali Tipitaka and in the Sanskrit texts. In a passage of the Sikhavalaṁda Vinisa, the khattiyas, brāhmaṇas, vassas and caṇḍālas are mentioned as dā (in Pali; jātī). The Dhampiya Atuvā Gāṭapadaya uses also this word jātī in order to indicate varṇas. If husband and wife belong to the same caste their offspring are called samajātikas. For example, two sons of Dāṭhā living at Nandivāpipāma, viz. Dhātusena and Silātissabodhi, are denoted as samajātikas in the Cūlavamsa.

Samadā, the Sinhalese equivalent of samajāti, was used by kings who claimed that their mothers were equal to their fathers as far as caste and social standing were concerned. Thus, Mahinda IV (956-972 A.D.) explained in the Raṁbāva Slab Inscription that his mother, i.e. Dev, (in Pali; Devā) was samadā of his father. In addition, in many contexts of the Pali Tipitaka this

1. Vinaya Piṭaka,III,p.184; IV,pp.80,177,272; see for more examples, N. Wagle, Society at the Time of the Buddha, pp.119ff; Monier Williams, Skt-Eng. Dict.,s.v. kula.
2. Sikhav. V.,p.43: Mehi dā ... meseyin danno saṇḍalhi kāṭayehi yanādi hīna ukaṭa dā yī.
5. Ibid.,52.64.
term jāti stands for varṇa. As G.S. Ghurye has pointed out: 'Rigorous demarcation of meaning between "varṇa" and "jāti", the former denoting the four large classes and the latter only their sub-divisions cannot, however, be maintained. The word is sometimes indiscriminately used for "varṇa".

From the above examples it becomes clear that the terms kula, jāti or varṇa, (or their Sinhalese equivalents) in passages which reflect the brahmanic theory of caste, normally indicate, as in India proper, the four varṇas in ancient Ceylon. Candāla is also classed as jāti in both India and Ceylon. On the mainland, basketmakers (vēna), hunters (nesāda), charioteers (ulkattā) and sweepers (pukkusa) are also called jātis.

It is not certain that this was the case in ancient Ceylon, too.

It is of prime importance in this connexion to decide to what extent the above groups can be regarded as a caste system during the period under survey. Yet any serious study of this aspect is extremely difficult owing to lack of evidence.

2. G.S. Ghurye, Caste and Class in India, 1950, pp. 55-56.
During the reign of Kassapa III (724-730 A.D.), we hear for the first time that the brahmāṇas were recognized as a religious group comparable with the bhikkhus in the Island. The Cūlavamsa states that 'for laymen, bhikkhus and brahmāṇas, the king (i.e. Kassapa III); encouraged the way of life fitting for each'. This may mean 'freedom in religious observances was allowed to the full' as has been indicated by Paranavitana. The passage may also imply that Kassapa III provided facilities for the brahmāṇas as the kings normally did for the monks, and encouraged laymen to live according to Buddhist ethics, the bhikkhus according to Vinaya and the brahmāṇas according to the Veda.

Thereafter we get a number of examples showing that some other kings in the Island extended their patronage not only to the bhikkhus but also to the brahmāṇas. There also is some archaeological evidence attesting the existence of Hinduism and of brahmin priests in the Island towards the close of our period. And there is, of course, clear evidence for brahmmins during and after the Cōla occupation. Besides, there is literary evidence for brahmāṇas and Hindu devāles even before the time of Kassapa III.

1. Cv., XLVIII, 23: gihina† cevā bhikkhūnaṃ brahmāṇanaṃ ca khatthiyo cattāpayi sakācāre.
The next occasion after Kassapa III when brahmanas were entertained by a king is recorded during the reign of Mahinda II (777-797 A.D.). In addition, the latter is said to have restored decayed temples of the gods in the Island and to have images made of the gods. These temples were probably Hindu shrines, and the images were those of the Hindu gods. We find evidence for Śaiva temples in the Island during our period. It has already been discussed that there were Śaiva temples at Māntai and Gokanā. Dantakumāra and Hemamālā, having arrived at Laṅkāpaṭṭana, are said to have settled down in a devālaya near the port before proceeding to Anurādhapura. The brahmanas attached to this devālaya entertained the

1. Cv., XLVIII, 143-144.
2. See ibid., p. 298 ff.
3. While the Dāthāvamsa mentions Laṅkāpattana, the Daladā Sirita records Māvaṭutota as the port at which they disembarked. (See Dāthāvamsa, v. 339 and Daladā Sirita, p. 35 respectively). About twenty miles south of Gokanā in Koddiyar Pattu, there is a port called Ilangkā-turai about three miles west of which two Brāhmī cave inscriptions have been found. (A.R. Arch. Surv. Ceyl., 1962-1963, p. G. 80, nos. 12-13). On the basis of the fact that Ilankā-turai is a precise Tamil rendering of the term Laṅkāpaṭṭana, W. J. M. Fernando surmises that it is at this port that the ship which carried the Tooth Relic arrived. (A.R. Arch. Surv. Ceyl., 1962, p. G. 75). But this seems far-fetched, as there is nothing to suggest that Ilankā-turai was used as a port in ancient times or even later. It seems more likely that Mahātīththa would have been called Laṅkāpaṭṭana ('the port of Laṅkā') because Mahātīththa was the principal port certainly in the Anurādhapura period (see ibid., p. 296), and perhaps even later. The Daladā Sirita probably mentions Māvaṭutota (Mahātīththa) as a synonym of Laṅkāpaṭṭana.
above couple and accompanied them to Anurādhapura. The above devāles in the major ports were probably built by South Indian merchants who had commercial intercourse with Ceylon for the welfare of, particularly, their travelling countrymen.

In the interior of Ceylon, too, there are references to Hindu shrines existing towards the close of the Anurādhapura period. According to the Bālarāmāyana and Anargharāghava, two Sanskrit plays of the ninth century A.D., there was an Agastya shrine on or near Adam's Peak. Rājaśekhara and Murāri, the respective writers of these two dramas, both lived in north India, and had probably no first-hand knowledge of such a shrine, because they never went to Ceylon, as far as we know, and also gave different locations of the shrine. Paranavitana, however, pointed out the significance of these references to the shrine of Agastya on or near Adam's Peak, considering

1. Dāthāvamsa, vv.339-341.
3. Bālarāmāyana, XII, v.48ff; Anargharāghava, p.361. While Rājaśekara refers to this shrine as located on a table-land (adhityakā) on the mountain, Murāri informs us that it was on low-land (upatyakā) at the foot of the Rohaṇa Peak.
that this sage is one of the priests of Yama\(^1\) and the latter is the god of Adam's Peak according to Paranavitana's own identification of Saman, the traditional god of this mountain.\(^2\)

As Paranavitana himself admits, this reference to an Agastya shrine on or near Adam's Peak, is not supported by more reliable evidence. The colossal rock-cut statue at the Potgul Vehera at Polonnaruva, for which different identifications have been suggested,\(^3\) is, according to J.Ph.Vogel, a representation of Agastya,\(^4\) Paranavitana has also cited some references to Agastya in the Jātakas.\(^5\) Yet none of these examples supports the view of Rājaśekhara or Murāri that there was a shrine of Agastya on or near Adam's Peak.

Apart from these somewhat uncertain references to the worship of Agastya, we find archaeological evidence for the existence of Śaiva shrines and for a temple of Bhadrakāli, the mother goddess, as well as for residences of Hindu priests with some lesser buildings at Anurādhapura.

---

5. S. Paranavitana, *The God of Adam's Peak*, p.73; Āti, the name of the minister who figures in the Minipē inscription of the thirteenth century, has etymologically been connected with Agastya; see S. Paranavitana, *Ep. Zeyl.*, V, p.160.
period. The remains of these buildings, aptly termed the Tamil Ruins, are scattered in a section of the northern quarter of the old city of Anurādhapura. In one of these, two hundred yards from an Abhayagiri building designated as L, an image of the goddess Kāli has been found. To the north of this kōvil, there is another ruined temple where a liṅga was unearthed; this was situated 20 yards from the priest's house. About the same distance separates a third but small sanctuary containing a liṅga. A fourth devāla (in which no liṅga was discovered), lies near the third one; it is apparently not provided with an attached shelter for the priest, though three or four buildings of unknown function lie south-west at a short distance. Describing these monuments, H.C.P.Bell reports:

'All these shrines are of one design—a vestibule (antarāla), a middle room (ardhamandapaya), and the garbha-grha, or sanctum, at the back, where the concrete object of worship was enshrined. They are all built on brick basements with engaged stone pillars as additional supports to the wall. The stone doorframes are all more or less cramped—a characteristic feature of these Hindū shrines.

The priests' residences, on the contrary, stand on high basements, stone-faced in two courses, with a single flight of stone steps

2. Ibid., 1893, p. 4.
on their front flanked by splayed blustrades and plain terminals. They are in every case larger than the shrines, and were divided into rooms.  

Paranavitana dated these ruins at Anurādhapura back to the 'latest period of that city's history'. As far as their architecture is concerned they may belong to the pre-Cōla period because they are in marked contrast to the embellished granite temples of the Cōla and later periods. Therefore, these Hindu shrines must have been built by about the tenth century A.D., if not earlier.

Such dating of most of these ruins appears to have been confirmed by Tamil inscriptions found at that site. Two of these are dated in regnal years of Cicapōti Mārāyaṇ (in Pali: Siri Saṅghabodhi Mahārāja), who has been identified by Krishna Sastri with Aggabodhi III (633-643 A.D.), because the Cūlavāṃsa mentions him as Siri Saṅghabodhi. But the name Siri Saṅghabodhi is of little help in identification as it was a consecration

3. SIT, IV, nos. 1403-1404.
name borne by many kings from the time of Aggabodhi III.¹ According to the palaeography of these records, it is probable that these inscriptions are attributable to the seventh century A.D., but it is uncertain who was Ciricaṅka-pōtī Mārāyaṇ.

On the other hand, kumārakanam and Ilakkāçu, two terms occurring in these inscriptions, may suggest that these inscriptions were written after the ninth century. As C. Minakshi has pointed out, the term kumārakanam referring to a group of a corporation in the position of a board of managers or trustees of a single shrine, does not occur in any of the South Indian Tamil inscriptions before the ninth century.² The term Ilakkāçu ('Ceylonese money'), indicating a particular type of Ceylon coin, cannot be found in the South Indian Tamil inscriptions before the reign of Parāntaka I (907-955 A.D.).³ It is therefore likely that these terms came into use in the Tamil inscriptions of Ceylon before the ninth century.

Another Tamil inscription, found in the same ruins, is dated in the reign of a Sinhalese king called Senavarman. We know of no Sinhalese king who bore the name of Senavarman in the Island. Therefore, this name probably

2. C. Minakshi, Administration and Social Life Under the Pallavas,pp.130-132.
indicates one of Senas, who ruled during the last two centuries of the Anurādhapura period. It is also to be noted that there were direct contacts between the Tamil and Sinhalese during the reign of Sena I (833-853 A.D.) and Sena II (853-887 A.D.). These kings also patronized (South Indian ?) brāhmaṇas who lived in the Island. Sena I ruled during the period between 833-853 and the last, Sena V, between 972-982 A.D. The above record would then be dated in the period between c. 833 and 982. For these reasons, the inscriptions under discussion must have belonged to the ninth and tenth century. The above mentioned Hindu ruins at Anurādhapura can therefore be dated in the latest period of that city’s history as has been suggested by Paranavitana.

It is interesting that one of the above mentioned inscriptions, dated in the fifth year of Ciricana-pōti Mārāyan, registers the grant by the members of the kumārakanam of 30 Iilakkācu for the daily offerings and the burning of the perpetual lamp, evidently in favours of one of the Śaiva temples in the area.

1. While the Pāṇḍya king Śrīmāra Śrīvallabha attacked Anurādhapura during the reign of Sena I, Sena II, who succeeded the latter, attacked Madurai, see supra, p. 385.
2. Infra, pp. 353 ff.
In addition to these Śaiva temples and officiating priests' quarters, some other Hindu monuments have been identified all in the same part of the city. For instance, some stone lingas were unearthed in the area north of the Basavakkulam Tank.\(^1\) Near the sluice of the tank, a figure of a small Nandi and argha of a linga were discovered.\(^2\) Similarly, a quarter of a mile north of the Thūpārāma, the remains of a small Hindu shrine, similar to those mentioned above, was unearthed.\(^3\)

These lingas and the remains of the shrine seem contemporary with the so-called Tamil Ruins as there is striking similarity between them. It remains, however, uncertain whether these were original or reconstructed buildings, as the stratification of these sites has not yet been identified by archaeological excavations. On the other hand, in the chronicles there is no evidence for the construction of new devāles during our period, or even for their reconstruction, apart from a single reference which we have already mentioned.\(^4\)

In contrast, the chronicles refer to the emergence of a number of devāles and brāhmaṇa residences in the

---

2. Ibid., 1898, p. 3.
3. Ibid., 1898, p. 5.
4. Supra, p. 345.
city of Anurādhapura during the reign of Paṇḍukābhaya.¹

From these examples it follows that there were Hindu temples in the major ports and in northern part of the old city of Anurādhapura and perhaps on or near Adam's Peak during the period under survey, in particular, from the seventh century onwards. These temples also included residences of the brāhmaṇas who served as officiating priests. We also discussed the evidence for the existence of phallic worship. Thus, in a period when Brahmanism had many adherents in the Island, king Mahinda II reconstructed devāles of gods, patronized the brāhmaṇas, and restored some Hindu shrines.

Another king who extended his patronage to the brāhmaṇas was Sena I (833-853 A.D.)² Sena II (853-887 A.D.), honoured the brāhmaṇas in addition to the bhikkhus. The Čulavamsa writes:

'(Sena) reformed the three fraternities. He had a thousand jars of gold filled with pearls and on the top of each he placed a costly jewel and presented (it) to a thousand brāhmaṇas whom he fed with milk rice in pure jewelled goblets, as well as golden threads. He clothed them also, as a friend of meritorious works, with new garments at their hearts' desire, and gladdened them with festive pomp. To the bhikkhus ...'³

3. Ibid.,LI,64-68; Cv. Trans1., Geiger,p.153.
As to the correctness of this account we need have little doubt because, as we know, on the one hand, it was a bhikkhu who wrote this passage and it was a Buddhist king who patronized the brāhmaṇas on the other. It is true that the author of the Cūlavamsa describes numerous contributions made by this king, as by many others, towards the maintenance of the Buddhist Saṅgha and the vihāras, but the above passage reveals that this king patronized the brāhmaṇas more than any other Sinhalese king. It is to be noted in this connexion that Sena took Madurai and subsequently maintained close relations with the Pāṇḍyas. ¹ In addition, it is at Mahātittha that Sena collected his troops which were dispatched to Madurai; his troops returned also to the Island at this port. The Cūlavamsa mentions that the king sojourned at Mahātittha while he was collecting troops; it also would have us believe that he stayed there till his troops returned to the Island. ² Mahātittha was a place which felt influence of brāhmaṇas rather than of bhikkhus. ³

For these reasons, it seems likely that Sena would have maintained good relations with the brāhmaṇas for his own prestige. It can also be assumed that there

---

¹ Supra, pp. 305 ff. 
² Cv., Li, 28 and 45 respectively. 
³ Supra, pp. 298.
were a considerable number of brāhmaṇas during that period who had secured an honourable position. In addition, the "golden threads" mentioned in the passage may, as Geiger suggested, relate to the "cotton thread" (upavītā), which according to Hindu tradition, the twice-born wears over his shoulder. In this case these were evidently interwoven with gold thread.\(^1\)

It is also interesting to note that it was milk rice that was offered in the above dāna. The utensils, from which the food was served, were also specially prepared. It is well known that milk rice was a traditional meal which was offered to the Buddha and his disciples and to the gods on many occasions. Even to-day, for both Sinhalese and Hindus in Ceylon this is the traditional food eaten on important occasions such as new year celebrations and dīpāvalī-festival.

It is well known that Sujātā at Uruvela in Magadha prepared milk rice as her gift to the god of the Bodhi Tree.\(^2\) King Kāvantissa offered milk rice to the bhikkhus on the day of name giving of his son Gāmiṇī, and on other

---

important occasions of both Gāmadī and his other son Tissa.¹

On the other hand, there are some Hindu teachings which discouraged the brāhmaṇas from taking certain kinds of food. They were also asked not to drink or eat from the vessels which were used by people of lower caste.² Parāśara states that a brāhmaṇa may take food prepared either by a ksatriya or a vaiśya in their own house only on certain religious occasions provided these persons have lived according to the sacred law.³

In the above passage it is also stated that the king reformed the three fraternities, i.e. the Mahāvihāra, Abhayagiri and Jetavana. Similar events are recorded during the reigns of Moggallāna I (495-512 A.D.), Kumāradhātusena (512-520 A.D.), Silāmeghavāṇṇa (623-632 A.D.) and Aggabodhi VII (772-777 A.D.).⁴ During the reign of Kassapa IV (898-914 A.D.) it is specially stated that the monks of questionable discipline were expelled from

---

1. Mv.,XXII,70,73-78. Did Sena II hold the above alms-giving to celebrate his victory over Madurai?
2. Sūtronāma Samuccaya, p.16.
4. Cv.,XXXIX,57; XLIV,2,44,46; 75-76 and XLVIII,71 respectively. Cf. the Abhayagiri Inscription, Ep. Zeyl., I,pp.1-9; and the Sikhavālaṇḍa Vinīsa which are written in the middle of the ninth century and the tenth century A.D. respectively regarding the Vinaya of the bhikkhus.
The Sāsana. These examples show that dissension occurred from time to time in the bhikkhu community and the kings took steps to restore order. In spite of that, from the eighth century onwards, particularly in the following two centuries, the Buddhist Saṅgha showed clear signs of decline. It seems likely that the brāhmaṇas took this opportunity to gain ground vis-à-vis the Buddhist Saṅgha.

As H. Ellawala has pointed out the brāhmaṇas had held a favourable position in Ceylon before the advent of Mahinda-thera, but they gradually lost it in the following centuries, owing to the strong influence of the bhikkhus on society. It is only towards the seventh century A.D., that they were able to regain some strength in the Island as we have seen above. On the other hand, before the seventh century and even a little later, the position of the bhikkhus in society was unchallenged.

It is also worth mentioning that most of the kings who supported the brāhmaṇas were the descendants

1. Cv.,LII,44. The conditions of the Buddhist Saṅgha during these centuries are discussed in detail in the following works:- W.Rahula, History of Buddhism in Ceylon, pp.92-111; R.A.L.H.Gunawardhana, op. cit., chapter,1. 
3. W.Rahula, History of Buddhism in Ceylon, pp.93ff. During these centuries no 'purification of the Buddhist Saṅgha' is also recorded.
of Manavamma who had been in the service of the Pallava army in South India and later captured political power in Ceylon with the assistance of an army provided by the Pallava king Narasimhavarman II.\(^1\) Manavamma's son Mahinda, who supported the brāhmanas during the reign of Kassapa III, was born and bred in the Pallava country.\(^2\) Sena I and Sena II were also descendants of Manavamma.

In addition, the last two rulers had relations with the Pāṇḍyas, too. The Pāṇḍya king Śrīmāra Śrīvallabha captured Anurādhapura from Sena I while afterwards his successor Sena II invaded Madurai and captured the city.\(^3\) Close relations between the Sinhalese and the Pāṇḍyas subsequently appear to have lasted till Rājaraṭṭha became a Cōla province.

Pallava influence on art and architecture in Ceylon is noticeable from the seventh century onward. The Nālanda Geği near Mātalē is an unique example in this connexion.\(^4\) Similarly, the well known bas-relief at Isurumuniya showing a man and a horse's head, the dvārapāla statue at Tiriya and the Bodhisatta figures

---

1. Cv., XLVII, 4-61.
2. Ibid., XLII, 8; XLVIII, 23.
3. Ibid., L, 30-40; LI, 22-47; cf. supra, pp. 30-37.
at Situlpava and Kurukkal-Matham show clear influence of Pallava sculpture in about the same period. There are also inscriptions in the Island written in Pallava Grantha script which exercised clear influence on Sinhalese script during the seventh and eighth centuries.

We have already mentioned that there were several Hindu shrines of pre-Cōla style in the northern quarter of Anurādhapura. As K. Indrapala has pointed out there were permanent Tamil settlements in this section of the city and some other parts of the Island towards the ninth or tenth century. As has already been seen Tamils in Anurādhapura made contributions towards the maintenance the brāhmaṇa temples in the city.

Thus, it seems likely that the close relations between Ceylon and South India were another reason for the apparent rise of the brāhmaṇa community in the Island from about the seventh century onwards. It is not necessary to emphasize that the brāhmaṇas occupied a very influential position in South India in those days.

5. See infra, note, 1.
It would be important to find out whether there any gānas allocated to the brāhmaṇas in the Island during the period under discussion, as was the case in the Indian subcontinent. Yet the available data for this matter are very vague. Thus, we come across a village by the name of Brāhmaṇacola mentioned in a story of the Sahassavatthuppakaraṇa. But it seems unlikely that this was inhabited by the brahmins because its inhabitants were fishermen.\(^1\) There were of course some brahmins both in India and in Ceylon who earned their livelihood by different reputable occupations, but not by fishing.

On another occasion, we hear that there were three brāhmaṇagāmas named Gokāṇa, Ekakāpilla and Kalanda, in each of which a brahmin temple was founded. These temples are recorded to have been destroyed by Mahāsenā (276-303 A.D.), who had three Buddhist temples built on their sites.\(^2\) There are no data enabling us to identify the last two villages. C.W.Nicholas only surmises that they were situated on the eastern coast of Rohaṇa.\(^3\) However, as has already been mentioned a brahmin temple at Gokāṇa is again mentioned by about the second half of the seventh century A.D., or even earlier, at a place where there was then a Buddhist temple, too.\(^4\) Another allusion to a

---

2. HY., XXXVII, 41.
4. Supra, p.312.
brahmin village is found in the Pūjāvaliya, where it is mentioned that king Ḫettatissa I (266-276 A.D.) built a tank in a certain bamuṇugama which still remains unidentified.

As to the most important problem, that of deciding whether these villages were mainly inhabited by brahmins, nothing is known. However, the areas in which brahmins are mentioned were certainly inhabited not only by them. We know that the ruins of the Hindu temples in Anurādhapura, which we cited elsewhere, are concentrated in the area between the road from the Jetavanārāma to the Vijayārāma and that from the Kuṭṭam-pokuna to Pankuliya as well as near the Thūpārāma, where there were also Buddhist monks and others. Similarly, Māntai and Trincomalee, where we find references to brahmins, were also of course inhabited by many others. Probably the above mentioned brahmin villages were similar to Caturvedi-maṅgalams in South India which belonged to the brahmāṇas but were inhabited also by craftsmen and others.

It is only in later times that we get references to the grants of villages to brahmins. However, in a

passage in slab inscription of Mahinda IV (956-972 A.D.),
the word *bamunu* occurs. As the remaining part of the
passage is badly withered, its context is unknown. This
inscription registers some land grants made by the king.
It may therefore be inferred that the word *bamunu* may
relate to such a grant made to *brāhmaṇas*. But this is
very uncertain. According to the *Dāthāvamsa*, Hemamālā,
and Dantakumāra were granted a village. The *Rājāvaliya*
names this village as *Kīravalla* in the Beligal Kōrale.
But this reference is doubtful, too, because firstly, there
is a long gap between the event and its record. Secondly,
this land grant cannot be compared with ordinary land
grants made to *brāhmaṇas* because Dantakumāra and Hemamālā
were Buddhist laymen. Therefore, the above village does
not seem a brahmin village similar to those existing in
the Indian subcontinent.

As advocated by the *Smṛtis*, *adhyāpana* (teaching),
*pratigraha* (acceptance of gifts) and *vajña* (conducting
sacrifice) were the duties reserved specially for
*brāhmaṇas*. In the pre-Mahinda period there were *brāh-
maṇas* who were engaged in teaching. In addition, Parā-

2. According to the *Cūlavamsa*, Hemamālā was a brahmin
woman. But *Pujāvaliya* mentions that she and Dantakumāra
Kramabāhu I (1153-1186 A.D.) is said to have learnt Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra (Koṭalla nīti), most probably from a brāhmaṇa. There was a relatively high standard of Sanskrit education in the Island during the period under consideration. It is true that there were bhikkhus, particularly in the Abhayagiriya, who learnt Sanskrit, but it seems more likely that the Sanskrit education was carried out mainly by brahmins.

There were astrologers during the period under discussion, as at any other time. Most probably this profession was carried out by brāhmaṇas as was the case in the mainland and in Ceylon in the preceding period. However, according to the material we have already examined, it seems that there were brahmins who accepted gifts, but the bhikkhus were the main pratigrāhakas in the Island. Although we hear of officiating brāhmaṇas in Ceylon, nothing more is known about their activities.

The evidence from all these data would lead us to conclude that the brāhmaṇas occupied an important place in society from about the seventh century onwards.

1. Cv., LXIV, 4; Cv. Transl., Geiger, p. 248, note, 1.
This may well be compared with their rise in South India.¹

There are a number of references to Ceylonese khattiyas in the chronicles and inscriptions but it is extremely difficult to determine how far these references are sufficient to lead to the conclusion that these royal members belonged to the ksatriya-varṇa. Thus, there are instances of Sinhalese kings belonging to both the Lambakaṇṇa and Moriya dynasty² and sometimes princes³ as well as princesses⁴ are indicated by the terms of khattiya and khattiyā respectively. In addition, some Sinhalese kings claimed, in their inscriptions, to be ksatriyas. The Ceylonese chronicles, too, appear to have taken great pains to show the ksatriya origin of the Sinhalese kings.

Up to about the eighth century A.D., the inscriptions in Ceylon have only a brief introduction. This includes only the name of the monarch with that of his father and grandfather. Very few inscriptions add the titles and biruda of the monarch, as well as his regnal years. But

² Dv., X, 7; Cv., VII, 12; XLVII, 23; Ep. Zeyl., I, pp. 85, 218, 223; II, p. 66.
³ Cv., XLVIII, 20, 26; L, 44.
⁴ Dv., X, 1; Cv., LIV, 9; cf. the Ruvanmañña Nighánduva gives kät kat mehesun as a synonym of the mehesī (anointed queen) and kät kat as that of rājāna (other queens), see y. 259.
in the eight and ninth-century inscriptions, there are, in addition, laudatory praśastis in which the royal lineage is not confined to the immediate genealogy of the kings but is traced back to the origin of the whole dynasty. These praśastis bear a striking similarity to those of South India: the charters and grants of the South Indian monarchs of this period also include a long introduction praising the king's valour, his prowess in battle and wisdom in administration, his personal qualities and his works of charity as well as his royal descent and lineage.¹ These praśastis have undoubtly influenced those in the Sinhalese inscriptions.

In the Sinhalese praśastis, it is Okāvas rad parapuren bat ('descending from the line of Okkāka') that is the most used passage with or without a qualifying phrase.² Okkāka, (Ikṣvāku, Sanskrit) was a mythical kṣatriya king to whom most of the kings of early India,

¹ See for example, Sinnamānur Inscr., Udayendiram Inscr., and Tiruppārakkaṭal Inscr., (SII, no.206,II, no.75 and III, no.99 respectively.
² Ep. Zeyl.,I,p.232; II, pp.40,45; III, pp.139,264; IV, p.182. In some praśastis this phrase is qualified with siribar kāṭ kula kōt ('pinnacle of the illustrious kṣatriya caste'), (see Ep. Zeyl.,I,p.245;III, pp.74,127; IV,p.62) or siribar kāṭ kulaṭ talāṭik baṇdu ('like a tilaka mark to the illustrious kṣatriya caste'),(see Ep. Zeyl.,III, p.297) or Daṃbadivhi an kāṭ kula pāmili kala ('which has caused other kṣatriya (sub) caste of the whole of Jambudvīpa to render it homage'), (see Ep. Zeyl.,I,p.218; II, pp.51,60,66).
too, traced their descent. Some Sinhalese kings appear to have further defined their ksatriya origin by stating that they descended from the Śākya clan, derived from the Okkāka dynasty, in which Gautama Buddha was born. In addition to claiming their affiliation to the Śākya dynasty and to Lord Buddha, some Sinhalese kings traced back their origin to Paṇḍuvāsudeva.

According to the tradition preserved in the chronicles, both Paṇḍuvāsudeva and his queen Bhaddakaccānā were Śākyas from whom the Sinhalese rulers are said to have originated. The ksatriya origin of these kings is similarly mentioned in the Cūlavamsa, too. Thus, Mānavamma, from whom the above kings (who regarded themselves as ksatriyas), descended, is described in the Cūlavamsa as a scion of lineage of Mahāsammata, the first (mythical) king of the present age of the world, from whom Okkāka and other ksatriya clans are descended.

1. F.E. Pargitar, Ancient Indian Historical Traditions, 1922, pp. 84ff.
4. Dv., X, 1; Mv., VII, 47; VIII, 4, 14, 15, 17; P.jv., pp. 115ff; Rjv., pp. 23ff.
5. Cv., XLVII, 2.
In addition, most Sinhalese kings whose kinship with the preceding rulers was not clear have been connected with this line in one way or the other in the chronicles. Thus, king Dhatusena (459-477 A.D.), who regained the Sinhalese throne from the Tamils, has been connected with the Moriya clan\(^1\) to which subsequently a whole line of Sinhalese rulers belonged. Similarly, Mahātissa, the founder of a royal dynasty in Rohaṇa by about the seventh century A.D., has been described as a scion of the lineage of Okkāka.\(^2\) Likewise, king Dappula I (659 A.D.), who belonged to another royal family in Rohaṇa, whose relationship with the dynasty of Mahātissa was not clear, is described also as a scion of Okkāka.\(^3\) The Origin of Datta (683-684 A.D.) is given in similar terms.\(^4\) Mānavamma (684-718 A.D.), the founder of the so-called second Lambakaṇṇa dynasty, was also described as a descendant of Mahāsammata.\(^5\) The Sinhalese prose work Saddharmākāratnākaraya and two poems Pārakumbā-Sirita and Kāvyaśekharaya, all attributable to the 15th century, explain the Lambakaṇṇas

2. Ibid.,XLV,38.
3. Pjv.,p.146; Rjv.,p.63.
4. According to the Cūlavamsa, Datta is descending from the rājavamsa, (see Cv.,XLVI,41). Whereas the Pujāvaliya and the Rājavaliya represent him as a scion of Okkāka line, (see Pjv.,p.146 and Rjv.,p.63).
5. Cv.,XLVII,2.
were originally a branch of the Moriya clan to which Aśoka belonged. They describe the Ceylonese Lambakaṇṇas as the descendants of Sumitta, who was one of the eight princes that accompanied the Bodhi Tree. Sumitta is a brother of Aśoka's Vidiśā queen. The latter is also a Śākya, according to the Saddharmapaññākaraya.  

Thus, there are examples showing that the Ceylonese Moriyanas as well as the Lambakaṇṇas were regarded as khattiyas in Ceylon. But, as has been indicated above, the most difficult problem is to decide whether these clans were real khattiyas. It is to be borne in mind that the Indian Moriyanas were also regarded by Ceylonese Buddhists, contrary to all others, as khattiyas. However, as these theories of the origin of the Indian Moriyanas have been widely discussed by many scholars, there is no need to repeat them here. It is sufficient to conclude that there is no prima-facie evidence suggesting that the Maurya dynasty in ancient Magadha had a kṣatriya origin and to reconcile the discrepancy between the

1. Saddharmaññākaraya (Colombo edition, 1923), p. 296; Pārāśekhara-Sīrīta, v. 10; Kāvyāsekhara, XV, vv. 11-21, see also Dv., XXII, 53; Attanagala Vamsaya, pp. 6, 19.
2. Saddharmaññākaraya, p. 296.
Buddhist tradition and others regarding this matter.

It is also to be noted in this connexion, that there are a number of ruling clans in India proper, which had no real kṣatriya origin or, of which the origin is uncertain, were regarded as kṣatriyas. For instance, the Pratihāras of Māḍor described themselves as descendants of a brāhmaṇa named Hariścandra but bring in the name of Lakṣmana, the pratihāra (door-keeper) of Rāmacandra, to show that there was nothing inferior about their avocation. Similarly, the Guhilas of Mewar and Cātsu are now regarded as solar kṣatriyas. But their earliest inscription describes their ancestor named Bappā as vipra and mahideva which would prove as contended by Bhandarkar, that originally the Guhilas were brāhmaṇas of Vādnagara.

The mythical and legendary character of the above traditions is manifest. Such traditions in Ceylon most probably arose in order to connect the Sinhalese rulers with the lineage of the Buddha. On the one hand, these traditions were preserved mainly through the writings


of monks. On the other hand, it is not surprising that at a time when the kings adopted Buddhist names and entertained the Bodhisatta ideal\(^1\) they would desire to claim kinship with the Buddha. They traced their line to Mahāsammata to show their pure \textit{kṣatriya} origin and their legitimacy as rulers. So it is difficult to decide whether the Sinhalese rulers belonged to the \textit{kṣatriya} caste, although they claimed so themselves and the chroniclers believed so, as was the case with some dynasty in India proper.

It is also to be pointed out that the Lambakāṇṇas and Moriyas as well as the \textit{kuliṅga}, \textit{taraccha} and \textit{balibhojaka} may have originated from the totemistic tribes of pre-Aryan origin, mainly because these names denote animals: \textit{lamba-kappa} is 'hare' or 'goat', \textit{moriya} 'peacock', \textit{kuliṅga} is the name of a bird, the 'forktailed shrike', \textit{taraccha} 'hyena' and \textit{balibhojaka} 'crow'. It is also suggested that a peacock was the emblem and perhaps the mythical ancestor of the Moriyas.\(^2\) But here again the problem is whether these tribes had any caste affiliation.

It is also worth considering that there were \textit{khattiyas} in Kācaragāma (Kataragama) and Candanagāma

---

(in Rohana ?) lived during the third or second century B.C. There is nothing to suggest that they were related to the Lambakāṇṇas or to the Moriyas. It appears possible that these kṣatriyas were connected with a stream of immigration to the Island quite distinct from the main stream whose legends and traditions are the theme of the chroniclers of Anurādhapura.

The khattiyas in the above two settlements are said to have been present at the celebration of the Mahābodhi during the reign of Devānāmipiyā Tissa. Paranavitana has expressed the view that Devānāmipiyā Tissa invited them to the above celebration and their acceptance of the invitation indicates that they acknowledged the supremacy of the Anurādhapura ruler. However, even after the reign of Devānāmipiyā Tissa there were independent rulers called Dasabhātikas (Pali), Dasāḥ (Sinhalese): 'Ten Brothers' at Kataragama, who have been identified by Paranavitana with the above mentioned khattiyas. The Dhātuvaṃsa relates that these khattiyas were slain by Gotabhābhaya, ruler of Māgama, early in the second century B.C. Consequently, Kataragama was annexed to the Māgama kingdom.

1. Mv.,XIX,54.
2. Inscr. Ceyl.,Introd.,p.LVII.
3. Ibid.,nos.487 and 549-552.
5. Inscr. Ceyl.,Introd.,p.LVII.
A contemporary khattiya family lived at Kālaṇiya, too, lost their independence to the rulers of Rohaṇa.\(^1\) Thus, it appears that there were petty states in some parts of the Island during the pre-Christian centuries which were, however, subjugated by the principal kingdoms. This may well be compared with the Indians' recognition of the war-like republican tribes such as the Licchavīs and Mallas in North India during the sixth and fifth centuries B.C.

There can be no doubt that the Sinhalese khattiyas retained an influential position even after they had lost their independence. As Paranavitana believes they would have migrated to other parts of the country. Paranavitana also identifies Asali, son of Gamaṇi Dhamaraja mentioned in a Brāhma inscription found at Mihintale with a son of Dhamaraja, the eldest son of the Dasabhātikas mentioned in the Bōvattēgala inscriptions. Thus, Asali would have migrated to Anurādhapura from Kataragama.\(^2\) In addition, we find a number of local chieftains, who eventually captured the Anurādhapura kingdom and Rohaṇa, whose origin is obscure.\(^3\) Some of them were perhaps originated from the above mentioned khattiyas. Some khattiyas would

---

3. *See infra, pp. 380ff.*
have merged into the *kulīnas*.\(^1\)

It appears, however, beyond doubt that a number of ruling families occupied a very favourable position in ancient Ceylon. It is established that kingship in the Island was hereditary, and limited to the so-called *kṣatriya* families. Succession took place in such a way that the king was normally succeeded by his younger brother. If there were no younger brothers the son of the eldest brother, and if there was neither brother nor a son as a successor, the son of a sister, (*the bhāgineyya*) could become king.\(^2\) This enabled the ruling families, *i.e.* Lambakaṇṇa and Moriya to keep kingship in their power though there were some interruptions.

We find that the Lambakaṇṇa dynasty founded by Goṭhābhaya (253-266 A.D.) continued to rule till the end of the reign of Mahānāma (410-432 A.D.). Mahānāma had neither a son by the *mahesi* nor a brother nor a *bhāgineyya*. Therefore, on his death, his son Sotthisena, born of a Tamil consort, was elevated to the throne, but was murdered on the same day by a princess named Saṅghā, the daughter of Mahānāma by his *mahesi*. Saṅghā installed

---

1. See *infra*, 377 ff.
2. See *supra*, p. 38 44.
her own husband named Jantu, the umbrella bearer (chattag-gähaka), on the throne who could remain in power only for a year. A usurper named Mittasena ruled next for a year, but was afterwards killed by Tamils who then ruled for about twenty-seven years.

Overthrowing the Tamils, the Moriyas came to power under Dhaṭusena at about the beginning of the latter half of the fifth century.¹ His dynasty lasted till the Lambakaṇṇas re-established their political power in about 620 A.D.² Again the Moriyas were able to come to power in about 680 A.D., defeating the Lambakaṇṇas.³ This follows a series of struggles for the throne between these two clans, which gave rise to a new élite represented the sword bearers (asiggāhakas) and ministers (camūpatis or amaccas). They played a vital role in the political field till the emergence of Mānavaḥamma, who founded another Lambakaṇṇa dynasty. At last, some of these new political figures were related to the traditional ruling families in one way or another. Thus, the sword bearer Saṅghatissa,

2. Cf. some scholars believe that the Sinhalese kings ruled before Subha (59-65 A.D.) were also descendants of the Moriya line, see C.W. Nicholas and S. Paranavitana, Concise History of Ceylon, p. 123, see also UCHC, (vol. I, pt. I), p. 294.
3. Cv., XLI, 69ff; Rjv., p. 63; Pjv., p. 146.
4. See for the rise of the senāpatis and others in later times, A. Liyanagamage, op. cit., pp. 51ff; H. W. Codrington, JCBRAS, XXXII, 1933, pp. 260ff.
who founded a short-lasting dynasty, was a kinsman of the mahesi of king Aggabodhi II (608-618 A.D.).

For others, viz. camupati Moggallana, asiggahaka Silameghavana and amacca Dathasiva, who became kings as Moggallana III (618-623 A.D.), Silameghavana (623-632 A.D.) and Dathopatissa I (643-650 A.D.) respectively it is unknown whether they were in any way related to one of the royal families. The offices they held were generally bestowed on close relatives of the king. On the other hand, these three rulers would also have belonged to one of the ruling classes of the past i.e. the Lambakanassas if we believe the later Sinhalese sources.

It is well known that the so-called second Lambakanass dynasty lasting till the downfall of Anuradhapura, was founded by Manavamma, the grandson of the above-mentioned Silameghavana.

The higher officers of the state were, after the king, the apa (heir presumptive) and mapa (heir apparent). It is beyond our scope to go into details of these aspects. But it is important to point out that these offices were always granted to the princes. The

2. Cv.,XLIV,2,22; 63,88,128.
4. Rjv.,p.63; Pjv.,p.146.
princesses were also given the title rājini from about the third decade of the ninth century A.D.  

Most of other higher officers entrusted with administrative and other duties were also selected from the royal family. The chattaggāhaka, 'umbrella bearer', was one of them. The first reference to this position appears in the following account of the death of Mahānāma (410-432 A.D.): Sotthisena, the son of the daughter by a Tamil consort was murdered at the instance of Saṅghā, the daughter of Mahānāma by his mahesi. Saṅghā was married to a certain Jantu, who held the office of chattaggāhaka and later became king for about a year.  

Another such position was the asiggāhaka 'sword bearer'. The first known asiggāhaka was the brother-in-law of Moggallāna I (459-512 A.D.), named Silākāla, a scion of the Lambakāna clan who later became king. The asiggāhaka of Aggabodhi II (608-618 A.D.), named Saṅghatissa, was also a relative of king. Saṅghatissa seized the throne on the death of his master.  

The senāpati 'commander-in-chief of the army forces' was also appointed from among the close relatives

2. Ibid.,XXXVIII,2-3.
3. Ibid.,XXXIX,55.
4. See supra, p.375.
5. Cv.,XLIV,1.
of the king. Thus, the senāpati of Dhātusena (459-477 A.D.) was his sister's son, as well as his son-in-law. Aggabodhi VI (733-772 A.D.) conferred the office of senāpati on his own son Mahinda, who later became king. Mahinda appointed also his own son senāpati. The senāpati of Kassapa IV (898-914 A.D.), Sena Ilānga, belonged also to the royal lineage.¹ There were a number of senāpati whose relationship to the royal family, if any, is unknown. There is, however, no evidence which, on the contrary, shows the appointment of senāpati from outside the court circle. Thus, it is clear that members of the royal family in the Island enjoyed a privileged position in society.

In this connexion, the words kulīna and kulagāma deserve attention, too. Regarding the former, Geiger holds as follows:

'Since the word kulīna is derived from kula, it is manifest that originally the nobility was meant by it, those who belonged to one of these clans.'² And indeed, where the term occurs in the chronicle, the kulīna are generally somehow or other connected with the ruling dynasty and with the government. They were the supporters of the kingdom and its tower of strength. From those clans the officials were taken both for civil and military service, probably by inherited right'.³

---

¹ Cv., XXXVIII, 81; XLVIII, 78-82; 154; LII, 16 respectively.
² I.e. the Moriya and Lambakāṇṇa.
We have seen elsewhere that the term kula is used in different connotations. In the above contexts, as has been indicated by Geiger, it may indicate 'nobility' and kulīnas may mean nobles like kulaputta ('noble son'). Geiger arrived at the above conclusions mainly from examples taken from the Culavamsa account of the Polonnaruva period, but it may be seen that his conclusions are applicable to our period as well.

It is said in the Culavamsa that during the Tamils held sway in Anurādhapura from about 432 to 459 A.D. kulīnas betook themselves (from Anurādhapura?) to Rohaṇa. A similar event is recorded in the chronicle with reference to the emergence of Dhātusena: those of the Moriya clan, who had fled (from Anurādhapura) through fear of the door-keeper Subha (Sabha) (59-65 A.D.), returned after Dhātusena's succession. Dhātusena was one of the Moriyas who lived in Nandivāpīgāma and Ambilayāgu as we shall see later. Thus, the Moriyas came to the fore some four centuries later, in the confusion following the death of Mahānāma. Subha may or may not have belonged to the Lambakaṇḍa clan. However, the political

1. Supra, p.341, etc.
2. Cv., XXXVIII, 12, 38.
3. Ibid., XXXVIII, 13-14; see also infra, pp. 380ff.
achievements of the Lambakaṇṇas culminated in Vasabha, the successor of Subha who founded a dynasty. Therefore, his seeking refuge with other clans, particularly the Mauryas, would be quite understandable at that time. It may be assumed that the Lambakaṇṇas had also fled during the Tamil rule in Anurādhapura. If this was the case, kulīnas in the above context may imply both the Lambakaṇṇas and Moriyas and probably all other noble clans. It is mentioned that some kulīnas served the Tamils. Dhātusena after becoming king, deprived them from their villages (kulāgāma). Others who had supported him were well treated by the king.

The kulīnas who sided with the Tamils may have been the Lambakaṇṇas who did not want the Moriyas to come to the fore. This may be compared with the actions of some nobles during the Kandyan period who took the side of English preventing their rivals from gaining positions in the state. There can be no doubt that the kulīnas who supported Dhātusena to become king were mainly members of his own clan, i.e. the Moriyas.

Kulāgāma may indicate either the villages which had been granted to the nobles for their service to the

---

state, or those that these nobles had held in hereditary succession. If we believe that it was the Lambakaṇṇas who took the side of the Tamils as mentioned above, evidently the kulagāmas in this context mean property belonging to them, either their settlements or the land granted to them for their service.

It is, however, evident that the kulagāmas were inhabited by nobles (kulīnas). We find a number of such villages. But these are not mentioned in the chronicle as kulagāma but by particular names. One such village was Nandivāpigāma where prince Dhātusena's grandfather kuṭumbika (house-holder) Dhātusena lived. Probably, Datta, the son of kuṭumbika Dhātusena, had moved from this village and settled in the Ambilayāgu where prince Dhātusena and his other children were born.¹ Meraliyavagga was another such village where Lambakaṇṇa Dāṭhāpadhutī's family lived.² Mahānāga's family lived at Saṅgillagāma.³ A similar village was Dhanapiṭṭhi of which Datta, who later became king, was the chief.⁴ In this connexion, it would be interesting to examine whether these villages were built by these noble families, and whether they

2. Ibid., XXXIX, 44-45.
3. Ibid., XL, 69-70.
4. Ibid., XLVI, 41; Pjiv., p. 146.
were mono-clan villages. But unfortunately nothing is known about these. Besides, the identification of these villages may enhance our knowledge of the geographical spread of the nobles in the Island.

C.W. Nicholas has attempted to identify Ambilayāgu and Nandivāpi (gāma?) as follows:-

'The village Ambilayāgu, near which was Nandivāpi, was close to the Kalā Oya. Ambilagrāma was a village assigned to Abhayagiri Vihāra. Ambilahāla Vihāra existed in the 1st century'.

Regrettably this scholar gives no reasons for his conclusion that Ambilayāgu and Nandivāpi (gāma?) were close to the Kalā Oya. On the other hand, 'close to the Kalā Oya' itself gives only a vague idea. The grant of the Ambilagrāma village appears among other such grants in the so-called Jetavanārāma Slab Inscription, written in Sanskrit, attributable to the first half of the ninth century A.D. It was found at the Kapārārāma ruins at Anurādhapura. The Ambilahāla Vihāra is referred to in the Papanācasūdani with reference to the sermon delivered by therī Culāna during the reign of Kūṭakaṇṇa Tissa (41-19 B.C.). But there is nothing to identify

this village and the above vihāra in any source. Therefore we can see no convincing reason to identify Nandivāpi-
gāma and Ambilayāgu as places 'close to the Kalā Oya'. Probably Nicholas was under the impression that Dhātusena
would have constructed the Kālavāpi, his main work, in approximity of his native place.

Geiger, on the other hand, had earlier than Nicholas suggested that Nandivāpigāma was not far from
Kacchakatittha (modern Mahagamoto). His suggestion rests on the Nandivāpigāma Vihāra which was built by Sabha in
gangante. In this connexion, Geiger has apparently based his identification on the Mahāvaṃsa Tiṅka which defines
gangante in the above passage as Kacchakagaṅgātire ('on the banks of the Kacchaka river'). Duṭṭhagāmanī, during
his campaign against Elāra, is said to have defeated a Tamil chieftain named Nandi at Nandigāma. This gāma is
mentioned among other Tamil strongholds situated near Kacchakatittha. Probably it is this Nandigāma that appears
in connexion with the campaign of Parākramabāhu against Mānābharaṇa, too. There remains, however, the difficulty
that it is by no means certain that Nandigāma is to be

4. Cv., LXXII, 44.
identified with Nandivāpigāma. One wonders whether there is an important väva or whether there are remains of a Śiva temple (as Nandi 'bull' associated with Śiva) near this place leading to confirm the above identification, but unfortunately there is none.

The other village mentioned in connexion with the family of Dhātusena is Ambilayāgu ('sour gruel'). Perhaps this and Ambilahāla ('sour rice') Vihāra and Ambilagrāma ('sour village') may refer to one and the same village, but we do not know its location. It seems quite likely that this and Nandivāpigāma were situated in close proximity as Nicholas has suggested.¹ One may attach some importance, in this connexion, to the village Ambilapiṭṭhiyanḍa or Mahābalapitthi, the exact location of which is unknown, although there is no doubt that it was situated in the vicinity of Kacchakatittha. It is said that Duṭṭhagāmanī camped at Ambilapiṭṭhiyanḍa and then marched to Vaḍḍhamānakatittha of the mahāgaṅgā (i.e. the Mahavāli-Gaṅga) and then to Mahākola destroying the Tamil fortress there.² In the Mahāvamsa, there are two Tamil strongholds which are referred to as situated at Mahākoṭṭha and Koṭa near Kacchakatittha together with

---

¹ See supra, p. 381.
Nandigāma and others. Mahākola may be either Mahākoṭṭha or Koṭa. Thus, we find two villages named Nandigāma and Ambilapiṭṭhiyāṅgaṇa situated apparently in close distance from one another, but it is uncertain whether Nandivāpīgāma was identical with Nandigāma and Ambilayāgu with Ambilapiṭṭhiyāṅgaṇa, and that these were villages associated with the family of Dhatusena.

Meraliya-vagga has been identified by Nicholas with the Merukandara district in the central highlands. But in this case, too, none of the examples he has cited established beyond doubt that these two names refer to the district. A passage in the Cūlavamsa would give the impression that Saṅgillagāma, where Mahānāga's family lived, was not far from Gokanna, but there is no evidence for its exact location. Geiger identifies Dhanapiṭṭhigāma with Modern Danapīṭṭigama, an uninhabited village at his time but now inhabited by mainly paddy cultivators, situated to the north.

2. JCBRAS, VI, p. 111: Nicholas has given the following references:— ’M,(hāvamsa), 39, 45: 41.19: 44.28:47. 27, 58, 59: 70.282, 295, 296’. (M.47, 27 is a mistake!).
3. Cv., XLI, 75-79.
of Kurupūgala in the Kaṭuvana Kōrale, Aṃbagaha Paḷāta.\footnote{Cv., Transl., p. 101, note, 7.}
As this is a very striking similarity applying to an uncommon name, this identification may be correct, but nothing of archaeological interest has been noticed at this site.\footnote{As no archaeological excavations have been started in any of the above villages, this argument evidently carries little weight.}

Thus, unfortunately, there is no conclusive evidence to identify the villages inhabited solely or mainly by nobles. It may, however, be assumed that the chiefs of these villages were generally nobles. Evidently the Dhanapitṭhi was under their control.\footnote{See supra, p. 380.}

As far as the available evidence is concerned, it may be suggested that there were kulīnas during our period established in different parts of the country, as well as in the capital.

From the above discussion it may be seen that though there was no real kṣatriya-varṇa during our period, the king and the members of the royal family formed a class by themselves, which can be compared with the kṣatriyas in ancient India. There can be no doubt that some kulīnas belonged also to this class.
Evidence is too scanty to make any serious study of the vaiśyas in Ceylon. The Mahāvamsa refers to vaiśyas in connexion with the origin of the Vessagiri monastery: this monastery was so-called because there lived five hundred vessas who were admitted to the Order by Mahinda. ¹ This is, however, not supported by any other evidence. We come across another reference to the vaiśyas in Ceylon in connexion with the families sent to Ceylon by Aśoka along with the Bodhi Tree. ²

After pre-Christian times we find no evidence for the existence of the vaiśyas. In the Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadava, vaiśyas are mentioned, but only in the passages where the brahmanic theory of the caste system was discussed. For instance, in the Ananda therassa³ vatthu of the Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā the khattiyas and brāhmaṇas are described as mahāsāla-kulas ('prosperous castes'), and others as nīca-kulas ('inferior castes'). ⁴ This is common in Indian texts. The Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadava explains that by nīca-kula in this context

¹ Mv., XX, 15.
² Sār. dip., p. 154; cf. Mv., XIX, 2.
³ Ananda theran lived at the time of the Buddha.
⁴ Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā, III, p. 248.
the vaiśyas and śūdras are meant. But in many contexts the vaiśyas are also enumerated as a mahāśāla-kula or uccā-kula. These examples are by no means sufficient to prove that there were indeed vaiśyas in the Island. Geiger is of the opinion that the vaiśyas in Ceylon were regarded as kulīna. But as we have discussed elsewhere, our sources do not provide us with sufficient material enabling us to make a comprehensive study of kulīna. What may be safely concluded from the available evidence is that the kulīna were people of high social rank as we have already discussed.

The word śūdra occurs neither in the literary nor in the epigraphic sources of Ceylon in the earlier period. As far as the period under review is concerned, this term is mentioned in our sources, but only in similar passages as those in which the vessa are mentioned in the Dhampiyā Atuvā Gātapadaya, as has already been seen.

4. See supra, p. 36, 77 ff.
5. See supra, pp. 77 ff.
The Sinhalese caste system in later times was based on occupational differences. It is true that we find no conclusive evidence for the existence of this system in early days, but there are examples showing that people who carried out similar occupations lived together. Thus, the people who earned their livelihood by making pottery (kumbhakāra) lived together in the south of Anurādhapura. This settlement was known as Kumbhakāragāma. References are made to this Kumbhakāragāma in the Sahassavatthuppakarama and Visuddhimagga, too. The potters' caste is at present known as kumbal-kula or baḍahāla-kula. It is interesting to note that the word kumbal was in existence in the tenth century A.D. as it is mentioned in the Mihintalē Slab Inscription. Similarly, kevattas (fishermen) (present kevul) had their own village settlements (Pali, Kevaṭṭagāma). The Rasavahinī speaks of such Kevaṭṭagāma named Mahājallika. The Cūlavaṃsa refers also to a Kevaṭṭagamhāragāma. Weavers (old Sinhalese

pehekara, Pali, pesakāra) lived, too, in separate village settlements. In an inscription written in later Brāhmī script there is a reference to a Pehekara-gama.¹ We find reference to weavers' settlements in the Cūlavamsa and Pūjavaliya, too.² The Mihintale Slab Inscription states that the village Vaḍudevāgama was granted to two chief carpenters (āduru vaḍu dejanakhaṭ), eight assistant carpenters (sirivaḍu atjankaṭ), and two tile makers (uluvaḍu dejanakhaṭ).³ Similarly, to lime-burners (sunu bolnaṭ) the village Sunuboldevāgama was granted.⁴ Lime-burners belong to the hunu caste at present. Reference is made to radavun (washermen), too.⁵ This word, at present, indicates the people belong to the radā caste. It is also interesting to note that the word radavun has been used in the above context with apulana ('washing') just as to-day.

In this connexion, it is also necessary to consider the term pañcāpessiyavaggās mentioned in our sources. The Cūlavamsa states that Māna, the son of Kassapa VII (1054-1055 A.D.), built the Uttaromūla pariveṇa and

1. Inscr. Ceyl., No. 1145, p. 91.
2. Cey. XLI, 96; Piv., p. 146.
4. Ibid., I, p. 97, lines 44-48.
5. Ibid., I, p. 97, lines 53-54: apulana radavun.
granted the pañcapessiyavaggas to it. \(^1\) This term occurs in the chronicles in two later instances. First, Kittisirimegha seeking a reconciliation with the young prince Parākramabāhu, sent the pañcapessiyavaggas to him. \(^2\) Second, Parākramabāhu II (1236-1270 A.D.) assigned the pañcapessiyavaggas and dasapessiyavaggas, who served at the palace, to work for the Saṅgha. \(^3\) In the Abhayagiri inscription, attributable to the ninth century A.D., there is a reference to pañcakaulikas who worked in the Abhayagiri monastery. \(^4\)

Pañcapessiyavaggas and pañcakaulikas may refer to a similar kind of people. The ordinary meaning of the pessiya is 'servant'. \(^5\) Geiger translates the term pañcapessiyavagga as five groups of servitors. \(^6\) Pañcapessiyas and pañcakaulikas are probably equivalent to pañca-kammālar in Tamil, and pañcakammakāras described in the Abhidhānappadīpikā and Mahārūpasiddhi. The last two texts agree in saying that the five kammakāras

\(^1\) Cv., LV, 27.
\(^2\) Ibid., LXXVII, 58.
\(^3\) Ibid., LXXXIV, 5.
\(^5\) Pali-Engl. Dict., s.v. pessiya.
consisted of carpenters (taccha), weavers (tantavāya), washermen (rajkaka), barbers (nahāpita), and leather-workers (cammakāra). As listed in the Madras Tamil Lexicon, paṇca-kammālar consisted of gold-smiths (taṭṭān), copper-smiths (kannaṁ), stone workers (cirpān), carpenters (taccaṁ), and black-smiths (kollan).

The above mentioned examples do not exclude the possibility of the existence of the present caste system in Ceylon in ancient times at least in embryonic form.

To the candālas, the untouchables in Indian society, we find only a single reference during our period: king Buddhadasa (340-368 A.D.) is said to have cured a candāla woman, whose "foetus in utero" had gone astray, i.e., cannot be delivered properly, (mūlhagabbhinniṁ). This candāla woman lived at Helloli-gāma. Another candāla woman, i.e. Aśokamālā, the consort of Sāliya, lived also in a village by the same name. If these two women lived in the same village, Helloli-

---

2. Madras Tamil Lexicon, s.v. paṇca-kammālar.
3. Cv., XXXIX, 140: see for mūlhagabbhā, j., I, p.407; Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā, IV, p.192; Milindapañha, p.169; Samv., p.96. This term has been rendered in the Dhampiyā Atuvā Gātapadaya as mulāgāba (see p.257) and as mūṭhagarbha in the Amāvatura (see p.81) and Saddharmālaṅkāraya (see p.151); cf. also Dharmapradīpikā, p.154: mūṭhagarbha-mātr.
gāma would have existed for many centuries as a Candāla-gāma.

Another interesting point emerging from these passages is that there was no rigid discrimination against the candālas, as it is mentioned that prince Sāliya was married with a candāla woman and king Buddhadāsa personally attended to a sick candāla woman. On the contrary, in the Indian subcontinent the candālas were invariably considered untouchables. As described in a passage of a Jātaka, contact with the wind that touches a candāla's body was regarded as pollution.¹

A certain seṭṭhi in Benaras, having seen a candāla, washed his eyes which were contaminated by a mere glance at him.² It is also to be noted that the candālas in Ceylon enjoyed religious rights and became Buddhists.³ It is therefore reasonable to assume that the milder treatment to the candālas in Ceylon was due to the influence of Buddhism on society.

As we have seen elsewhere, the area under cultivation towards the close of our period was quite

---

2. Ibid.,IV,p.576:apasitabbayuttaṃ passimhāti gandhodakena mukhaṃ dhovitvā.
considerable. Consequently, a class of land owners appears to have emerged at that time. Thus, Paranavitana explains that 'those who enjoyed pamunu land were referred to as pamunu-laddan, and they appear to have held their estates irrespective of any service which rendered to the state. Gam-laddan on the other hand appear to have held their land as recompense of the services they rendered to the state, and were not obliged to pay the Treasury any share of the revenue that derived from them. A third class of land holders named kābāli-laddan most probably were allocated shares from a large estate'.

The old Sinhalese word pamunu, the equivalent of paveni in Pali, means 'hereditary succession'. The Dhampiyā Atuvā Gāṭapadaya translates the Pali passage paveni-rajja (hereditary kingship) as pemen vālāndiya yutu rajaya (kingship which is to be enjoyed in hereditary succession). In the latter part of the Cūlavamsa we find the expression kulappaveṇikāyattagāma.

3. Cv., LXXXIV, 13ff; Dr., XVIII, 1.
which means 'village held by a family in hereditary succession'. This may well be compared with pamunugam and batgam (Pali, bhuttagāma) inherited by people. We find the Pali passage tam ca gāmaṃ yathāsukhām paribhogāṃ katvā adāsi, appearing in the Milindapañha has been rendered into Sinhalese as Macala gamat pamunu koṭa dunha ('(he) granted the village of Macala, too, as a heritable piece of land'). The Sahassavatthupparakaraṇa speaks of a minister named Tissa who enjoyed Mahāgama as his bhogagāma. In the Saddharmālaṅkārāya, the word batgama has been used in the place of bhogagāma.

We find a number of persons who held gāmas as pamunu. Thus, Mahayā Kitambava, living in the reign of Kassapa IV (898-914 A.D.), held Kolayuṣugama as a pamunu. Similarly, a certain Kaliṅgurad received land from the king. It is also laid down that this land should be enjoyed by children and grandchildren of Kaliṅgurad. This may imply the hereditary succession

2. Cf. there are villages in present Ceylon bearing the names Pamunugama and Pamunuva.
4. Sahasi, p.158.
7. Ibid., p.68.
of the descendants of Kaliṅgurad to this property. In later times, Parākramabāhu I (1153-1186 A.D.) granted a pamuṇu village to Kitnuvaragal in recognition of his service in the Burmese campaign. It is also laid down that the grant should last as long as 'the sun and the moon endure'. Thus, the grant has been made to Kitnuvaragal to be enjoyed by himself and his descendants in hereditary succession.

In a number of inscriptions there occurs the term kāballas to indicate a particular type of land holding. Thus, veher-kāballa and tunnakā-kāballa may indicate a piece of land belonging to Buddhist monasteries. Those kāballas were granted to the servants working in the monasteries. Governors of districts (raṭ-ladu) also received kāballas, and these kāballas were called raṭ-ladu-kāballas. Kāballas held by Tamil soldiers were indicated as Demel kāballas.

It is said in the Mihintalā Slab Inscription that the kamiyan or temple officers and other servants

2. Ibid., I, p.197; IV, p.40.
3. Ibid., I, pp.94ff.
were given काबाल्लास as divel. The Sinhalese word divel may be the equivalent of Sanskrit and Pali जीविता which means 'life', 'existence', 'subsistence' and 'livelihood'. Land on divel tenure would therefore be land held for subsistence for the period of service in lieu of salary. Unlike pamumu properties these were not permanent possessions.

Only in the ninth-and tenth-century inscriptions do we find the technical term पात्ता-लद्दन. H.W. Codrington equates the word पात्ता with Tamil पात्तम. 'It is in common use', he writes, 'in Tinnevelly District with the meaning of "rent" always in cash as opposed to vāram, a share of the produce. It exactly equals the Sinhalese badda, the medieval Indian taḍḍapāḍḍam, &c., being the Sinhalese kottal-badda, &c. In Malabar the word पात्तम is not confined to cash but includes share of the produce as well'. पात्ता-लद्दन may mean middleman who received the revenues due from the tenant on behalf of the lord. No evidence is available on

---

1. Pali, जीविता has been translated as divel (see Dh. A. G., pp. 127, 272). See also the Saddharmālaṅkārava (p. 761) and Amāvatura (p. 58). In the following Pali words, too, ta has changed into la or ลา in Sinhalese:— जगता=diyal (see Ep. Zeyl., I, p. 24); माता=mālā (see Dh. A. G., p. 14).
pāṭṭa-laddan after the tenth century A.D.

Those who lived on land belonging to the vihāras were known as kudin or haskaruvan. The ulkudi means the hereditary cultivators whose ancestors either helped in the original founding of a village or were brought in to extend the cultivated area.¹ The Jātaka Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya refers to those who paid land tax to their land owners as ayakudi.² The Milindapañha refers to the people who lived in villages belonging to some one else as kuṭipurisa.³ The kudin appearing in the inscriptions may be analogous to ulkudi, ayakudi or kuṭipurisa. The Mihintalē Slab Inscription states that the land tax should regularly be taken to the vihāra from the kudin residing in the vihāra land.⁴ It is also revealed from this inscription that the officers (kāmiyan) in the monastery collected the land tax from the kudin. It is also laid down that any gifts from the kudin should not be accepted by these officers. Nor were they allowed to use cows and buffaloes belonging

2. Jātaka Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya, p.91.
3. Milindapañha, (PTS), p.74?
to the kudin for the cultivation of their own land.\(^1\)
The haskaruvan (Pali, sassakāra) evidently indicates
the cultivators. It becomes clear from a passage in
the Mihintalē Slab Inscription that the haskaruvan
tilled the land belonging to the Cetiyagiri monastery
as hereditary cultivators.\(^2\) It is also laid down that
such fields should not be taken away from the haskaruvan
as long as they were able to cultivate them.

**Dāsas**

There are numerous examples showing that dāsas
were employed in the Buddhist monasteries, royal
households and in the noble families and other rich
households. In fact, the Buddha had prohibited bhikkhus
from accepting male or female dāsas.\(^3\) But with the
increase of monks and properties attached to the vihāras
dāsas were accepted by the bhikkhus. The commentators
may have tried to justify such acceptance by interpreting
it at suit the injunctions of the Buddha. Thus, Buddha-
ghosa explains that it is not improper to accept dāsas

---

yutu, Mekungen ge gon gene kāmiyan tumanat govika\m
no kāra viyā yutu.
vāteta kāra kuśburu.
paṭivirato hoti; cf. *D.N.*, p. 49.
from some one who says: 'I offer a kappiyakāraka, I offer an āramika'. From a passage in the Samantapāsādīka it becomes clear that dāsas were offered to the monasteries by kings and these dāsas were known as āramikadāsas.

The Gūlavamsa records some kings who granted dāsas to the vihāras. For instance, Silameghavāna (623-632 A.D.) granted captives taken in battle as slaves to monasteries. Similarly, Aggabodhi IV (667-683 A.D.), Potthakuṭṭha (c.683-684 A.D.), and Sena I (833-853 A.D.) granted slaves to the Buddhist monasteries. From the first instance mentioned above, it appears that the type of karamarānīta (captives in war) dāsas were found in the Island at that time. No clear evidence is available on this type of dāsas before the reign of Silameghavāna, except for a vague allusion: Velusumana, a paladin of Daṭṭha-gaṇapati (c.161-137 B.C.), promised Elāra to bring Kākavaṇṇa Tissa as a captive and make him his slave when Velusumana visited the former

3. Cv., XLIV, 73.
4. See for details of this type of dāsas, Mahāvagga, 1, 2, 1; Smp., p. 1001; Nīti-Nighaṇṭuva, p. 7; J., V, pp. 456 ff; cf. Breloer, Kauṭaliya Studien, II, p. 30.
in the disguise of a spy.¹

It is also interesting to note that there were anvayāgata slaves and ran slaves who were granted to the Galapāṭa monastery as recorded in an inscription in situ.²

The anvayagata slaves and ran slaves mentioned in this record may be equivalent to the antojāta (slaves who had been born and bred in the family for generations) and dhanakkāṭita (purchased slaves) respectively.³

The Samantapāśādikā further describes how bhikkhus came to own dāsas. Thus read:-

'Poor people become kappiyakārakas themselves in the monastery (thinking we) shall live depending on the Saṅgha; the relatives or patrons of a bhikkhu grant a dāsa (to the bhikkhu); one (bhikku) has his own dāsa; masters grant a dāsa (to the bhikkhu); a dāsa who is without master be a dāsa to the bhikkhus'.⁴

In this passage the first and the last mentioned dāsas may represent the category of sāmanḍāsavyopagata

⁴ Smp.,p.1001: duggata-manussā saṅgham nissāya jīvissāmāṭi vihāre kappiyakārakā honti; bhikkussa ūtatakā vā upatthaka vā dāsaṃ denti; attanō va asa dāso atthi; sāmikā dāsaṃ denti; nissāmiko dāso hoti.
(those who for their livelihood or for their protection, of their own accord, agree for a certain sum to become slaves) dasas. Dasas mentioned thirdly were perhaps those owned by a bhikkhu before becoming a monk. The above mentioned examples may be important to determine the relationship between master and slaves in Ceylon, a topic which will, however, be discussed later.

It seems that in some large monasteries there were a large number of dasas. For instance, the Mihintale Slab Inscription records that in the Cetiyagiri monastery there were twenty-four female slaves. They were supervised by a chief female slave.1

It is also worth considering in this connexion that some people granted villages to monasteries to provide for maintenance of the slaves. For example, a senāpati named Mūga of king Aggabodhi I (575-608 A.D.) built a great (visāla) vihāra and assigned to it the village Lajjika for the maintenance of the dasas.2 Similarly, the senāpati of Sena I (833-853 A.D.) named Ḍadda built a parivena and endowed it with revenues to ensure the maintenance of dasas (dāsa-bhoga).3

2. Cv., XLII, 23.
3. Ibid., L, 82: dāsa-bhoga may also mean dāsa and revenue; cf. Cv. Transl., Geiger, p. 145.
It has been suggested that the serfs attached to the monasteries and to the royal household lived in villages allocated only for them and it is these villages which are meant by dasagam (Sanskrit, dāsagrāma; Pali, dāsagāma) in the inscriptions. Doubts have also been cast regarding this meaning of the term, as it may be interpreted as 'ten villages', too, if it should be equated with Sanskrit dāsagrāma (Pali, dasagāma). In fact, in some cases ten or twenty (or even more) villages sometimes constituted groups for administrative purposes, both in Ceylon and in the Indian subcontinent. It is stated in the Manusmṛti that if any trouble arose in the village, the village chief should personally report the matter to the chief of ten villages, the latter to the chief of twenty villages, who again should inform the chief of a hundred villages. In the Khalimpūr plate of king Dharmapāla, an officer is referred to as dāsagrāmika, presumably the chief of a group of ten villages. The Cūlavāṃsa mentions that king Buddhādāsa

(340–368 A.D.) appointed physicians for every ten villages. In the Vēvālkāṭiya inscription of Mahinda IV (956–972 A.D.), which contains rules of rural administration, we find that there was a chief for every ten villages (dasagamaṭ ekeka näyakayan). These officers are again referred to in the same inscription as dasagam-ätan, who may well be compared with the above mentioned chiefs of group of ten villages appearing in Indian inscriptions. Dasagama in this inscription may therefore mean a group of ten villages. In the Vessagiriya inscription of the same king, dasagama appears to have been used in a similar connotation.

Some inscriptions, attributable to the sixth and seventh century A.D. and found in the Buddhist monastic precincts, refer to people releasing themselves or others from slavery by paying a fee and granting money (kahāpanas) for the maintenance of slaves in the monasteries. Doubts have been cast by some scholars on the validity of the evidence from these inscriptions. They deny that the term

3. Ibid.,I,p.33,line 26.
vaharala which occurs in these records means 'slavery'.

1. Paranavitana, who first edited the inscriptions in which the term vaharala appears, interpreted this term as 'slave'. He also translated the vaharala cidavi or cidavi vaharala, the most used expression in the above inscriptions, as 'freed slaves'. In some contexts the term vaharala has also been used as vaharala vaṭakaṭa which is translated by him as 'for the maintenance of slaves'. (Ep. Zeyl., pp.142-150). W. Wimalakitti, who edited the same inscriptions, substituted Paranavitana's interpretation of vaharala by two alternative meanings, i.e., 'a residential building' or 'meals in the monastery'. He also translated the expression vaharala cidavi or cidavi vaharala as 'a residential building caused to be built' or 'provided meals in the monastery'. According to him, vaharala vaṭakaṭa may mean either 'for the maintenance of a residential building in the monastery' or 'for continued supply of meals in the monastery'. (See for these conjectures, W. Wimalakitti, 'Inscriptions of Ceylon'. The Siiuma literary Supplement, 1938, Sep. 11. and Silālekhana Sangrahaya, 1951, pt. I, pp. 127-128, 1959, pt. V, pp. 87-93 respectively). D. J. Wijayaratne disagreed with Paranavitana and argued that vaharala may mean 'timber' and the passage vaharala cidavi or cidavi vaharala means 'cut timber'. He also took vaharala vaṭakaṭa to mean 'for the expenses (or continued supply) of timber'. (D. J. Wijayaratne, 'Interpretation of vaharala etc.', UCR, X, pp. 103-120). Paranavitana rejected the interpretation put forward by Wijayaratne (Ep. Zeyl., V, pp. 35-65). However, neither Paranavitana nor Wijayaratne took into consideration the meanings suggested by Wimalakitti. But recently, M. W. Sugatapala de Silva, who carried out a brief survey of the suggested interpretations of the above term, preferred Wimalakitti's notion, i.e., 'provided meals in the monastery'. (M. W. Sugatapala de Silva, 'The "Vaharala" Inscriptions of Ceylon', Journal of the American Oriental Society, 85, 1965, pp. 206-207). Paranavitana wrote again in support of his own argument and rejected the interpretation made by Silva. (S. Paranavitana, 'The Interpretation of Old Sinhalese Word "vaharala"', Journal of the American Oriental Society, 87, 1967, pp. 166-169). Paranavitana's interpretation has, however, been followed by many scholars. (See, Rahula, History of Buddhism in Ceylon, p. 147; Ellawala, Soc. Hist. Early Ceyl., p. 64; R. A. L. H. Gunawardhana, The History of the Buddhist Saṅgha in Ceylon, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, p. 185).
even if this evidence is discarded the prevalence of slaves in the Buddhist monasteries in ancient Ceylon and their release and the making of grants towards their maintenance are facts firmly based on the commentaries, the chronicles and on a number of inscriptions, as has already been seen.

As a matter of fact, there were dasas who were employed in the royal household. The daughter of Paṇḍu Vāsudeva named Cittā is said to have guarded by a dāsi.1 When prince Mahānāga was wandering in the forest, his sister handed him over a slave.2 Aggabodhi VIII (804-815 A.D.) employed dasas and kammakāras for the service of his mother.3

In addition, there were dasas who were employed in well-to-do families. For example, in a family in Nāgadīpa a dāsi named Nāgā was employed for sixty kahāpanas. Later, Nāgā borrowed another sixty kahāpanas from her master on the understanding that she would become a ratti dāsi4 (servant who does night duties), too. Similarly, in Rohaṇa, there were a certain husband and wife who had become slaves.5

2. Cy., XLI, 71.
3. Ibid., XLIX, 60.
4. Sahas., p. 32.
5. Ibid., p. 50.
In spite of the above mentioned examples showing the existence of dāsas in ancient Ceylon, there is little evidence to determine their position in society. As far as the expected pattern of behaviour of the masters towards dāsas is concerned, their position was by no means in all respects unfavourable.

According to the Sigālovāda Suttanta, the master should assign to his servants work in keeping with their strength (yathābālam kammantasamvidhānena), supply them with food and wages (bhātavetanānupadhānena), tending them in sickness (gilānupatthānena), sharing with them unusual delicacies (accāriyānam rasānam saṃvibhāgena), and granting them leave at times (samaye vossaggena).¹ According to the commentary on this Suttanta, regular relaxation should be accorded to them so that they did not need to work all day, and special leave with extra food and ornaments should be given to them.² These passages set out the servants' rights to fair treatment, conditions, regular holidays and free medical attention.³

2. Suttasangahaṭṭhakathā, p.59: ārasukāle kammaṃ akarītvā sappāyabhessajādīṇī datvā paṭijaggaṇena, niccasamaye ca kāla samaye ca vossajjanena chaṇanakkhattakādīsu alanākaraṇabhāṇḍakādānīyabhōjanīyādīṇī datvā.
Dasas and kammakaras should in return discharge their duties towards their masters as follows:— 'They should rise before him, lie down to rest after him, be content with what is given to them, do their work well and carry about his praise and good fame.' From a passage in the Culavamsa, it reveals that any humiliation to dasas by their master was by no means appreciated: king Aggabodhi VIII (804-815 A.D.) once addressed, probably in anger, one of his slaves with the word dasa but he afterwards repented of it, to make up for this he allowed the slaves to use the same word towards himself.

We learn from other sources that dasas sometimes had enough time to engage in religious activities. For instance, the above mentioned Nāgā gave a dāna to sixty bhikkhus accompanied by fellow villagers. This suggests also that the villagers by no means discriminated against Nāgā. It is also worth considering that, as a way, to show their complete submission and generosity towards the Saṅgha, kings sometimes offered themselves

2. Cv.,XLIX,62.
to the Saṅgha as slaves. For example, Mahādāṭhika Mahānāga (first century A.D.) offered himself, his queen, his two sons, his state elephant and his state horse to the Saṅgha and then redeemed himself and the others by giving to the Order of monks various suitable gifts.\(^1\) Similarly, a noble son of the Lambakannā family once having listened to a discourse, offered to the Saṅgha, his valuable ornaments, his chariot and oxen, his children and wife and finally himself by saying "I am also your slave".\(^2\) A king attributed himself as a dāsa of the Buddha as it reveals from his name, i.e. Buddhadāsa.\(^3\) It is true that the last three examples do not imply actual dāsas in the real sense of the word but they indicate that one would by no means bring disgrace on oneself by becoming a dāsa. Some more important points emerge from the story of Nāgā: to make the above mentioned gift, Nāgā borrowed money from her master. Probably, in the interest of the both parties, only after making a written agreement (paṇṇe likhitvā) her master lent the money to Nāgā on the understanding that she would become a ratti dāsi. Another interesting point is that

---

1. \(\text{Mv.}, \text{XXXIV}, 86-88.\)
2. \(\text{Siha} \text{lavatthuppakarana}, p.150.\)
3. \(\text{Cf. Cv.}, \text{XXXVII}, 158.\)
Nāga was a 'debt slave' (Pali, iṇa-ḍāsi; Sanskrit, ṛṇa-ḍāsi), i.e., one who became a slave to his creditor till her debt is paid. A reference is made to another iṇa-ḍāsi in the Saddharmālaṅkārāya lived in Mahāgāma.¹

In addition, the normal duties of dāsas in Ceylon were husking paddy, cooking, collecting firewood, sweeping the compound and fetching water etc.,² which suggests that dāsas in Ceylon were treated as domestic servants rather than slaves as known in Europe and America till about a century ago. Sometimes they were employed as gurdians,³ personal attendants of the royal household and as spies.⁴

Although there were instances, as mentioned above, in which dāsas were offered to the monasteries, we have no conclusive evidence to prove the existence of slave trade in Ceylon. On the other hand, sources contain some, though not many, examples of payments made by the masters to their dāsas. As has already been seen, a dāsi was paid by her master 120 kahāpaṇas for day and night service. This dāsi formerly received

---

4. Cv., XLIX, 60.
sixty kahāpanas only for day duty. The same amount of money was received by Tissā and Muṇḍagutta.¹ This may have been the normal payment for a dāsa or a dāsi in ancient times. It would therefore be important to try to determine the monetary value of a kahāpana and the time that a dāsa or a dāsi had to work for sixty kahāpanas. But, unfortunately, no conclusive evidence is available on these aspects, except for some vague allusions: Nāgā in the above story had already sixty kahāpanas when she asked for another sixty, and her master told her that other dāsīs gradually reduced the amount of their loan whereas she increased hers by borrowing more and more money.² It may become clear from this passage that Nāgā had not to work for her master during her whole life for sixty kahāpanas. It is also revealed that for a meal of a single person, at least, one kahāpana would have to be spent, because in order to prepare just a piṇḍapāta for a bhikkhu Nāgā had to spend, at least, one kahāpana. Then the sixty kahāpanas may be equivalent to about thirty day's

¹ Sahas., p. 50.
² Ibid., p. 32: paresaṃ gehadāsi hutvā vasamānā thokena thokena imaṃ appakaṃ karonti; tvam pana punappunam vaḍḍhetvā dhanaṃ gaṇhāsi.
food expenses of an ordinary man. This may give some idea of the value of a kahāpaṇa.\footnote{1}{G. I.¥. Codrington, Ceylon Coins and Currency, p.11.}

In addition, the Nihintalē Slab Inscription mentions that an officer-in-charge of female slaves at the Cetiyagiri Vihāra was paid two payas and each of assistant female slave was paid one paya.\footnote{2}{Ep. Zeyl.,I,p.95,lines,E20-21.} In this context, it is not clear whether paya here means a plot of land or a measure of rice, and whether these payments were made yearly or otherwise. For the garments of these female slaves the price paid was one kalaṇḍa (of gold?). It is, however, specified that this payment should be made yearly (havuruduvakaṭ). It would therefore appear that the payment on a yearly basis did not apply to other cases. Yet we are in no position to decide whether other payments were made monthly or weekly or daily.

From the above study of the social groups and ranking during the period under consideration, it may become clear firstly, that Hindu varṇa system was hardly followed by Sinhalese, though there were brāhmaṇas, who, organized as a religious group, probably were
influenced by South India from about the seventh century A.D. onwards, and kings and the members of the royal families who claimed to be kṣatriyas and formed a class by themselves equivalent to the kṣatriyas in ancient India. Examples in our sources are too scanty to show the existence of the vaiśyas and śūdras in Ceylon.

Secondly, instead of the Indian varṇas, something like the present caste system in Ceylon appears to have prevailed, at least, in embryonic form.

Thirdly, as there was a vast area in the Island which was opened for cultivation, the kings made many land grants to the nobles; officers in the state and vihāras were generally paid in land. As a matter of fact, the vast majority of Sinhalese earned their livelihood by cultivating paddy and other crops. Thus, the land owners (gam-laddan, pamunu-laddan and kābāli-laddan) and cultivators (kuṭin or haskaru) became very large in number and they occupied a foremost place in society. The bhikkhus, kings and rich people demanded the service of dāsas, who represented the poor class of society. However, they were by no means equal to 'slaves' in the European sense.

Finally, it seems to us that there was no rigid caste system or class distinction in Ceylon during the period under consideration.
CONCLUSION

In the light of the foregoing study it may be concluded that social conditions in Ceylon underwent certain changes during the later Anurādhapura period, particularly from about the seventh century. Although a comparison between social conditions in the period under discussion with those prevailing in the early Anurādhapura period would have been of great interest, no such attempt has been made in this study for two reasons. Firstly, the sources for such a comparative study are, on the whole, inadequate. Secondly, a comparison of this kind to the extent to which it is possible, would involve a major study by itself.

It seems that, although the nuclear family was the basis of society, the joint family system had become its most prevalent characteristic. Collective responsibility and co-operation of several nuclear families were the general norm. This is especially clear in the royal family from about the seventh century. Although there were internal conflicts from time to time, the rulers always strove to maintain or to restore solidarity among the members of the royal family.
This attitude of the rulers from the seventh century had important political implications with the emergence of an independent ruling dynasty in Rohana. For the rulers of the main kingdom, i.e. Anuradhapura, always tried to maintain close relations with Rohana by matrimonial alliances and other means: sisters and daughters of the kings of Anuradhapura were given in marriage to princes of Rohana. Princes and princesses of Rohana, in many cases the children of sisters of the Anuradhapura rulers, were sometimes brought up in the palace of Anuradhapura; their marriage were arranged by the kings of the latter again with members, mostly cross-cousins, of the Anuradhapura royal family. The rulers of Anuradhapura, assisted their sisters' sons to recover their positions in Rohana if the need arose. Princes of Rohana, in return, assisted their mother's brothers in Anuradhapura.

Secondly, family solidarity may have been an important factor in strengthening the position of the ruling clan in case of rivalries between the two main royal dynasties: the Moriyas and the Lambakannas.

Finally, there can be no doubt that the Sinhalese rulers were aware that any conflict within the royal
family would be dangerous as it might elicit intervention by South Indian rulers, who invaded Ceylon many times during the last centuries of the Anurādhapura period.

It is true that there are only few examples attesting solidarity between members of ordinary families, but the available evidence suggests that members of such families, who normally carried out similar occupations and lived in mono-clan villages, considered family solidarity of prime importance.

It also emerges from this study that there was a well-established Sinhalese kinship terminology. This terminology was classificatory in its widest sense.

There is evidence for a patriarchal social system, although there are also examples of a bilateral system. In the context of kinship terminology, both paternal and maternal kin were recognized for the three middle generations. In addition, it was established that any claimant to the throne should be qualified not only from his father's but also from his mother's side.

On the other hand, it follows from our study on family and kinship and particularly from that on the position of women, that women during the period under review occupied a very favourable position. As daughters,
mothers and wives, women could certainly play an im-
portant role. Girls' rights were by no means inferior
to those of boys as far as marriage was concerned; both
could conclude a second marriage; no restrictions nor
satī practice were imposed on widows. Women possessing
land and other properties were by no means rare. Their
literary accomplishments were unrivalled. Moreover,
religious and social achievements of women certainly
added to their credit. The bhikkhuni Order, which was
probably in its peak of glory during the period under
review, was itself an institution which enabled the women
to enjoy equal religious rights.

Certain changes in patterns of settlements
and also in the social groups and ranking, can be noticed
during the period under review. In order to meet the
needs of the apparently increasing population a considerable
number of reservoirs were built not only in the outskirts
of Anurādhapura but also in more remote areas from about
the last decade of the third century A.D. throughout
the period under discussion. Hence, vast areas were
brought under cultivation.

Towards the close of the tenth century the area
settled by the Sinhalese was considerable. Naturally,
most of the settlements were gāmas. In addition, other local groupings such as nigama, paṭum-gama and nagara were common. Because it had been the capital of the Island for many centuries, Anurādhapura naturally developed into its greatest city. The emergence of the city of Sigiriya in the latter half of the fifth century A.D. was an important event. Similarly, Polonnaruva, had developed into a city well before the end of the period under study. Mahātittha was the principal sea port, which had also developed into a relatively large nagara inhabited by mainly local and foreign merchants.

The ruling clans in the Island always regarded themselves as khattiyas, although some of these clans, such as the Moriyas and Lambakaṇṇas, were, most probably, of totemistic origin.

We find neither vaiśyas nor Śūdras in the Island. However, brāhmaṇas appear to have occupied favourable positions from about the latter part of the seventh century. There are a number of examples showing that brāhmaṇas were especially concentrated in the capital towards the close of the period under review. We feel that the apparent rise of the brāhmaṇas was a consequence of the close relations between Ceylon and South India.
Nevertheless, there is little evidence for the existence of the *varṇa* system except as a purely theoretical model. Instead, there are quite a number of examples suggesting some features of the modern caste system in Ceylon. Modern Sinhalese castes, such as those of the *rajaka* (washermen), *sunu* (lime-burners), *kumbal* (potters) and *kevattas* (fishermen) existed in mono-clan villages during the period under discussion.

There is evidence for the emergence of a class of feudal lords from about the seventh century. These were known as *gam-laddan*, *raṭ-laddan*, *kābāli-laddan* and *pañña-laddan*. Those working on monastic and other kind of property were known as *kuḍin* or *haskaru*.

Slavery existed in Ceylon but the corresponding term *dāsa*, had a totally different connotation from the slaves in Europe. *Dāsas* in Ceylon were usually domestic servants with limited freedom.

As has already been pointed out in some cases, some features of modern Ceylonese society, can already be noticed in the period under discussion. Particularly, kinship terminology, cross-cousin marriage and the ceremony of the tying of the marriage badge (*talla*) may be mentioned in this connexion.
In many cases, the social system was flexible; there was no rigid caste or class system. This attitude was probably the result of the influence of Buddhism on the Sinhalese. It may, however, cause surprise that the behaviour of historical persons was not always in agreement with the Buddhist norms because "real societies can never be in equilibrium". ¹

# APPENDIX

## WEIGHTS AND MEASURES IN ANCIENT CEYLON

### Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 (dīgha) gāvutas (about 2 1/2 miles)</td>
<td>= 1 (dīgha) yojana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (rassa) gāvutas (a little more than 1 mile)</td>
<td>= 1 (rassa) yojana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(B)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 hātākmas (4 miles)</td>
<td>= 1 gāvuta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 gāvutas</td>
<td>= 1 yojana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36 paramañus</td>
<td>= 1 aṇu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 aṇus</td>
<td>= 1 tajjārī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 tajjārīs</td>
<td>= 1 rathana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 rathanas</td>
<td>= 1 likkhā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 likkhās</td>
<td>= 1 ūkā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 ūkās</td>
<td>= 1 ḍaṇñamāsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 ḍaṇñamāsas</td>
<td>= 1 aṅgula (inch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 aṅgulas</td>
<td>= 1 vidatthi (1 foot)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 vidatthis</td>
<td>= 1 rathana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 rathanas</td>
<td>= 1 yaṭṭhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 yaṭṭhis</td>
<td>= 1 abbhantara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 abbhantaras</td>
<td>= 1 usabha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 usabhas</td>
<td>= 1 gāvuta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 gāvutas</td>
<td>= 1 yojana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


Table III

7 ūkās = 1 viyata (paddy grain)
7 viyataś = 1 āṅgula (finger breadth)
12 āṅgulas = 1 viyata (span)
2 viyataś = 1 riyanā
4 riyanās = 1 bambā (fathom)
7 riyanās = 1 yat
20 yastis or 35 bambas = 1 isba
80 isbas = 1 gāvuta
4 gāvutās = 1 yojana

Table IV

35 bambas = 1 isba
7 riyanās = 1 yasti
20 yastis = 1 isba

Table V

4 pasatas (sataśosa or kadamba) = 1 nāli or pata
4 nāli or patas = 1 ālāhaka
4 ālāhakas = 1 dopa
4 dopas = 1 mānaka
4 mānakas = 1 kari
20 karis = 1 vāha (sakaṭa)

11 dopas = 1 amuna
10 amunu = 1 kumbha

2. Ibid.
Table VI

5 kurunis or yala = 1 parā
12 kurunis = 1 pāla
8 parās or 160 sērus = 1 amuṇa
40 lāhas = 1 pāla
4 pālas = 1 amuṇa

Table VII

4 miṭas = 1 atalosa
8 miṭas = 1 pata
2 patas = 1 manāva
2 manāvas = 1 nāliya
4 nāli = 1 kuruṇi or lāha
4 lāhas = 1 tiṁba
5 kuruṇis = 1 bera
2 beras = 1 pāla
4 pālas = 1 amuṇa

Table VIII

3 tala āṭas = 1 amu āṭa
3 amu āṭas = 1 vi āṭa
8 vi āṭas = 1 madaṭiya
20 madaṭiyas = 1 kalaṇda
3 Kalaṇdas = 1 huṇa

---

2 huṇas = 1 palam
2 palams = 1 kulundal
2 kulundals = 1 pata or huṇḍuva
2 patas or huṇṇu = 1 manāva
2 manāvas = 1 nāli or sēru or kuruṇiya
2 nāli = 1 lāha
4 lāhas = 1 timba
10 lāhas = 1 pāla
4 pālas = 1 amuṇa

Table IX

3 tala āṭas = 1 amu āṭa
3 amu āṭas = 1 vi āṭa
8 vi āṭas = 1 madaṭa
20 madaṭas = 1 kalaṅda
3 kalaṅdas = 1 huṇṇa
4 huṇṇas = 1 palam
2 palams = 1 kulundal
2 kulundal = 1 pata
4 patas = 1 nadumba
4 nadumbas = 1 lāsu
4 lāsus = 1 droṇa

Table X

4 viṅhas = 1 guṇija
2 guṇjas = 1 māsaka
2 māsakas = 1 akkha
8 akkhas = 1 dharaṇa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approximate Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 dharāṇas</td>
<td>= 1 suvaṇṇa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 suvaṇṇas</td>
<td>= 1 phala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 suvaṇṇas</td>
<td>= 1 nikkha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 phalas</td>
<td>= 1 tulā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 tulās</td>
<td>= 1 bhara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table XI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approximate Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 vi āṭas</td>
<td>= 1 madaṭa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 madaṭas</td>
<td>= 1 kalaṇḍa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 kalaṇḍas</td>
<td>= 1 huṇa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 huṇas</td>
<td>= 1 palam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 vi āṭas</td>
<td>= 1 aka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8 akas   | = 1 kalaṇḍa |²

---

1. *Abhidhānappadīpikā,* p. 194.
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Gamaṇī (t.), 355-6
Gamaṇī Dhamaraja, 372
Gaṁdebhāgaya, 271
Gampola, 286-7
gandha, 147
gaṁdharva form of marriage, 108-9
Ganekanda Vihāra, 246
Gaṅgamaṇi, 269-70
gaṅgante, 382
Gangetic valley, 263
ganikā, 190-4
Garadara, 234
Garimalaka Mahavahara, 231
Gautama Buddha, 232, 366 (see Buddha)
gē, 182
Geṅgē, 358
geha, 262
Geiger, W., 2, 39, 130, 272, 312, 378, 382, 390
ghee, 291
Ghurye, G.S., 343
Giant's Tank, 239
giṇi, gihiṇiya, giṇiya, 191-2 (see gaṅikā)
Giribāva, 243
Giridugga, 262
Giriṅḍa Vihāra, 152, 156, 232-3
Girimalaka Vihāra, 244
Girimaṅḍu Vihāra, 223
Giritalan Kōraḷē, 251
Giritīsagama, 237
Giriulla, 252
Goḍavāya, Goḍapavata Vihāra, Goḍavā Vehera, 314, 338
gods, 96
GoKaṇṇa (Trincomalee), 230, 311, 313, 319-38, 345, 360
gold-smiths, taṭṭām, 391
Gonawatta, 226
Gonnava, 249
Gonça Nadî (Kalâ Oya), 242
Goṭhābhaya (k.), 287, 371, 373
gotra, 49, 94-5
Govindakeśvadeva, 293
Govîn-nāmāpiṭiya, 211
Guhilas, 369
Gupavarman (m.), 19, 168, 171-2
Gupta dynasty, 135
Guruḷugomi, 146

Hāqā Oya, 234
Hair Relics, 127, 232
Hambantota, 217, 259
Hāmbarāva, 336
Handessa, 271
Haṅguranketa, 226
Harasbādda inscription, 227
Hare, B. M., 282
Hariścandra, 369
Harṣacarita, 93
haskaru, 397-8, 412, 418
Hatthatdātha (k.), I, 85 (see Dāthopa-
tissa I)
Hatthikucchi Vihāra, 151

Hatthiselapura, 334 (see
Kuruṇāgala)
havurudu, 411
Hayigaraya, 230
Helloligāma, 391
Hemā, 113, 187
Hemacandra, 294
Hemamālā, 164, 184, 298, 345, 362
Hemamālika Cetiya, 161
Hennegama, 237
Hereditary succession to, -family
property, 38; -throne, 393
Heṭṭipola, 251; -vāva, 252
Higher Ordination, 19, 168,
(see upasampadā)
himī (husband), 142
himiniya (wife, cf. aṃbu,
 bhāryāva, jā), 54
Hīndagala Vihāra, 226
Hindu, 92-3, 98, 108-9, 121, 181,
195; -devāles (shrines,
temples), 311, 313, 329, 344-5,
349, 352-3, 359, 361
Hinukvāva, 245
Hiripiṭiya, 246
Hiripiṭiya-Polpitigama road,
245
Hiriyāla Hatpattu, 247
History of Ceylon, 2
Hiuan-Tsang (Yuan Chwang, m.),
18, 321, 324
Hocart, A. M., 297
Homerits, 303
Hopitigamu, 23-4, 338; -padī, 292
Horner, I. B., 282
Horovupotāna, 217
Houei-Kieo, 18
householder, 60, 67
household servants, 31
Hulugalla, 245
hunu, 389 (see lime-burners)
Hūrātoṣā, (Urātoṣā, Kayts), 313
Hurulu Palātā, 216-7, 335
hus (father's sister, mother's brother's wife, mother-in-law), 54

Ibbāgamuvā-Polpitigama road, 246
Ikkvāku, 365
Ilakkācu, 350
Ilanāga (k.), 198
immunities, 44-5, 272
ina-dāsī, 409, (see dāsī)
India, 99-100, 117, 120, 173, 263, 268, 305,

Indian, -law books, 192; -coins, 28; -subcontinent, 12, 75, 90, 101, 285, 312, 332, 362, 392
Indo-Aryans, 96
Indrapāla, K., 228, 270, 328, 359

interrelationship between
kin, 57; brother and brother., 71-79; husband and wife, 80-82; mother's brother and sister's son, 83-86; parents and children, 57-71

Icipiniyāva inscription, 217
Issarasāmanārāma, 151
Isuru, 36-7; -kula, 37, 46
Isurumuniya, 358

Ja (wife), 54
Jaffna, 259; -Peninsula, 228, 337
Jainism, 300
Jajjara Nadī, 316 (see Dāduru Oya)
Jambudīpa, 75, 127, 315
Jambudoni, 334 (see Daṁbadeṇiya)
Jambukola, 228
Jantu, 374, 376
jasarā, 273
Jātaka, 66, 92, 99, 264, 347, 392
Jātaka Atuvā Gātapadaya, 53-4, 397
Jaṭāvarman Viṭarāṇḍya (k.), 312
jāti, 342-3, 106
Java, 171, 175
Jayatilaka, D.B., 272
Jen Tsun (k.), 308
Jetavana, 324, 356
Jetavanarama, 361, 381
Jetūvā, 188
Jetūthā (q.), 160
Jetūthamattā, 188
Jetūthārāma, 167
Jetūthatissa (k.), I, 361
III, 119, 204, 213
jhita, 53
jinasa, 175
jīvita, 396
kābālī-laddan, 393, 412, 418
kābāllas, 270, 395-6
Kabuba, 212
Kācaragāma, 370
Kacca, 382-3
-kāngātīra, 382
Kada-aviya, 216
Kadamba dynasty, 135
Kadamba Nadī, 193, 304
Kādambarī, 93
Kadaragamaya, 246
Kādīgala, 243
Kaduruvāva, 246
khaṭapaṇa, 36, 87, 284, 288, 290, 403, 405, 409-11
Kākavaṭṭa Tissa (k.), 399
Kakelkuvahanaka Vihāra, 230
Kākiriṇa-Talāva road, 211
Kakusthavarman (k.), 135
kalā, 342
Kalaṇigevelī, 241
Kalāhumana niyamatanā, 22, 288-9, 291-2
Kalaka Mahavihara, 221
Kāla Nadī, 213, 242
Kalāṇiya, 220, 298, 316, 372
kalañda, 189, 411
kalaṅju, 291, 360
Kalā Oya, 242, 381
Kalās, 191
Kalāvāva, 212-5, 248, 382
Kalī, 348
Kalidāsa, 93
Kaliṅga, 104, 136, 164, 305
Kaliṅgurad, 44, 183, 394
Kaliṅga bhikkhuṇī, 66
Kalkulam, 231
Kalū, 182, 213
Kaludupotāna, 237
Kalū Gāŋa, 221-2
Kalutara (Kalutoṭa), 221, 259
Kalyāṇavatī (q.), 197
kāmiyan, 395, 397
kammakāra, 390, 405, 407
Kanamuḍu, 227
Kanarese, 294
Kānci, 135, 244
Kandaka, 252
Kihirāli (Khadirāli)  
Vihāra, 219-20  
Kiliveṭṭi, 231  
kindred, 34  
Kiṁbulvāna Oya, 249  
Kinagaha vävakanda, 241  
Kinigama, 270  
Kinnaras, 65  
kinship, 5, 29, 36, 87;  
-terminology, 30, 44, 46ff, 51, 57; affinal, 54; classificatory, 47ff, 51; descriptive, 47, 53ff; lineal, 54; paternal and maternal, 55  
Kūrnāvīla, 362  
Kiripokunuṭela, 235  
Kitnuvaragal, 395  
Kitti (q.), 35, 124, 132  
Kittagagabodhi (k.), 34, 96, 82, 85, 106, 129, 131, 134, 198  
Kit Saṅg Boy, (Sīgiri poet), 145  
Kittisirimegaha (k.), 199, 349  
Kivisi, 224  
Kohoṁbagama, 227  
Kokkilāy, 229  
kollan (black-smiths), 391  
Kolayunu, 214; -gāma, 271, 394  
Konamalai, 312  
Konḍavaṭṭavan inscription, 236  
Koṇḍuruva, 225  
Koneśvaram Śiva Temple, 311  
Könvāvakanda, 241  
Koṭa, 384  
Kotallāhiṭiti, 363  
Kotmalē, 227  
Kottal-Kīṁbiyāva, 246  
Krishna Śāstri, 349  
Krṣṇa (k.), III, 291  
Kuccavāli, 230  
Kuṇḍa Mihide, Mahinda (k.), IV, 313  
Kuḍīn, 397-8, 412, 418  
Kukurumahandamana Pillar Inscription, 176, 225, 271  
kula, 31-2, 37, 102, 107, 114, 341, 343; -gāma, 36, 377-9; -geha, 36, 46; -putta, 36, 378; -ppaveṇikāyattagāma, 393; -sataka, 32, 162, 184, 194  
Kulaviṭṭiya, 212  
kulīna, 36, 46, 373, 377-9, 385, 387ff  
Kulīnga gotra, 370  
Kunram plates, 299  
Kumāra, 321  
Kumāradāsa, Kumāradhātusena, 211, 356  
kumārakanam, 350
kuṁbaḷ (kumbhakāra, potters), 388, 418; -gam, 388; -kula, 388
Kumbāḷaka, 248
Kuṁbalhala, 275
Kuṁburulena, 250
Kumuna, 235
Kunārivata, 235
Kurukḳal -maḍam, 359
Kuruṇāgala, 241, 249-51, 259, 335, 385; -District, 240
Kuruṇāgala -Anurādhapura road, 242-3; -Daṁbulla road, 247; -Giriulla road, 252; -Nārammala road, 249; -Puttalam road, 240-1
Kurundi Vihāra, 229
Kusalānakanda, 237
Kuṣṭarājāgala, 220
Kuṭakaṇṭatissa (k.), 381
Kuṭhāri Vihāra, 315
kuṭi, 262-3; -gāma, 264; -purisa, 397
Kuṭṭam -pokuṇa, 361
kuṭumbikā, 37, 380
Labuṭabāṇḍīgala, 23, 217, 288, 291
Laḍa, 213
Lake Lady, 202
Lakṣmāna, 369
Lakṣmī, 145
Lamāṇi, Upatis (k.), 128
Lambakaṇṭa dynasty, 309
land grants, 44
land ownership, 22 (see gam-laddan, Kābāli-laddan, pāṭṭa-laddan, kuḍin and haskaru)
Lāṅkāpaṭṭana, 345
leather-workers (cammakāras) lēkamgē, 24
Lenerolle Julius de, 272
Lewis, I.M., 6
Licchavī, 372
Līlāvatī, 197, 316
lime-burners, 389 (see humu, sunubol)
liṅga, 329, 348, 352
liyan, 190
Locke, H.E., 29
Lowie, R.H., 56
Lüders, H., 280-3
luhuvuhu, 51
Lumbinni garden, 61
Macalagama, 394
maqākkū, 189
maqāvuva, 189
Māda -Ulpota (Panāvāli), 225
Māḍavacciya, 212
Madirigiri inscription, 253
Madiriya, 247, 253
Madras Tamil Lexicon, 391
Madurai, 135, 354, 358
Māeli Arama, 248
Māeliyavāva, 248
Magadha, 99, 355
Magalamb, 225
Māgama (Mahāgāma, Tissa-mahārāma), 32, 220, 275, 337, 371
Māgamtoṭa, 382
Māgha, 99, 227, 334
Mahāambalapiṭṭhi, 383
Maha-amuṭu-dora, 123
Mahābodhi, 371
mahābhoga, 83, 124
Mahādāṭhika Mahānāga (k.), 408
Mahāgāpiyova (Bilibāva) 211, 272
Mahagariya, 212:
Mahākaccaṭkodi, 228
Mahakalattāva, 166
Mahākoṭṭja, 383-4
mahākula, 36-7, 46
Mahālabujagaccha, Mahadelgas, 221
mahālē, 142
Mahāmallaka nunnery, 167
Mahāmukalānīya, 247
Mahānāga, 83, 156, 189, 319-20, 339, 380, 383-84, 405
Mahānāma (k.), 103, 172-6, 200, 276, 358, 373, 376, 378
Mahānāma (Cm.), 85
mahānīla, 202
Mahāpāli, 325
Mahāpaṭṭana (see Mahātittha)
Mahāpiṭṭivā, 203
mahappā (father's elder brother), 52
Mahārohaṇagutta (m.), 180
Mahārūpasiddhi, 390
mahāsālākula, 386-7
Mahāsammata, 366-7, 370
Mahāsaṅgha (minister), 275
Mahasattay (Sigiri poet), 112, 1234
Mahāsenā (k.), 79, 85, 163, 2487
244, 248, 256, 276-311-2, 3187
9, 360
Mahatabaka niyamatana, 288-9, 292
Mahāthera, 155
Mahātissa (k.), 367
Mahātittha (Mahāpaṭṭana, Mahapuṭu, Mannār, Māntai, Māntoṭṭham, Mātoṭa, Tirukō-tīsāvaram, 113, 187, 238-40, 296, 301-19, 322, 339, 354, 417
Mahāvagga, 178
Mahāval, 182
Mahāvālī Gaṅga, 286-7, 292, 336, 383
Mahāvaṃsa, 8, 14, 15, 37, 383, 386; Tiṅkā, 14, 382
Mahāvāva, 216
mahāvyeya, 176
māhāvi (mahāpitā, mahāmātā, father's elder brother, mother's elder sister), 48-9, 51-2
Mahāvihāra, 12, 156, 163, 211, 275, 324, 327, 356
Mahāvīthi, 326-7
Mahayā Kitambavā, 394
Mahendravarman (k.), I, 299
Mahesī, 39, 41, 77, 80, 102-4, 119, 156-7, 162, 166, 174, 187-9, 195-6, 199-200, 248, 373, 375-6
Mahidavāva, 229
Mahinda (k.), I, 97; III, 42; IV, 25, 102, 104, 183, 188, 196, 262, 277, 325, 342, 362, 403; V, 177, 257, 322, (brother of Sena II), 35, 132;
Mahinda (ruler of Rojava, son of ādhipāda Dāṭhāsīva), 70; (son of Kassapa V), 131, 133; (son of Kittaggabodhi), 35
Mahinda (m.), 357
Mahindārāma, 176
Mahindasena, 161
Mahinda upassaya, 69
Mahiyāṅgana, 23, 337
Māhō-Nikavāva road, 246
Majjhima Nikāya, 282
Makul-ebē, 225
mal (younger brother), 51
Malasnēgala, 241
Malaya, 13, 83, 125-6, 275; -Jana-pada, 262; -rāja (t.), 110, 253
Malayālam, 294
Male, 302
Mallas, 372
Malvatu Oya, 238-9
Māmaḍu inscription, 229
Māna (son of Kassapa VII), 389
Mānābharaṇa (k.), 382
Mānamatta, 239
Manampitiya, 335
Manampitiya, 335
Mānavamma, 40, 42-4, 184, 309, 320, 323, 358, 366-7, 374-5
Māndalagiri Vihāra, 253
Maṅgala, 114
Maṅgalabegāma, 225
Maṅgala Mahāvīthi, 326
Maṅgul, 326
Mahgul-maha-veya, 326
Manihira, 256
Mānikdena inscription, 225
Mannar, 259; -District, 238; -Kacceri Pillar Inscription, 275, 301, (see Mahātittha)
mantadhara, 319
Māntai (see Mahātittha)
Māntottam, 307
Manu, 58, 145, 335, 402
manussâmâma, 267
māpā, 375
mapuruma, 142
Māra, 77
Māravarman Rājasinha, (k.) II, 306
Marcian of Heraclea, 17, 246
market town, 285, 288-9, 292, 295, 329
Marriage, age of partners, 88-91; bride-price, 124; brother-sister, 95; Buddhist forms of, 109; child, 91-3; cross-cousin, 49, 98-101; consent of parents or guardians, 110-2; divorce and remarriage, 118-22; dowry, 124; Endogamy, 99, 101-106; Exogamy, 95, 97; Hindu forms of, 108-9; love, 112-3; marriage alliances: between Anurādhapura and Rohaṇa, 129-34; between Moriyas and Lambakanaṇhas, 127-9; between Ceylon and Kalinga, 136-8; matrilocal, 123; monogamy, 114, 153; parallel cousin, 97; patrilocal, 122-3; polyandry, 114, 139-40; polygamy, 114, post-puberty, 91, 93-4; pre-puberty, 90, 92; qualification of partners, 94ff; sati, 120-2; wedding ceremony, 114-8.

Marshall, J.H., 289
mas, 295
mātā, 71 (see mav)
Mātalē, 259, 315, 358; -District, 223
Mālalē-Dāmbulla road, 225
Māṭambiya, 215
materamajjāka, 162, 184
Māti Vihāra, 252
Māṭiyangana Vihāra, 252
Māṭōmbu, 215-216; -Kōrale, 214-5, 335
Mātoṭa, 296, (see Mahātittha)
māṭula (mother's brother), 83-6
māṭulāni (mother's sister), 189
Māṭuposaka Sutta, 67
Matvana Samanā (Sīgiri poet-ess), 202
Mauryas, 46, 368 (see Moriyas)
may (mother's sister), 51-2
mayil (or suhuru, mother's brother; father's sister's husband, father-in-law), 48, 50, 54, 82
Mayulavila, 234-5
Medhātithi, 90, 92, 99
medical halls, 167
Meghavannā (k.), 8, 22, 43, 162 (see Sirimeghavannā)
Menan (Sīgiri poet), 146
Meraliyavagga, 380, 384
Merukandara, 70, 384
Mewar, 369
mićivājārama, 188
Mihintalē, 25, 122, 155, 160, 337, 372, 395; - Slab Inscription, 188, 276, 388-9, 397-8, 401, 411
Milādu, 291
Miśindapāñha, 394, 397
munumēburu (great-grandson), 54
mīmutu (great-grandfather), 54
Minakshi, C., 350
miniśbirī (granddaughter), 54
Minnēriya, 216, 253
Mī-Oyen Egoḍa Kōralē, 243
misogynists, 148
Mitaya, 32, 53, 162
Mithilā, 292
Mittasena, 374
Moggallāna (k.), II, 141-2, 71, 127, 166, 174, 315-7, 376; II, 68, 375
Mongkon (k.), 172 (see Mahānāma) monks, 179 (see bhikkhus)
Mookerji, R.K., 290
Moravak Kōralē, 218
Moriyaś (Mauryas), 138, 367-9, 370-7, 373-4, 378, 414, 417
Mūga, 401
Muggāyatana, 275
mūlhaṅgabhīnī, 391
Mullēgamakanda, 241
Müller, E., 20
Mulugama, 237
Muṇḍagutta, 81-2, 410
munumēburu (grandson), 44, 54
mutna (father's father and mother's father), 47
mutnu (father's mother and mother's mother), 47
Murāri, 346-7
Nabaḍagala, 211
Nācceri-malai, 230, 231
nadāya duva (brother's sister's daughter), 53
nādi,hus (brother's sister, mother's brother's wife, mother-in-law), 48,50
Nāga, 320
Nāgā, 405, 407-10
Nāgadīpa, 228, 337, 405
Nāgama Pillar Inscription, 271
Nagara, 261, 284-5, 298, 301-3, 339-40, 417
Nagaragalla, 166
Nagaragaṇa, -nunnery, 244; -Vihāra, 244
nagarasobhana vaṇṇa-dāsī, 192-3
Nāgarī script, 26
Nāgirigala, 230
Nāgirikanda, 211-2
Nāgiri Vihāra, 277
Nahapāna (k.), 290
nahāpita, 391 (see barbers)
Nāl (Sīgiri poet), 203
Nālanda, 358; -Geḍigē, 358
Nālārāma, 166
Nālava, 247
nāli, 291
nāmadānadinā, 126
Nāmaluva, 234
nāṇdi, 54
Nandi (merchant), 79, 169, 298
Nāndigāma, 382, 384
Nandimitta (paladin of Duṭṭha-gāmāpi), 36
Nandivāpi, 381
Nandivāpīgāma, 378, 380, 382-4; -Vihāra, 382
naṅgā, 50-1
naṅgi, 52
Nanking, 169, 171-3
Nanlin Temple, 172
Nārāmmala, 252
Narasiṃhavarman (k.) II, 358
Nārāyana (Sīgiri poet), 77
Narendraśena (k.), 135
Narivigama, 244
Nāsik, 290; -inscriptions, 281, 290
Nātanār Kovil, 231
nāti, 34; -dāsī, 33; -kula, 32-3
Navaḍa-aviya, 216
nāyakayan, 403
Nayi-peṇa-guha, 334
negama, 281 (see nigama)
nesāda, 343
Nicholas, C.W., 244, 253-5, 288, 314, 360, 381-2
Nidala Mihid, 148, 201
Niehoff, A.H., 4
nigama, niyam-gama, 261, 281-2, 284-6, 292, 339-40, 417
nigama-gāma, 296
nigama-puta, 280
nigam-sabhā, 281
Nīgganṭhas, 316, 317
niḥi, (leli, yeli, daughter-in-law, sister's daughter), 49
Nikaviṭigama, 211
Nikaviṭiya, 211
nikāyas, 163
Nikāya Saṅghrīhayā, 16, 163, 284
nīlacūḷāmaṇi, 161
Nilapānīkkakulam-malai, 230
Nilasa, 212
Niligalu Bud, 44
Nilakkagama, 245
nīn, 54
Nīnrasīr Netmāran, 300
Niśāṅkaṃmalla (k.), 231, 285
Niṭalaviṭiya, 216
Niti-Nīghaṇṭuva, 278
nivāsa, 263
niyama, 289, 291
niyam-gama, 261, 279-80, 282-7, 296 (see nigama-gāma)
Niyamgampāya, 287; -Vihāra, 286
niyamatana, 22, 221, 288-9
Niyaṇḍavarāgala, 237
Nokapika, 237
nuns, 119-20, 169, 171-3, 177-8
180 (see bhikkhuṇī)
nuvara, 261
Nuvara Eliya, 227, 259
Nuvaragala, 237
Nuvaraganḍalātā, 211, 217
Okkāka, 104, 365-7
Ōmuṇagala, 237
Oruvala Sannasa, 277
Pachow, 173
Pācīnadesa, 42
Paḍa, 212
paḍā, 293-4
pāda, 202
paḍā, 293-4
pāḍajāla, 162
Padaviya, 230
padesa, 106
padhānaghara, 215, 312
paḍī, 294-
padī, 294
Paṭigala, 243
Padipaṇcāva, 243
padmarāga, 325
Pahangama, 240
paśāca form of marriage, 108-9
Pajina pasa, 292
palibodha, 160
Pāli-English Dictionary, 273
Pallava, 121, 135, 308-9, 329, 358-9
Pallelama, 250
Pālmañḍulla-Ambalantota, road, 223
Pamagalu, 211
pamunu, 263, 393-6;
-gam, 394; -kābālla,
269-70; -laddan, 393,
412
Panāḍa, 61
Pānadvura-Horaṇa road,
221
Pānakakkāmam-kulam, 240
Pānāma, 234-5
Panāvāli, 225
pāñcakāmālar, 390-1
pāñcapessiyavaggas,
389-90
Pāñcatantra, 107
Pāñcayojana raṭṭha,
Pāsuvagya, 222
paṇḍitā, 108
Paṇḍu Pāmila, 200
Paṇḍukābhaya (k.), 251,
328, 336, 353
Paṇḍuvāpi, 251
Paṇḍuvāsudeva (k.), 218,
366, 405
Paṇḍuvas Nuvara, 251
Paṇḍyas, 117, 121, 135, 305-7,
312, 354, 358
Pankuliya, 361
paṇīṇā, 40
PaśChang, 19, 168
Papañcāsūdanī, 381
parahandi, 189
Pāraṇikā Pāli, 13
Parakkamapura, 251;
Parakkamasamudda, 251
Parākramabāhu (k.), I, 9-10, 220,
222, 229, 252, 255, 362-3, 395;
II, 9, 220, 390; VI, 277
Pāraṇukūbhā-Sirita, 219, 367
Pāramēṣvarayarman, 299
Paranavitana, 2, 20, 25-7, 123,
251, 253, 269, 271, 291, 332,
335, 346-7, 371-2
Parāntaka (k.), I, 359; II, 313
Parāṣara, 91, 356
Pārīkkhittagāma, 266
parivena, 73, 258, 401
Parker, H., 253
pasāda, 108
pāsāda, 151, 158, 160
Pāsdevn Kūralē, 222 (see Paṇca-
yojana raṭṭha)
pāṭaka, 294
pāṭana, 314
patha, 293
pāṭi, 294
pāṭimā, 163
pāṭṭa, 396; -laddan, 396-7, 418
paṭṭakaṁcuka, 161
paṭṭana, 319, 322; -gāma, grāma, 17, 230, 296,
(see paṭṭana-gāma)
Paṭṭieliya, 242
pātu, 294
paṭṭun-gam, 261, 285, 296, 339, 340, 417 (see paṭṭana-gāma)
paveṇi, 393; -rajjam, 393
paya, 188-9, 411
payamulleydaru, 144
(see Bohodevi)
pehekara, 389 (see weavers)
Pepodatuḍa, 275
Perādeniya, 226
Perera, L.S., 2
Periyakaḍu Vihāra, 247
Periyakaṇcikulam, 239
Periyakulam, 231
Periyapuliyankeḷam, 229
Periyapurāṇam, 299-300, 311
Persia, 302, 303, 311, 318, 329
Persian Gulf, 308
pessiyas, 390
petas, 265,
phussa, 320

Picchatiyāva, 240
pi-chiu-nī, 169
Pi-chiu-nī-chuang, 18-9, 168
piṇḍapāta, 410
pitā, piyā, father, 51-2, 54, 58, 71
piyangala, 275
Piyangudīpa, 228
Point Pedro, 228
Pokunuṭa, 236
Pokunuṭṭa Vihāra, 221-2
Polonnaruva, 45, 73, 146, 197, 227
252-9, 296, 335-6, 347, 417;
- Rājaṁālīgāva Pillar Inscription, 270
Polonnaruva Temple, 177
Pomparippuva, 242
Pondicheri, 310
pōruva, 115
Potgul Vehera, 347
potters, (kumbhakāras), 388
poṭṭ habba, 147
Potthakuṭṭha (k.), 399
Prabhāvatī Guptā (q.), 35
prājāpatya form of marriage,
Pran Nath, 268-9
praśasti, 365
pratigrāhakas, 362-3
Pratihāras of Mandor, 369
pravara, 96-7
Ptolemy, 17
Pūjāgala, 247
Pujavaliya, 16, 192, 214, 218, 253-4, 274, 286, 313, 361, 389
Pukkusa, 343
Puliyanthulam, 239;
-Slab Inscription, 45
Pulmoṭṭai, 232-3
Pulatthinagara, 254, 258, 322 (see Polonnaruva)
Pungutiv, 228
Pura, 340
Purātana, 286
Pūrṇaghaṭa, 308
Purohitā, 96
Puta, putta, son, 53-4, 58
Puttalam, 240-1
Puttalam-Anurādhapura road, 240
Puvakgaha-Ulpota, 225
Queyroz, 116
Radā, 389 (see washermen)
Radava, 389 (see radā, washermen)
Radcliff-Brown, A.R., 29, 47
Raha, 295
Rahula, 116, 177, 180
Rājadhāni, 284, 285
Rājagala Vihāra, 236
Rajaka, 391, 418 (see radā, radava, washermen)
Rājakula, 31
Rājarāja (k.), I, 231, 313
Rājarāja Perumpalli, 231
Rājratha, 9, 117, 129, 219, 214, 231, 234, 258, 268
Rājasimha, (k.), II, 307
Rajatalena, 343
Rājāvaliya, 16, 218, 254, 313, 362
Rājini (q.), 161
Rājini (t.), 35, 83, 187, 196, 209, 376
Rājini nunery, 166
Rājyaśrī (q.), 93
Rākṣasa, 108-9
Rāmacandra, 369
Rāmbāva (Gālindaru-Gomaṇḍala), 44, 183, 217; - Slab Inscription, 44, 102, 136, 342
Ramboḍagalla, 250, 335
Rāmesvaram, 299
Ran (slaves), 400
Ranagiri, 247
Ranagirimaṭṭa, 247
Rapson, E.J., 290
Rasa, 147
Rasavāhinī, 37, 105, 301, 388
Rāssahela, 236 (see Rājagala Vihāra);- inscriptions, 130
Rāṣṭrakūṭa, 136; - dynasty, 291
Ratana (nunnery), 166
Ratanadāṭha, 83
Ratanasutta, 326
Ṛṭ-laddan, 418
ṛṭ-ladu, 395
ṛṭ-ladu-kābāllas, 395
Ratnapura District, 223
ṛtti-dāsī, 405, 408
Ratubaka Plateu, 175
Rayigam Kōrale, 222
שימה Davids, 282
Ṛṭigala, 335
Riyansen (m.), 149
ṛṇa-dāsī, 409
Rohana, 10, 28, 34, 36, 39,
  70, 75, 77, 82-4, 107, 110-
  11, 117, 124, 129, 131,
  133-4, 198-200, 217, 219-
  20, 259, 268, 275, 323,
  360, 367, 371-2, 378, 405,
  414
Roman, -coins, 28, 310;
  -merchants, 329;
  -settlements, 310
Rome, 308, 318
ṛṣi, 96
Royal harems, 114
royal succession, 38, 44,
  46
Rudraśena (k.), 135
rūpa 147; - sammān̄a
  108
Ruvanvāli Mahasāya, 161
Śabbagunopeta, 106-7
śabda, 147
Śab. ā-vāvastā, 24
Saddharmālakārāya, 409
Saddhārma Ratnākarāya, 367-8
Saddhārma Ratnāvaliya, 16, 89,
  112, 192
Saddhātissa (k.), 61, 237, 284, 394
saga, 146
Sāgaliya, 166
Sāgama, 211
Śagati, 281
Sagaya, 288
sa-gotra, 95, 97
Sahassavatthuppakarāṇa, 14, 107, 111,
  113, 202, 300-1, 319-21, 360, 388,
  394
Śaiva (Śiva), 300, 345, 347, 383;
  -temples, 329, 351ff (see Hindu)
Sakkara, 279-80
Sakkasenāpati, 162, 167, 306, 344
Sākya, Śākya, 366, 368
Salāvata, 316
Sāliya, 391
Sāma, 65
samadā, 102, 342
samādhi, 14
Sambalturai, 228
Sambandar, 299-300, 311
Sāma Jātaka, 65-6
samajāti, 102, 342
sāmāndāsavyopagata (slaves), 400
Samanoṇa, Samantakūṭa, 222
Samantapāśādikā, 13, 37, 170, 262, 399–400
Śaṁkha, 92
Samvarta, 91
Saṁyutta Nikāya, 267
Saṅgalāṅkāra, 45
Saṅgama, Vihāra, 247
Saṅgha (Buddhist), 5–6, 11, 169–70, 189, 232, 357, 390, 407–8, (father of Surananimala), 37; (minister), 106–7, 111
Saṅghā, (q.), 61, 71, 124, 126–7, 132, 155, 184, 196, 373, 376
Saṅghamittta (m.), 163–4, 170–1, 321
Saṅghapālakanda, 244
Saṅgharakkhita (m.), 32–3, 50
Saṅghasena Pabbata, 161
Saṅghatissa (k.), 70, 376
Saṅghavarman, 168, 172
Saṅgillagāma, 380, 384
sap muṇḍu, 148
sa-piṇḍa, 95–6
sa-pravara, 95
Sasadāvata, 398
Sāsana, 85, 154, 158, 163–4, 188, 208, 357
sassakāra, 398
Sāssēruva, 246
Sātā, 123, 182
satī, 120–2, 139, 157, 209, 416
Sayañpabhā, 60
Sekkilār, 299
Sena (k.) I, 34, 69, 73, 75, 82, 94, 106, 111, 124, 32, 184, 196, 198, 255–7, 319, 351, 353, 358, 399, 401; II, 141, 111, 126, 305, 353, 358; V, 73, 200, 256–7, 351; (chief scribe), 166; (son of Kittaggabodhi), 35, 76
Senā (daughter of Yuvarāja Kassapa), 34
Senaggabodhi āvāsa, 73
Sena Linga, 166, 377
Senāsana, 81, 185, 274
Senavarman (k.), 350
Seṭṭhivāpi, 252
seven generations, 54, 86
Sevu, 148
Sharma, B.N., 99, 119
Shih-tzu-kuo, 169
Sigālovāda Suttanta, 58, 406
Sīgiri, 26–7, 77, 113, 142, 145, 156, 202, 223–4, 226, 330ff, 417; –graffiti, 3, 7, 26, 77, 80, 115, 118, 142, 144, 147–8, 150, 182, 187, 189, 194, 201, 207, 225, 229,
331-8; - ladies, 144, 157, 204; - paintings, 202; poets, 112, 120, 142, 146, 331; - visitors, 145

Sihigiribim, 224
Sikhavalañda Vinisa, 16, 61, 113, 165, 179, 342
Sīla, 74
Silākāla (k.), 14, 68, 78, 88, 110, 124, 127, 197, 376
Silāmeghavanṇa (k.), 107, 110, 129, 356, 375, 399
Silātissabodhi (brother of Dhatuseṇa), 74
silivi, culapitā, father's younger brother, mother's younger brother, 48, 51

Sīmhamitiśa (k.), 308-9
Sindu, 303
Sīṅguruvali, 327
Sircar, D.C., 281
Siridunna, 249
Sirimeghavanṇa (k.), 234, 324, (see Meghavanṇa)
Sirivaddamānaka, 249
Siri Saṅghabodhi Mahārāja, 349
Siruttontar, 299-300
Situlpavva, 337, 359
Siva (k.), 128;

(minister), 79, 187, 301, 319
Śiva, (see Śaiva)
Śivalī, 198
Sivat (Śiṅgiri poet), 144
Sivkāśāla, 329
Siyabaslakara, 190-3
Si-ju-ki, 18
Skandagupta (k.), 291
śivāye, 31, 36, 407; - villages, 23
Śrītās; 89-90, 95, 100, 362
sohoyur, brother, 53
solidarity, of kin, 35; of royal family, 45-6
Sopater, 310, 318
Sorata, W., 274
Sora velahāma, 295
Sotthisāla, 329
Sotthisena (k.), 78, 103, 373, 376
Spooner, D.B., 289,
śrāddha, 96
śrāṇi, 290
Śrīmāra Śrīvallabha, (k.), 305, 358
Sthānurāvi (k.), 136
Still John, 26
stone-workers (cirpāṇ), 391
strīdhana, 186ff
stūpa, 337
Subha (Śuba k.), 334, 378-9
Subhagiri, 334
śūdras, 341, 387, 412, 417
Suddhodana (k.), 61
suhuru (see mayil)
Sujātā, 99, 355
Sūkaratittha, 313, (see Īrātōta)
sukiya, 314
Sulugalu, 245
ṣulumav (mother's younger sister), 49
Sumitta, 368
Sundara Mūrti Nayanār, 307
Sung dynasty, 169, 308
suṅkha, 314
suṇṇa-gāmās, 267
sunu boi (see lime-burners), 389
surā, 145 (k.)
Sūratissa, 244
Suttanta, 59, 67
svayamvara form of marriage, 109

Tabaraya, 226
taccan, 391 (see carpenters)
Talagama, 227
tale, 116
tāli, 115
tālla, 115-6, 418	Tamankaḍuva, 335
Tamannahala, 214	Tambiah, H.W., 98-9
Tamapaṇṭī, 238
Tamil, 85, 93, 98, 115, 117, 228,
   259, 267, 270, 277, 284, 313, 348
   328, 382; -Ruins, 348
tana, 289, 291
tanasiyan, 274
tantayāya, 391
Tapassuka, 232
Taprobana, 296
taraccha, 370
tāta, 52
taṭṭān (gold-simths), 391
tel, 295
Teldeniya, 226
Teliṅgu, 294
tenants, 22
ten villages, 23
terms, endearing, 52
Tevāram, 298, 307
Theravāda Buddhism, 328
Tiruketiṭhavaram Hindu Temple,
   296, 298, 300, 307-8, 312
Tirunakkaṭṭamkūṭi, 299-300
Tirunāmanallūr, 291
Tisara, 171
Tisaraśandeśaya, 192
Tisaviya, 241
Tissa (minister), 275
Tissā, (nunnery), 166;
   (daughter of Kittagagabodhi), 35, 132;
   (daughter of yuvaraja Cassapa), 34
Tissamahārāma, 337
Tittāvela, 246
Tiya brāhmaṇa, 268
Tonigala, 22, 241, 243, 291; -Rock Inscription, 288
Toṇikallu, 239
Tooth Relic, 164, 173-4, 184, 325-6; -festival, 18; -Temple, 325
Topāvāva, 253-5
Toravāva-Mayilāva Vihāra, 244
Toṭṭama, 236
Toyavāpi, 253, 255
Trapuṣyaka, 232
Trincomalee, 233, 259, 238, 311, 318, 361,
   (see Gokanaka);
   - District, 231, 233
Tulāna Kōralē, 215
Tumpokkuna, 275
Tzinista, 302
ucca kula, 387
Udā Mahayā (K.), (see Dappula, IV),
   Udaya (k.) I, 42, 111, 129, 196;
   II, 34; IV, 102, 161, 292, 325, 357;
   (son of Kittagagabodhi), 35
Udāyi (m.), 107
Uhana, 236,
   ukkatta, 343
Ulgalla, 335
ulkūqi, 397
uḷusiyam, 274
Ummagga Jātaka, 292
uṇdu, 288
Upamitiḥavaprpaṇcaḥkathā, 99
uparāja (t.), 126, 187, 196;
   -Mahinda, 124; - Sena, 35, 124, 132
upasampadā, 19, 168-72
Upāsikā Vihāra, 170
upassaya, 161-2
Upatissa (k.), I, 122, 200, 253, 255,
   326-7; II, 69, 110, 124, 128
Upatissagāma, 238
upavīta, 355
Uppalavana (daughter of Cassapa
   I, 99, 151
Upulvān (god), 219
Urban settlements, 11
Uruvela, 242, 355
Usavadāta, 290
Uttara, (nunnery), 165; -Vihāra, 161
Uttaromūla parivena, 389
Uturukuru, 240
uturu pasa, 292
Uturupav Vihāra, 247

Vādda Language, 49
Vāddas, 101
Vadnagara, 367
vaḍu, 389 (see carpenters)
Vaḍudevāgama, 389
Vāhalkaḍa, 242
vaharala, 404
Vaiśālī, 289
vaiśyas, ca, 341-2, 356, 387, 412, 417
Vajagama, 216
Vajirā (q.), 162, 167
Vajiviyā, 216
Vajrabodhi (m.), 222-3
vājū, 51
Vajur Agboy (Śīgirī poet), 123
Vākātaka, 135
Valapanē, 227
Valaṇā, 223
Valavē Gaṅga, 223, 314
Vāḷlava, 249
Vallipuram, 228
Valluka, Bhalluka, 232
Vālmilla, 222
Vāluka, 327
Vamsatthappakāsinī, 15,
(see Mahāvaṃsa Ṭīkā)
vanadugga, 262
Vāña Nadī (present Valave Gaṅga), 223
vanavil, 273
Vanni Hatpattu, 242
Varaguṇa (k.), 306
Varahamihira, 145
vārṇa, 102-4, 342, 411, 418
Vasabha (k.), 200, 238, 379
vassa, 81, 159, 185
Vaṭadāgā, 233, 253
Vātāpi, 135, 253, 299-300
Vātsyāyana, 191
Vattakāla, 233
Vāuḍavilli Hatpattu, 250
Vavuniyā, 259; - District, 228-9, 259
Veda, 344
Ved-ḥal., 176-7
Vedikinnari-malai, 229
Vegiriya, 226
Veheragala, 237
Vehera Udā-maluva, 238
vejjasālā, 258
Velāgama, Velāgama, 231
Velāngama, 212, 220, 231
Velugama, 220
Velisūmanā, 399
Veluvana Vihāra, 215-6
venā, 343
Veragala, 242
Verāgama, 271
Verapaṭāva, 236
vesī, 191
Vēvālkāṭiya, 23, 104, 114, 403
veyyāvačca, 177
Vidiśā, 368
Vidūrā (q.), 161
vidyā, 107
vihāra, 15, 21, 63, 154, 158, 174, 180, 184, 213, 219, 221, 227, 229, 275, 312, 340, 354, 382, 401, 412
Vijaya, 263
Vijayabāhu (k.), I, 8-9, 14, 137; II, 252, 334; IV, 286-7
Vijayārāma, 361
Vikkamabāhu (k.), 219
Vilagama, 237
Vilbā Vihāra, 250
viliśnāttan, 148
village (see gama)
Vinaya, 107, 173, 179, 205, 262ff, 282, 287, 344
Vinaya Piṭaka, 107 (see Vinaya)
visagaṇḍa, 180
visāla, 401
Viṣṇu, 186
Visuddhimagga, 14, 33, 67, 122, 136, 152, 154, 158, 180ff, 185, 189, 233, 264, 388
vivāha, 96 (see marriage)
vipra, 369 (Viraṅdagoḍa, 241)
Viyaulpota, 224
Vogel, J. Ph., 347
Vyāsa, 91
Wagle, N., 33, 263, 282
Washermen, 389, 391
Watta, vāstu, vatthu, 276-7
weavers, tantavāya, pehekara, pesakāra, 389, 391
Western India, 100
Western Minor road, 211
Wickremasinghe, D.M.de.Z., 176, 180, 188, 270
Wickramasinghe, Sirima, 9
women, 5, 30, 141, 202; education of, 201-6; general attitude towards, 143-50; political activities of, 197-201; property rights of, 186-94; religious activities of, 158-80
Ya ā gī, 202
Yahisapavata, 288
yajña, 362
yakkhas, 265
Yama, 347
Yangtze River, 169
Yāpahuva, 334
Yaṭivila inscription, 250
yēli (see nīhi)
Yuan-Chwang, 18 (see Hiun-Tsang)
yuvarāja (t.), 61, 68, 72-3, 126-7;
-Kassapa, 34, 134; -Mahinda, 61