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Abstract

In this study an attempt is made to examine the developments in the history of Ceylon from the death of Parākramabāhu I to the end of the reign of Parākramabāhu II covering a period of roughly a century (c.1180 to 1270 A.D.). The unity and general prosperity which the country enjoyed under Parākramabāhu I gave way to dissension and disintegration soon after his death. The forces of disintegration moved on until about four decades after Parākramabāhu's death Dambadeniya emerged as a new centre of activity and of resistance to foreign invaders with the foundation of a royal residence there. The difficult problems concerning the disintegration of the Polonnaruva Kingdom so soon after reaching its culmination under Parākramabāhu I, and the subsequent rise of Dambadeniya to importance under Parākramabāhu II form the subject of this study. In chapter I the introduction sets out some of these problems and then proceeds with the discussion of the sources. Apart from the Pali Chronicles, other literary works, written both in Sinhalese and Pali, will be examined with a view to estimating their historical value. After this analysis of the sources, chapter II deals with the developments which followed the death of Parākramabāhu I after giving a brief outline of his reign. Here the process of the disintegration of the Polonnaruva Kingdom has been examined with an attempt to determine the possible causes. Chapter III deals with the examination of the circumstances that led to the foundation of a royal residence in Dambadeniya. This chapter discusses the role of Vijayabahu III, the founder of Dambadeniya, together with that of other local rulers in parts of Rohana and Mayarattha. The next chapter
states some of the difficulties which arise from the principal sources dealing with Parākramabāhu II and examines his early life. A major part of this chapter is devoted to an examination of the policies of Māgha, who had invaded and occupied Rājaratthā. Among foreign invaders Māgha is unique in some respects, and for that reason his rule has been examined in detail. The initial stages of Parākramabāhu's struggle with Māgha are also examined in the same chapter. Māgha was not the only foreign invader with whom Parākramabāhu had to deal. His kingdom was invaded twice by the Pāṇḍyas - events not dealt with in the Pali Chronicle but brought to light by South Indian inscriptions. Ceylon was also invaded by Candrabhanu of the kingdom of Tambralinga in the Malay Peninsula. This is the first known instance of an invasion of Ceylon by a ruler from South East Asia. These events are important for the understanding of the course of the history of Ceylon in this period, and will therefore be considered in detail in chapter V. The last chapter is devoted to an examination of Parākramabāhu's restoration of the ancient cities of Rājaratthā and to a consideration of the extent of his rule and the importance of his reign in the history of Ceylon. The conclusion brings out the principal results of this study.
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Chapter I

Introduction and Sources

In this study an attempt is made to trace the course of events that led to the disintegration of the Polonnaruva kingdom and the emergence of Dambadeniya to the position of a seat of royal power. This study covers a period of nearly a century from the death of Parakramabahu I to the end of the reign of Parakramabahu II. It is hardly necessary to stress the necessity for a study of this nature. Concerning the period immediately preceding ours, apart from papers devoted to some of the problems in the history of this period which appeared from time to time, two important studies were completed recently. Sirima Wickramasinghe's study of The Age of Parakramabahu I is not only a thorough examination of the reign of one of the greatest Sinhalese kings, but it could also form a sound basis for further investigation into various other aspects of the history of the Polonnaruva kingdom. More recently W.M.K. Wijayatunga completed a valuable study on The Rise and Decline of the Cola Power in Ceylon. He has examined the course of events that led to the Cola conquest of Ceylon in the early part of the eleventh century and the termination of the Cola rule in Ceylon. This has also necessitated a careful study of the reign of Vijaya-

---

bāhu I who played the dominant role in the expulsion of the Colas from Ceylon. These two monographs together cover the reigns of two important rulers of the Polonnaruva kingdom, which in some respects marks the greatest achievements of the Sinhalese kings.

The present study in which we have sought to examine the disintegration of the Polonnaruva kingdom and the rise of Daṁbadeniya as a seat of Sinhalese royal power could well be a complementary monograph in relation to the works cited above.

So far no comprehensive study of our period has appeared. From time to time several scholars have sought to concern themselves with particular problems in the history of this period. On the period up to the foundation of Daṁbadeniya as a royal residence, Professor S. Paranavitana drew attention to 'Three Cola Invasions not Recorded in the Mahāvamsa', which appear to have taken place in the reign of queen Līlavatī.\(^1\) In 1958 B. J. Perera made a notable attempt to analyse and interpret the political aspects of the confusion that set in after the death of Parākramabāhu I.\(^2\) Prior to that - as early as 1937 - H. W. Codrington set out the possible causes for 'The Decline of the Mediaeval Sinhalese Kingdom' in a paper read before the Royal Asiatic Society.\(^3\) More recently Murphy


Rhoads examined this question by a comparative study of the decay of other Asian civilizations; he concluded that the collapse of the irrigation system was due to the break-down of the socio-economic organization on which it was dependant for its effective maintenance, as a consequence of repeated foreign invasions and internal dissension and so led to the collapse of the Sinhalese kingdom.\(^1\) We have examined these arguments and shown how far they may be accepted.

More recently, Sirima Wickramasinghe contributed a useful chapter to the *University of Ceylon History of Ceylon*, in which she sought to examine in brief the developments in the period covered by the successors of Parākramabāhu I up to Māgha's invasion of Ceylon.\(^2\) Also Paranavitana's contributions to the same publication are very valuable.\(^3\) While these are notable additions to our knowledge of this period, it was far beyond the scope of this publication to undertake a detailed examination of all problems arising from the troubled history of the island in this period. Hence our attempt to examine these problems in greater detail requires no apology.

---


As to the period of the Dambadeniya kings, similarly important attempts have been made to understand some aspects of its history. It is but natural that in the early years much of the energy and enthusiasm of scholars was directed towards the various problems connected with the history of the Anuradhapura kingdom and the better times of Polonnaruva under Parakramabahu I. This concentration of interest was perhaps not entirely due to the vigour and youthfulness of the Sinhalese civilization during that period, but also to the comparatively rich source materials available to them both from archaeology and literature.

However, as early as 1890 F. H. Modder published informative topographical accounts of the Dambadeniya and the Kurunegala Districts, together with popular traditions concerning this region.\(^1\) These accounts may be of some general interest, but dependent as they are on such popular and unauthoritative works as the Dambadeniya Vistaraya and the Kurunegala Vistaraya they may not prove of much value. Codrington's 'Notes on the Dambadeniya Dynasty' which appeared in 1924 is a noteworthy contribution, in which he drew attention to certain aspects of the history of the period, particularly the problem of its chronology.\(^2\) Many of his suggestions proved useful in subsequent studies, though in some cases, such as his date for Vijayabahu III, his conclusions have been seriously contested.\(^3\)

One great problem in the history of this period was the invasions of Ceylon by Candrabhānu - his identification and the nature of his expeditions. This problem which had given rise to a great deal of speculation among scholars was settled by Coedès in 1927 with his thorough re-examination of an inscription from Jaiya in the Malay Peninsula, the text of which he had published as early as 1918.\(^1\) These important studies by Coedès, viz. 'Le Royaume de Črīvijaya' and 'A propos de la chute du Royaume de Črīvijaya' in which the identification of Candrabhānu had been established almost beyond doubt, are significant contributions to our knowledge of an important problem in the history of Ceylon. Apart from establishing the identification of Candrabhānu, the arguments of Coedès that the latter was a local ruler who had seceded from the imperial control of Śrīvijaya are now generally accepted. While these paved the way for a better understanding of the problem of Candrabhānu much remained obscure.

Some years later Nilakanta Sastri made an attempt to examine this question further in two important papers entitled 'The Ceylon Expedition of Jatāvarman Vīra Pāṇḍya' and 'Śrīvijaya, Candrabhānu, and Vīra Pāṇḍya' respectively.\(^2\) In these papers Nilakanta Sastri analysed and interpreted the data in South Indian inscriptions which have a bearing on the Pāṇḍyan invasions of Ceylon during the reign

\(^1\)B.E.F.E.O., XVIII, No. 6 (1918), 1-36; B.K.I., LXXIII (1927), 459-72.
\(^2\)8th All Ind. Or. Conf., Mysore, 1935, 508-26; T.B.G., LXXVII (1937), 251-68.
of Parākramabāhu II and on the expeditions of Candrabhānu. He
established the chronological sequence of these events and drew attention
to their synchronism. This scholar devoted particular attention to a
prāṇasti of Vīra Pāṇḍya from Kuṇumiyamalai which gives a detailed ac­
count of his expedition to Ceylon. This record presents numerous dif­
ficulties in its text, and in view of the confused nature of the course
of events on which they were focused, this scholar was both cautious
and tentative in his conclusions. At that stage he also did not have
the opportunity of taking into account the notices of these events
contained in the Pali and Sinhalese works other than the Cūlavamsa.

Even so, these studies mark a further stage of progress in our under­
standing of an important aspect in the history of this period.

The contributions to the University of Ceylon History of Ceylon
by Paranavitana, particularly the chapter on 'The Daṁbadeniya Dynasty',
deserve special mention.¹ An effort has been made not only to syn­
thesize the body of knowledge that has grown over the years, but also
to examine some of the problems with a view to opening avenues along
which further enquiry could proceed. As such, they form a valuable
addition to our knowledge. Being circumscribed by the scope and plan
of this publication, some of these problems could not receive the de­
tailed treatment they deserved.

¹U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, Book V, Ch. 1, 613-34, see also 636-57.
Some aspects of the history of the Daṃbadeṇiya period became the subject of discussion on the Ṣāhitya Day celebrations held at Daṃbadeṇiya in 1958 through the auspices of the Department of Cultural Affairs. The proceedings of these discussions have already appeared.¹ The emphasis in the discussions was on the literature of the period, except for the noteworthy contribution by Paranavitana in which he drew attention to the main political events of the period. There he also expressed the view that Māgha, like Candrabhānu, was of Malayan origin.²

Ṣāhityyaya, the organ of the Department of Cultural Affairs, Ceylon, devoted a special number to a treatment of the Daṃbadeṇiya period, where again the emphasis naturally fell on its literature, although it also contained brief articles on subjects such as the arts and crafts and the coinage of the period. Some of the contributors have given a brief outline of the political events. These contributions are no doubt useful and are of general interest. However, in so far as the political history of the period is concerned, they have not taken us nearer to the solution of the problems of its history.³

¹Daṃbadeṇi Ṣāhitya Sammēlanaya, Sammēlaṇa Satahan, Colombo, 1959.
³Ṣāhityyaya, Daṃbadeṇi Kalāpaya, Colombo, 1958.
Apart from these Sinhalese publications by the Department of Cultural Affairs, a work of considerable importance, the *Dambadeniya Yugaya* by Degammāda Sumanajoti Thera, appeared on the Sāhitya Day of the same year.¹ This work contains an outline of the political history of the period together with a general account of its administration, economic conditions and a topographical survey of the places of historical interest. A few years later Sumanajoti Thera followed up his work with two more parts.² These were devoted to an account of some aspects of Buddhism and a survey of the literature of the period. The two parts, particularly the section on the literature, are the more valuable section of this work. Its bibliography may be helpful to students of the history of this period. The political history is dealt with concisely. The problems of chronology, and the examination of the Pāṇḍya and the Jāvaka invasions were perhaps beyond the intentions of the author. The accession of Vijayabāhu III is placed in 1220, but it is now well known that the initial regnal year of this ruler was 1232. These limitations, however, should not deprive it of its value as a work of considerable importance in as much as it attempts to give a picture of the period as a whole.

---

¹ *Dambadeniya Yugaya, i. Itihāsa hā Purātattva Vigrahaya, Vakkunuvala, 1958.*

² *Dambadeniya Yugaya, ii. Sāsana Vamsaya; iii. Sāhitya Vamsaya, Vakkunuvala, 1961.*
In our study an attempt will be made to investigate further the complicated problems referred to above, with a view to indicating possible lines of solution. The reign of Mahā which has hitherto not been examined in detail will receive our special attention. In our study the emphasis will fall on the political developments because of the significance of the problems arising from the political history of the period. This is by no means to suggest an underestimation of the importance of other aspects of its history. In fact we have drawn attention to religious and cultural developments where necessary, in so far as they contribute to a better understanding of the course of its political history. The available material for a study of the cultural developments in this period is richer and should, therefore, form the subject of a separate investigation. For example, substantial data are available for a study of an interesting problem like the condition of the Buddhist Samgha in this troubled period, which remains beyond the scope of the present investigation. Two important studies on the culture of this period have already appeared. Dr. M. B. Ariyapala's Society in Medieval Ceylon is an examination of the social conditions in the thirteenth century based on Sinhalese literature generally, and the Saddharma Rāṇāvaliya in particular.¹ Prof. Geiger's posthumous work which appeared recently, The Culture of Ceylon in Medieval Times.

¹Colombo, 1956.
based mainly on a study of the Pali Chronicles is an excellent monograph, which embodies the results of a life-long investigation into various aspects of the culture of the people of Ceylon. These two studies together form a valuable addition to our knowledge, though they by no means exhaust the possibilities of further fruitful enquiry.

Sources

It is necessary to discuss the nature of, and the limitations set by, some of our principal sources within the body of this thesis as they have a direct bearing on the problems concerned. Many of the principal sources utilized in this study are well known to students of Ceylon history and have been the subject of discussion by different scholars. We therefore confine ourselves to drawing attention to particularly noteworthy features and to a consideration of the comparatively less-known works.

Naturally, as in almost any study of the history of medieval Ceylon, the Cūlavamsa forms one of the most important sources of information. The so-called Cūlavamsa which, in fact, is a continuation of the older Māhāvamsa, by different authors from time to time, has been the subject of discussion in the past. In his excellent edition

1 Edited by Heinz Bechert, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1960.

of this text Geiger has discussed its trustworthiness while drawing attention to some of its deficiencies.\footnote{1} He also considered the date and authorship of the work; but much remained yet to be known. In this connection, the examination by Sirima Wickramasinghe of the authorship of the different parts of the Cūlavamsa is particularly noteworthy.\footnote{2} She has demonstrated convincingly that chapters xxvii to lxxix consist of two parts written by two different authors, and not one written by one author as Geiger was inclined to believe. Although no division mark separating the two parts has been detected by Geiger, there is a marked difference in the treatment of 'the epic of Parakkama' from that of the previous rulers as shown by Wickramasinghe. And there is good reason to regard the former as the work of a different author. According to tradition a part of the Cūlavamsa was written by a therā named Dhammakitti during the reign of Parākramabāhu II, which, she is inclined to believe, could be the second part of this work devoted to the reign of Parākramabāhu I.

In so far as we are concerned, what is of direct relevance to our study is the continuation of this Chronicle from the reign of Vijayabāhu II, i.e. from chapter lxxx. According to Wickramasinghe's view this would really form the third part of the Cūlavamsa. That a

\footnote{1} Vols. P.T.S; London, 1925, 1927, see Introduction; Cv. Tr. 2 parts, Colombo, 1953, see Introduction in part 1, IV-XXX.

\footnote{2} Op. cit., see chapter on Sources.
new section of the Chronicle begins at chapter lxxx appears to be beyond doubt. Geiger has noted the words \textit{namo tassa bhagavato arahato sammā-sambuddhassa} found in four of his manuscripts in verse 84 of chapter lxxix, which is the formula of salutation to the Buddha. This is a clear indication of the beginning of a new section.\footnote{\textit{Cv.}, I, p. III.} In a fifth manuscript three, instead of one, division marks occur at this point. Moreover, the narrative takes a different tone exactly where this indication of division occurs in the manuscripts. As pointed out by Geiger and by Sirima Wickramasinghe, what strikes the reader here at once is the definite reference to the misdeeds of Parakramabāhu I. We are told that Vijayabāhu II relieved the people of the suffering caused by the excesses of this ruler who, by this implication, stands rebuked. As the chronicler says, Vijayabāhu II 'in his great mercy released from their misery those dwellers in Lāṅkā whom his uncle sovereign Parakkama had thrown into prison and tortured with stripes and fetters'.\footnote{\textit{Cv. Tr.}, II, p. 125, note 2; Sirima Wickramasinghe, \textit{op. cit.}, see chapter on Sources.} Quite clearly, these words would not have come from the author who gives a glowing account of Parākramabāhu's great achievements in the preceding chapters. There is therefore no doubt that the \textit{Cūlavamsa} was taken over by a different author at chapter lxxx.
According to Geiger's manuscripts, this third section of the Gūlavamsa, as we may call it, seems to end with the end of the reign of Parākramabāhu IV at verse 102 or 104 of chapter xc. Geiger observed:

'One of my mss. ends altogether with ch. 90, v. 102. In two of them there is a double division mark after verse 104, and the last one has two division marks after v. 102. They are followed by the verses 103 and 104 which end on the third line of the leaf, the rest of the leaf being left blank and the next one beginning with v. 105. Thus the break is clearly indicated in our manuscripts.'

In the general treatment and tone of this part of the Chronicle, there is no indication of a break at any other point such as the statement pertaining to the reign of Vijayabāhu II cited above. Nor has Geiger detected a break in the manuscripts from chapter lxxx to the end of the reign of Parākramabāhu IV in chapter xc. There is therefore no valid objection to taking these chapters as forming the third part of the Gūlavamsa.

It would, however, be a more difficult task to determine the date of its composition and authorship, of which the text unfortunately bears no indication. In most literary works written from the thirteenth century onwards the authors often give their names and biographical details of the families to which they belong.² The author of this part of the Chronicle, perhaps following

¹ Cv., I, p. IV.
the tradition of his predecessors who composed its earlier parts, preferred anonymity.

That this part of the Chronicle was known in the reign of Kirttiśrī Rājasimha is evident from a statement found in the more recent part of the Gūlavamsa: 'There was a book, called the Mahāvamsa, written in verse from Mahāsammata to (the kings of) Hatthiselapura'. Geiger has drawn attention to the significance of this passage.

There is a possibility of this part of the Gūlavamsa being written some time towards the end of or not long after the reign of Parākramabāhu IV. There is evidence of keen literary activity during this period. This period witnessed a keen interest in the writing of the histories of the sacred objects and sacred shrines - often referred to as the vamsa literature. The Hathavanagallavihāravamsa which purports to give a history of the Hathavanagalla Vihāra was written in the reign of Parākramabāhu II. The Pali Thūpavamsa - a history of the stūpas - was written at the request of king Parākrama by Vācissara, who is believed to have been a pupil of Sāriputta during the reigns of Vijayabāhu III and Parākramabāhu II.

---

1 Cy., II, Ch. XCIX, 76.
2 Cy., I, p.iv.
3 C. E. Godakumbura, Sinh. Lit., 105-27.
4 See below, 48-58
Interest in this class of literature continued in the decades that followed.

The Simhala Bodhivamsa, based partly on the Pali Bodhivamsa of about the tenth century, was written by Śrī Parākramabāhu Mahāsāmi of Vilgammula at the request of Parākramabāhu IV. Similarly, the Dalādā Sirīta which embodies the history of, and the observations connected with, the Tooth Relic was written in the Saka year 1247 (1325 A.D.) during the reign of Parākramabāhu IV, possibly at his request. The Čūlavamsa refers to the keen interest which this ruler showed in the Jātakas. It is stated that five hundred and fifty Jātaka stories were translated into Sinhalese and were distributed throughout the island. The Čūlavamsa attributes the authorship of the Dalādā Sirīta to the king himself. In the light of this keen interest in literary activity, particularly in works devoted to the history of the sacred shrines and sacred objects such as the Tooth Relic, stūpas and the Bodhi Tree, it is not improbable that some writer of this period should have taken up the task of continuing the Pali Chronicle which gives the history of the island from the point where the author of the second part left off when he composed it, possibly in the reign of Parākramabāhu II as tradition would

---

2 See below, 70-73.
3 Cv., XC, 80-86, 77-79.
have us believe. This is at best a probability.

In this connection we may draw attention to another point. We have noted earlier that in one of Geiger's manuscripts two division marks are found after verse 102 of chapter xc of the Cūlavamsa. Another manuscript ends altogether at verse 102. If this verse marks the end of the work where its author left off, then one may note that the death of the king (Parākramabāhu IV) is not recorded up to that point. In two of Geiger's manuscripts the two division marks are found after verse 104. The latter verse in artificial metre contains the characteristic moral admonition found at the end of many chapters of this Chronicle. Verse 103 refers to his death which, we are told, occurred after his performance of many a meritorious work. Here again the length of his reign is not recorded, though it is usual for the chronicler to mention the duration of the reigns of kings who ruled only a few days or months. Here one might have been inclined to suggest that, since no reference is made to the death or the length of his reign up to verse 102 where, according to some manuscripts, the work appears to end, it might have been composed during his reign while he was yet alive, and that strophes 103 and 104 were inserted by the author of the next continuation of the Cūlavamsa. But it would be difficult to maintain such a suggestion if we take into account

\footnote{Cv., I, p.iv; Ch. XC, 102-104.}
Geiger's cautious observation:

'If we assume that it closed originally with v. 102, which is indicated by two of the mss; then there was added later a summarizing sloka and then a strophe in artificial metre. Exactly the same thing occurs at the close of the first part (79.84). The addition was evidently intended to veil the break in the text and lead over to the new part.'

A further objection can be raised: would a writer have chronicled the events of a reigning monarch during his lifetime in this manner? But this would not be a serious difficulty, for we know that Vijayarāhu I had seventeen years of his reign as a yuvarāja 'chronicled in writing'. And there is reason to believe, as will be shown in the sequel, that at least a part of the account of Parākramabāhu II was written while the king was alive.

It may also be noted that the reign of Parākramabāhu IV is dealt with in some detail in 41 verses, which compares favourably with the treatment given to other rulers of the period. Here again, this need not necessarily mean that this author was close to the times of this ruler, for it may well have been that his rather long reign devoted to services to Buddhism had left a favourable impression, which influenced the author of this part of the Chronicle. Conse-
sequently, our suggestion for the date of this part of the Cūlāvamsa is tentative.

The contents of this part of the Cūlāvamsa and the limitations of its account will be indicated in the relevant chapters. Chapter lxxx, which deals with the reigns of the successors of Parākramabāhu I, is very brief except for its account of Māgha and his sack of Rājaraṭṭha. In spite of its brevity, one could, however, get an impression of the political confusion of the times when ruler after ruler was ousted or reinstated by the generals who played a dominant role in the political scene at this time. The fact that a whole chapter (lxxxi) is devoted to the brief reign of Vijayabāhu III together with brief notices of a few local rulers is significant. The details concerning these local rulers are particularly important as they are not mentioned in any other source. One could get a fair picture of the manner in which Vijayabāhu rose to the position of the ruler of Māyāraṭṭha, from small beginnings as a vanni chieftain, and the services he rendered to Buddhism.

A major part of the eight chapters devoted to the reign of Parākramabāhu II deals with his services to Buddhism. Although it contains useful information on the political aspects of his reign such as the invasions of Candrabhānu and his struggle with Māgha, much desirable information is lacking. For example, the chapter on 'The Subjugation of Hostile Kings', which undoubtedly contains a good deal of useful data, bears no comparison with the more detailed accounts
of the wars of Parākramabāhu I both at home and abroad.¹ There are also other limitations which in some respects are more serious than those arising from vagueness or the limited nature of its data. Thus, not a word is mentioned about the invasions of Ceylon by the Pāṇḍya kings during Parākramabāhu's reign, which are established beyond doubt by the testimony of South Indian inscriptions. Here one must recall that the chronicler who recounts enthusiastically the victories of the generals of Parākramabāhu I in South India was silent on the fate which befell them in the end. There again South Indian inscriptions confirm the early victories by the Sinhalese generals as given in the Pali Chronicle. But these records also have established that these generals were in the end routed in battle by the Colā kings.² That explains the silence of the chronicler on the ultimate failure of these expeditions, which perhaps in his view were not conducive to the greatness of his hero. These limitations should in no way lead to an underestimation of the value of the Cūlavamsa, which contains by far the most detailed account of the reign of Parākramabāhu II. We only draw attention to the fact that some of these limitations deprive a student of the history of this period of the greater advantages of the detailed accounts of the Cūlavamsa supplemented by the comparatively rich epigraphical and archaeological data available to a student engaged in a study of the reigns of Vija

¹Cf. LXXXIII and LXXV-LXXVII.

yañāhu I or Parākramabāhu I.

It is interesting to find out why this part of the Cūlavamsa differs considerably from the previous parts. One explanation is that records suffered during Māgha's sack of Rājarātthā. Foreign invasions of course were not a new phenomenon, but there is reason to believe that Māgha's pillage of Rājarātthā led to this result. It is expressly stated that books were torn from their cord and were strewn on the ground. This is a unique measure adopted by any invader, and an attempt will be made to examine the implication of this measure in our study of the reign of Māgha. However, even if these books were mainly concerned with the teachings of the Buddha, there is every reason to believe that records which contained information on various other subjects also suffered at the hands of Māgha. This charge, repeatedly levelled against Māgha, seems to rest on a valid foundation. The Nikāya Sadgrahaya specifically states that monks who fled to Māyāratthā in search of protection when Rājarātthā was sacked had to leave behind their books amongst other articles lying wherever they were (pat pot ādi pirikara tubū tubū tena hāra Māyā rajayata pūmini mahāsaṅghayā). While some of these monks came over to Māyāratthā others fled to South India. In doing so not only books pertaining to the Dhamma, which must have

---

1 Cv., LXXX, 67.

2 Hks., 87.
formed the bulk of it, but also records pertaining to various other aspects of contemporary life might have suffered. Apart from the royal establishments such as the lekam-ḡē ('the house of secretaries or scribes') which must naturally have housed records pertaining to the administration, the vihāras also would have had very valuable records, which suffered in the course of Māgha's violence.¹

To add to this, we may also note that the years preceding Māgha's invasion were a period of political upheavals, caused both by internal dissension and by foreign invasions. It would therefore have been difficult to maintain records regularly. If this were the case some of the comparative deficiencies in this part of the Chronicle may be understood. One could be almost certain that much of the account of Parākramabāhu I was based on such records. It is inconceivable, for example, that the accounts of Parākramabāhu's campaigns in South India, containing such meticulous details, should have been written without the aid of the records of these events. In the account of Parākramabāhu I it is stated:

'Thereupon he ordered his skilled scribes to make an estimate of the King's revenues, of his stocks of grain, of his troops, of his various war materials and so on, with the charge: record these by stealing into the various departments of the administration.'²


²Cy., LXVI, 154-55, there is also evidence of the maintenance of judicial records, Cy.,XLIX, 20.
The statement in the Cūlavamsa that Vijayabāhu had seventeen years from the time he was yuvrāja 'chronicled in writing' also points to the prevalence of such a practice. The same text informs us that Parākramabāhu I erected, among other edifices, one hundred and twenty-eight buildings for books (potthaka-mandira). The bulk of the contents of these libraries may have been devoted to religious books, but there is no reason to believe that they were confined to such texts alone. These libraries, whatever may have been the nature of their contents, would have suffered under Māgha's attacks. Similarly, the records in the royal establishments like the lekam-ūgā would not have escaped the violence which characterised Māgha's invasion. If thus the records as well as the practice of maintaining them suffered in this period, as indeed it appears to have been, it may well be reflected in the subsequent continuation of the Pali Chronicle.

Another noteworthy feature in this part of the Cūlavamsa is that we get much more information on Māyārattha whereas the contrary is true of the previous parts. In the accounts of Vijayabāhu III and Parākramabāhu II, for example, we get a good deal

---

1 Cv., LIX, 7.
2 Cv., LXXIX, 80.
of information on their activities in this part of the island. But the information on Rāja- rātha and even on Rohaṇa is comparatively scarce, though it does contain useful information such as the location of Māgha's fortifications in Rāja- rātha and its condition when Parākramabāhu II succeeded in extending his control there after defeating Candrabhānu. This may be partly due to the fact that the Sinhalese royal residences were located farther south at places like Daṁbadeniya and Yāpahuva, away from the ancient capitals in Rāja- rātha, and naturally greater information was available to them on Māyāraṭha. Besides, the latter region had risen in importance with the foundation of royal residences and, possibly, the movement of people from Rāja- rātha in these troubled times. On the other hand, this could be partly due to the possibility that Rāja- rātha could no longer be the centre according to the chronicler's view of the history of the island. In the older parts of the Pali Chronicle, naturally, the centre of interest was Rāja- rātha, though a considerable amount of information on other parts of the country, particularly Rohaṇa, appears in the narrative. In our period, too, the writers including the author of the Cūlavamsa look upon Rāja- rātha with respectful admiration and indeed call it the mūlarājadāni.  

1 Cv., LXXXIII, 15 ff; LXXXVIII, 77-102.
2 Ṣīv., 131; Cv., LXXXVII, 66-70.
Even so, it appears that Rājarattha could no longer be the central point in his view of history. It is true that, despite the difficulties of communications in those days, one may find it difficult to believe that the people of the southern parts were not sufficiently aware of the developments in Northern Ceylon. As Rājarattha had been in occupation by foreign invaders for more than fifty years of the thirteenth century, it is not surprising that the writers of this period showed lack of precision in their accounts of Rājarattha. In spite of the availability of several other works of historical value in this period, the Pali Chronicle undoubtedly occupies the pride of place.

One noteworthy advantage to a student of the history of Ceylon in this period is that, apart from the Cūlavamsa, a number of contemporary works, which throw light on certain aspects of the island's history, are available to him. Among these works the Pūjavaliya undoubtedly deserves special attention and is best considered along with the Cūlavamsa.¹ The Pūjavaliya is a large work written in order to justify the epithet araham ('the worthy one') applied to the Buddha. The work consists of thirty four chapters, the last two of which are devoted to an outline of the history of Ceylon from the earliest times up to the end of the reign of Parākramabāhu II. The 34th chapter gives an account of the reigns of Vijayabāhu III and Parākramabāhu II,

¹ Ed. Bentara Sraddhā Tisya Thera, Pānadura, 1930.
the latter being treated with greater detail.¹

The last two chapters are by far the most important for a student of history.² The preceding chapters may also be of considerable value in a study of social conditions. But the 33rd and 34th chapters are of much greater importance as they are devoted to a purely historical outline. Before we draw attention to its noteworthy features and its historical value it is necessary to consider its date and authorship.

The authorship of the Pūjāvaliya presents no difficulty and is well known as a work of Mayūrapāda Thera of the monastic college named Mayūrapāda Pirivāna at Vātagiri (Vākirigala), who lived in the reign of Parākramabāhu II as stated in the text.³ This monastery was a flourishing institution in the times of Parākramabāhu II and received his patronage.⁴ The name Mayūrapada is mentioned in the list of writers who composed religious works, contained in the Nikāya Samgrahaya.⁵ It is certain that the Pūjāvaliya was composed in the reign of Parākramabāhu II, but it is necessary to consider the date of the composition of the last two chapters, which, as stated earlier, are most relevant to our study, in the light of certain statements in

¹Sinh. Lit., 61-66.
³Pjv., 140-41.
⁴Cv., LXXXVIII, 43-47; Pjv., 134-35.
⁵Nks., 89.
the text concerning the date of its writing.

It is stated at the end of chapter xxxiv, that the Pūjāvaliya was composed in the thirtieth year (of the reign) of Parakramabahu (mē pūjāvaliya nam dharmavyākhyānakathāva mē rajahatā tisyavannehi upadava). This reading is found in three printed editions of the text, but four of the manuscripts consulted by Suravīra in his edition do not contain it. However, there is no reason to doubt this statement, which Suravīra too incorporates into his edition. According to it, the work was composed in the thirteenth regnal year of Parākramabahu II. For the thirtieth regnal year of Parākramabahu II (1266) agrees very well with another statement found at the beginning of the same chapter (xxxiv), that a period of one thousand eight hundred and fifty-four years had elapsed from the attainment of the first Bodhi by the Buddha up to the end of his account of the homage paid to the Buddha by successive Sinhalese kings (apa maha Gautama Budungē prathama Bodhiyehi pātan māgē mē stuti pūjāgē avasānayāta ekdahas aṭāsiya sūpaṇas havuruddek atikranṭa viya). This reading contained in the Sraddhā Tisya, Jinaratana and Medhamkara editions should be preferred to the reading in Suravīra's edition which is manifestly corrupt: apa maha Gautamabudungē avasānayāta ekdahas aṭāsiya sūpaṇas havuruddek atikranṭa viya. The latter omits the vital phrase

1 Pivy., 141, note 2.

2 Pivy., 82; Ed. Mābopitiyē Medhamkara Thera, Colombo, 1932; Ed. Śraddhā Tisya Thera, Pānadura, 1930; (Ed. Humupitiyē Jinaratana, 1928).
prathama Bodhiyehi paṭan māgē mē stuti pujāvagē and therefore means 'One thousand eight hundred and fifty four years had elapsed up to the end of the Buddha'. There is good reason to believe that this reading is corrupt. In the first place the statement makes no sense, for it does not mention the event which it purports to date. Secondly in dating an event in this manner it is usual to refer to the Buddhavāsa, Bodhi or Parinirvāṇa. It is extremely doubtful that the original text had the phrase Budungē avasānayata ('to the end of the Buddha'). For, if that was meant one should expect the word Parinirvāṇa, and avasānaya simply means the end'. It is unusual for a Buddhist writer to refer to the death of the Buddha so casually, as in numerous Pali and Sinhalese writings the term employed to denote this event is Parinirvāṇa (Pali: Parinibbāna). The word avasānaya clearly refers to the stutipūjā as is evident from the reading in the earlier editions. This is also clear from what follows in the text. It gives a list of 153 kings from Vijaya to Parākramabāhu II who ruled in Ceylon up to the date of the composition of his Pūjāvaliya. Though it may appear rather unusual to see this date being reckoned from the Bodhi and not from the Parinirvāṇa it should be noted that the author of the Pūjāvaliya follows the same practice in his Yogārna, written some years later in the reign of Bhuvanekabahu I.1 The Hatthavana-

gallavihāravamsa, another work written in the reign of Parākramabāhu II, dates the consecration of Parakramabāhu II from the Bodhi and not from the Parinirvāṇa.¹ A further argument in favour of the date being reckoned from the Bodhi is that it agrees with the statement at the end of chapter xxiv of the Pujāvaliya that it was composed in the thirtieth year of Parakramabāhu (1266).²

It is thus quite clear that the Pujāvaliya was composed in 1266. But does this imply that the entire work including chapters xxxiii and xxxiv was composed in that year? There is sufficient reason to believe that some additions, at least those to chapter xxxiv, were made later. Now we have noted the statement at the end of chapter xxxiv that the work was composed in the thirtieth year of Parākramabāhu. It is added that the Pujāvaliya was sent to the king through his minister Devapatirāja and that the king received it with great honour.³

But there is another statement in the same part of the narrative which refers to the upasampadā held at Dāstoṭa in the thirty-fifth year of the king and that the king was lying in Jambudroni engaging in meritorious activity and happy with the royal fortunes of his sons.⁴ Simi-

¹ Pjv., 31.
² Pjv., 141.
³ Pjv., 141.
⁴ "mesē pantis vannehi karana lada Vijayabahu mālukam pūjāva hā samaga. nava mālukam pūjāvak karavā tumū eya Jambudroni nam purayehi tava da vada vada putrayan vindināha śri sampat bala bala tava da, vada vada pin rūs koṭa rajasiri vindināha, Pjv., 140."
larly, the concluding portion of the same chapter, which gives the contents of each chapter in a summary form, refers to the 'end of (the of the reign of) Parākramabahu' (Pārakum rajun avasanāta).\(^1\)

Quite obviously these statements are later additions, which were not found in the text when it was written in 1266.

Though these statements point to certain parts being added later, it does not follow that these two chapters were entirely new additions. The description of the contents and scope of the Pūjāvaliya in the concluding portion of chapter xxxiv refers to his work as consisting of thirty four chapters (sūtisparicchedayakin), and in the summary of their contents both these chapters are again mentioned.\(^2\)

It seems very unlikely that the statement which gives the scope of the work as consisting of thirty-four chapters was added later. We are inclined to believe that the work consisted of thirty-four chapters when it was written in 1266, but a portion of chapter xxxiv which deals with the last years of the king was added later to complete the account. In favour of this view one may note that in all the four manuscripts consulted by Suravīra and in one printed text a considerable portion of the concluding part of chapter xxxiv is altogether missing.\(^3\) There

\(^1\)Pīv., 143.
\(^2\)Pīv., 141.
\(^3\)Pīv., 140, note 11.
the account ends with a statement that Parākramabāhu ruled thirty-two years and entrusted the kingdom to his elder son Vijayabāhu.\(^1\)

The reference to the duration of his reign as thirty-two years may be the result of the exclusion of the years in which Vijayabāhu had been entrusted with the kingdom, although in the missing portion referred to above the thirty-fifth year is mentioned.

There is a statement in the early part of chapter xxxiv that Parākramabāhu had the upasampadā ceremony performed in his third, sixth, eleventh, twelfth, seventeenth, twenty-first, twenty-seventh and thirtieth years, eight times in all, in order that he might 'reach (the saving shore) through the Noble Eight-fold Path'.\(^2\) And in the concluding portion of the same chapter referred to above, reference is made to the upasampadā ceremony held at Dāstoṭa in his thirty-fifth year. This was by far the most important because it was held on a grand scale in its traditional site after his cherished consecration in Polonnaruva. Whatever be the significance of the reference to the Eight-fold Path in this context, it is noteworthy that the earlier statement has not taken into account the more important upasampadā ceremony held at Dāstoṭa but is mentioned as the ninth at the end of chapter xxxiv together with the statement that Parākramabāhu was living happily at Jambuddoni. It may be noted that the last upasampadā

---

\(^1\) jyeṣṭha vū Vijayabāhu nam put raja haṭa rājyaya bhāra kota dī tumū detis avuruddak rājyaya kalāha. Pjv., 140, note 11.

\(^2\) Pjv., 123.
ceremony according to the earlier statement, was held in the thirtieth year, which was also the date of the composition of the Pujavalīya. We have therefore good reason to believe that the concluding portion of chapter xxxiv, which is missing in Suravira's manuscripts is a later addition.

The missing portion deals mainly with the king's activities in the last part of his reign such as the restoration of Anuradhapura and Polonnaruva, Parakramabahu's consecration at the old capital, the restoration of the Tooth Relic to its shrine in Polonnaruva and the upasampadā ceremony held at Dātota. One may, however, note that this part also includes the account of the second invasion of Candrabhānu, which took place about the year 1262-3 as will be clear from our discussion of these events, and it could therefore have been included in the previous part as it was written in 1266. This need not be a strong objection, for it would not be surprising if the author could not include these events in his narrative which took place some three years prior to the date of its composition. Besides, it would not be unreasonable to assume that Mayūrapada Thera was in some haste to complete his magnum opus and present it to the king who, it appears, was ailing and advancing in age. Once the work was completed he sent it to the king who received it with great joy and admiration. Thus any

1Piv., 130-40, see note 11 on page 140.
omissions in the work concerning the events which immediately preceded the date of its composition is understandable.

There remains yet another question. If a part of the concluding chapter was added later, when was this additional portion incorporated into the text? Suravīra expressed the view that certain parts including the concluding portion referred to above were added to the text by a later writer following the Cūlavamsa account of Parākramabāhu II, on account of the close similarity of the two versions.\(^1\) The relation between these two texts is unmistakable. In spite of the very close similarity of the two accounts, it is difficult to conclude that these parts were incorporated into the Pūja-valiya on the basis of the Pali Chronicle. Such an incorporation of data from the Cūlavamsa, if it ever took place, has to be dated after the reign of Parākramabāhu IV, in or after whose reign this part of the Cūlavamsa appears to have been written. However, our impression is that these portions were added to the text either already towards the end of Parākramabāhu's reign or not long afterwards. It is possible that the author of the Pūja-valiya added these sections himself to round off the account. One can rightly ask why the text at the end of it states that Parākramabāhu is living in Jambudroṇi enjoying royal splendour overjoyed with the royal fortunes of his sons devoting

\(^1\)Piv., pp. vi-vii.
himself to more and more meritorious deeds, after the performance
of the ninth upasampadā ceremony by Vijayabāhu in the thirty-fifth
year of the king.\(^1\) Quite clearly, the king was then alive and the
sentence is in the present tense. It is difficult to understand why
this statement should have been made unless the account of Parākramabāhu's good deeds was completed. If any significance is to be at-
tached to this statement one would be led to think that the account
was completed almost in the king's last year. If it was added after
the thirty-fifth year of Parākramabāhu, our impression is that the
account was completed by the same author not long after the king's
death. For, we know from the Yōgārnavaya, a medical treatise written
by the same author, that Mayūrapāda Thera outlived his royal patron.
The Yōgārnavaya was written by Mayūrapāda Thera in the reign of
Bhuvanekabāhu I (1272-84), who succeeded to the throne after the
brief two-year reign of Vijayabāhu IV, the son and successor or Parā-
kramabāhu II, whose reign came to a tragic end.\(^2\) There is thus no
inherent difficulty in assuming that Mayūrapāda Thera himself com-
pleted the Pujāvaliya account of Parākramabāhu II, either in his
thirty-fifth year or a few years later, though it is by no means con-
clusive.

\(^1\) mesē mē pantisvannehi karana lada Vijayabāhu mālukam pūjāva hā samaga
nava mālukam pūjāvak karavā tumū eya Jambudropi nam purayehi tava da,
vādā vādā putrayan viṇāinā ārī sampat bala bala tava da, vādā vādā
pin rās koṭā rajasiri vihīnāhā, Pjv., 140.

\(^2\) Yōgārnavaya, ed. Kiriñḷē Näṇavimala, 1943, p.l.
Suravīra has drawn attention to some aspects of the value of the Pujāvaliya as a source of history.¹ It is the earliest extant Sinhalese work which purports to give a history of the island. In the first place its account of Vijayabāhu III and Parākramabāhu II is particularly noteworthy, for its author was an eye-witness of the events treated therein. Secondly, though the Pujāvaliya account is less detailed than that of the Cūlavamsa, it contains the essence of the contents of the latter. The information on Māgha and Candrabhānu is valuable, coming as it does from a contemporary writer. It contains details of great importance which are not mentioned in the Cūlavamsa. For example, the reference to the regnal year of Parākramabāhu II (savisivana havurudu) in which his son Vijayabāhu and nephew Vīrabāhu entered Polonnaruva after defeating Candrabhānu has not only helped to date the defeat of the Jāvaka ruler, but also to confirm the chronology of the Pāṇḍyan invasions of Ceylon which took place during the reign of Parākramabāhu.² Similarly, the probable date of the defeat of Māgha has also been arrived at with the aid of a reference to the duration of the latter's occupation of Rājarattha in the Pujāvaliya.³ But the Pujāvaliya like all other accounts which deal

¹ Piv., 1-47; Sahityaya (1958), 67-73.
with the reign of Parākramabāhu; II makes no mention of the Pāṇḍyan invasions.

In considering the historical value of the Pūjavaliya, one has to take note of the close relations between its author Mayūrapāda Thera and his patrons. Mayūrapāda Thera undoubtedly enjoyed the patronage of Parākramabāhu. The author states that it was written at the request of the prime minister Patirājadeva in order to promote the attainment of the Bodhisattva status by Parākramabāhu. A more striking statement is found in the conclusion of his work. We are told that having completed his Pūjavaliya the author sent it to the minister Devapatirāja, through whom it was presented to the king. It is added that on receipt of this work Parākramabāhu was so overjoyed as if a second kingdom had been bestowed upon him, and that he listened to its praise of the virtues of the Buddha during the period covered between two uposatha days, setting aside his royal duties. Further, we are told that the book was placed on the back of the royal elephant with banners flying and was taken round the city amidst great festivity. These statements clearly show that Parākramabāhu had been

1 Cv., LXXXVIII, 43-47.
2 Pjv., ed. Bentara Šraddhā Tiṣya, 12, 13, 46.
3 Pjv., 141.
greatly impressed by the Pūjāvaliya which thus won high royal favour. Perhaps the king's piety alone or the fact that it was purported to have been written to assist the king in the attainment of the Bodhisattva status does not adequately explain the exceptional personal interest shown by the king in the Pūjāvaliya. It is not unreasonable to hold that its author enjoyed the patronage of Parākramabāhu as is testified to by the Gūlavamsa, and that the eulogistic account of his reign which it contained - perhaps elaborated further some time later - led the king, partly at least, to bestow such distinct honour on the Pūjāvaliya. It should therefore not be surprising if its author tended to exaggerate at times the power and achievements of his patron. Where such exaggeration has been made it is often easy to detect, as will be shown in this study. Hence, it would hardly detract from its value as a source for a study of the times of Parākramabāhu II.

Another noteworthy point is that the Pūjāvaliya account of Vijayabāhu III and Parākramabāhu II, as well as that of other rulers agree well with that of the Gūlavamsa, with this difference that the latter is a more detailed version. But in many places the two accounts agree almost word to word. This may be explained in either of two ways: either the authors of both these works drew from a common tradition or the author of this part of the Gūlavamsa had consulted

the *Pūjavaliya*, which was certainly available to him at the time when these chapters appear to have been written. We have referred to the possibility suggested by Suravīra that certain parts of the account of Parākramabāhu II might have been added by a later writer by following the *Gūlavamsa*. But then, how do we account for the similarity of the accounts of Māgha and his predecessors in Polonnaruva in the two works unless we assume that the entire chapter (xxxiv) is later than the *Gūlavamsa*? We have shown earlier the difficulty of accepting this proposition.

Although many editions of the *Pūjavaliya* are now available, there is ample scope for an improved edition of this valuable text with critical annotations and a comparative study of its historical tradition. Such an edition should examine in detail the relation between the *Pūjavaliya* and the *Gūlavamsa* accounts of the rulers of this period.

Among other contemporary works which contain information on the reign of Parākramabāhu II, the *Hatthavanagallaviharavamsa* is of considerable importance.¹ As the title suggests, this work purports to give a history of the Hatthavanagalla Vihāra, a monastery situated in the Western Province, which tradition identifies as the site where king Sanghabodhi of Anurādhapura, who abdicated his kingdom and re-

tired to a life of meditation, donated his head to a poor way­farer in order that the latter might get from Gothābhaya, his rival for the throne, the price set for securing Samghabodhi's head. It is now believed that the cremation of this pious king also took place at this vihāra, but on the authority of the Mahāvamsa­tīkā it has been rightly pointed out that that event took place to the South of the Issarasamaṇa-vihāra in Anurādhapura¹ and not in the present Attanagalla of the Western Province.

An excellent edition of this valuable text by Dr. C. E. Godakumbura appeared a few years ago. In its introduction, this scholar has drawn attention to the nature of the text, its language and contents and to its historical value.² He has also shown that this Pali text shows a very strong influence of the Sanskrit kāvyā style reflected in works like the Jātakamālā.

The name of the author is not mentioned in the text, but the opening verses state that it was written at the request of Anomadassi, who is described as the Sabbayatirāja. In all probability this Anomadassi may be the dignitary of the same name who is described as a maha­sāmi in the Cūlavamsa. Parakramabāhu caused to be erected for him at the Hatthavanagalla Vihāra a three-storeyed pāsāda 'at great cost' through his minister Devapitirāja.³ Parakramabāhu II took keen interest

²see above, p. 48, note 1.
in this vihāra and effected repairs to its shrines in addition to the erection of a cetiya and an octagonal image house. There is thus good reason to believe that this Anomadassī Mahāsāmi for whom the king erected a costly pāśāda in addition to the building referred to above is the same as the Anomadassī who requested evidently one of his pupils to write a history of the Hatthavanagalla Vihāra of which he was the incumbent. The author of the Daivajñākāmadhenu, a Sanskrit work on astrology was also Anomadassī, to whom Goākumbura has indicated the possibility of ascribing the authorship of the Sinhalese grammar - Sidatsañarāva - written in this period.\(^1\) Whoever may have been the author of the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa, there is little doubt that it was written in the reign of Parākramabāhu II. The work ends with an account of the reign of Parākramabāhu II together with that of the contributions made by the latter and his father to the Hatthavanagalla Vihāra.\(^2\) The concluding portion of this text contains a strophe in which the author expresses the wish that the history of the vihāra be continued by the addition of the names of the pious personages, who erect new edifices or repair the existing ones or make donations of fields etc. It is therefore reasonably clear, since the narrative ends with an account of the reign of Parākramabāhu II, and calls upon others to include the names

\(^1\)Hyv., Introduction x.

\(^2\)Hyv., Chapter 11, pp. 30-34.
of the future benefactors of the vihāra, that the work was com­posed in the reign of this monarch.

It is possible to determine the date of this work even more precisely. Godakumbura has pointed out that the author of the Pūjēvaliya quotes two stanzas from the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa. According to him, 'this fact enables one to conclude that the latter work existed before that date'.¹ This scholar has not, however, indicated that these stanzas could be later additions or were taken from a source common to both these works. We have seen earlier that the Pūjēvaliya was written in 1266 A.D. It would therefore appear that the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa is earlier in date than the Pūjēvaliya of 1266. In its account of the reign of Parākramabāhu II, the invasions of Candrabhānu are mentioned. The first invasion of Candrabhānu took place in 1247. This work, however, makes no distinction between two invasions, but as the death of Candrabhānu in battle is implied, it appears that the author of this work takes the second invasion into account. As shown in our discussion of Candrabhānu's invasions, the second invasion took place about the year 1261-2. It would therefore be reasonable to hold that the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa was written sometime between 1261-62 and 1266. Even if the lower limit is stretched further, it can be safely dated between 1247 and 1266.

¹Hv., Introduction, x.
As for its contents, eight of its eleven chapters are devoted to an account of the life of the pious king Sirisanghabodhi. Only the last two chapters deal with the Hatthavanagalla Vihāra and the endowments and contributions to it by successive Sinhalese kings. Consequently, it is more than a history of the Hatthavanagalla Vihāra. Apart from additional details such as the parentage of Sirisanghabodhi and the story that his queen followed him when he abdicated the throne to lead a life devoted to meditation and died of grief near the spot where her husband offered his head to a wayfarer, the story of this ruler follows the version given in the Mahāvamsa.  

1 That its author followed earlier works is clear from a statement in the opening verses, to the significance of which the editor of this text has called attention, that the author was basing his work on 'stories based on history' (itihāmugatam kathām) and on 'former writings' (pubbalikhitam). Godakumbura is inclined to believe that the latter may refer to the records found in the vihāra itself.  

Apart from the data on the life of Sirisanghabodhi useful information on some aspects of social conditions in medieval Ceylon can be gleaned from this part of the Hatthavangallavihāravamsa, though it need not necessarily apply to the times of Sirisanghabodhi, round

---

1Mv., XXXVI, 58ff.

2Hyv., Introduction, xiii.
whom the account is woven. For example, the graphic description of the funeral rites of Sirisaṅghabodhi and his queen given in chapter ix would be very valuable, for our knowledge of such interesting aspects of society is limited to the information contained in the principal Chronicles. The same part of the narrative goes on to record the reaction of the villagers when they saw the dead bodies of the king and his queen.

'The people of the neighbouring villages assembled and thought "It is not proper on our part either to touch the bodies of the consecrated king and his queen, or to carry out the funeral (rites) without informing the present king", and having erected a shed to ward off sun and rain and a fence to prevent animals from coming in they went away.'

This passage brings out the sanctity of the royal person, particularly after consecration, according to the ideas of kingship prevalent in medieval Ceylon. The statement that the people considered it improper to perform the funeral rites without informing the reigning monarch is also noteworthy.

Attention may be drawn to another interesting passage. It is a statement put into the mouth of the wayfarer who was later to receive the head of Sirisaṅghabodhi - a statement not found in the Mahāvamsa account of this king. The wayfarer requested the king (though

1 samīpagāmavāsino sannipatītvā: muddhābhisitassa rañño ca mahesiyā-sairam amhādisehi phusituḥ ca na yoggam, vattamānassa rañño anive-dayitvā alāhanakīccam pi kātum na yuttan sammanītvā vassāta-panivāranāya kutim katvā tiracchānaappavesanisedhāya vatiḥ ca katvā apakkamiṁsu, Ḥvy., 25, para 3, see also pp. 26-27.
he was not yet aware of the fact that he was the king) to partake
of his portion of rice, but the king was reluctant to do so. Then
the wayfarer addressed the king in these words:

"I am not of low birth. I am not a fisherman, nor
am I a hunter making a living by destroying life.
On the other hand I am born into a family worthy of
being associated with by the high castes. Good Sir,
it befits you to partake of my rice" — thus he en-
treated over and over again.¹

The Sinhalese versions of this text of a later date convey the
sense of this passage in much the same way but for slight elaborations.
To the list of those who live by taking others' life is added the Padu,
a social division in Ceylon today, whose present occupations, however,
are not reminiscent of the memory reflected in this text. Uttamavanna
of the Pali text is given in the Sinhalese versions as cāturvānayan,
possibly a reference to the 'four castes'. But this term may signify
the social order in general, rather than the fourfold Indian division.²

We need not over-estimate the importance of these passages; nor
is it possible to examine them here. But they may be certainly useful
to a student of the social institutions of medieval Ceylon. It is note-
worthy that this passage occurs in a work in which the author takes
pains to mention that Anomadassi Thera who requested him to write this
work was of a Brāhmaṇa lineage.³ The author of the Pūjāvaliya has also

¹atha so puriso: nāham nihinajātiyam
jato na pañavadhajāvīkaya jivanto kevatto vā luddako vā
bhavāmi, atha kho uttamavannehi paribhogārāhe vanse sahjāto'mhi
mama sentak'jam idam bhattam bhotum arahati kalyanadhām-
mika ti tam punappuna yaci, Ḥvv., 23, para 1.

³Ḥvv., p.1, strophe 3.
set down the details of his respectable lineage at the conclusion of his work.\(^1\) Similarly, there are other monks who wrote literary works in this period and have provided us with their family background in terms of caste divisions such as \textit{Brāhmaṇa} or \textit{Vaiśya} to which they trace their origins.\(^2\) We drew attention to these passages in order to illustrate the value of these literary texts for a study of the social conditions of this period.

So far as we are concerned, what is of significance to us in the \textit{Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa} is its account of the reigns of Vijayabahu III and Parakramabahu II. Since this work belongs to a date earlier than that of the \textit{Pujaṇāvali} it may well be the earliest datable account of the reign of Parakramabahu II. Therefore its account, though not so detailed as that of the \textit{Pujaṇāvali}, is nevertheless of considerable value. The opening passages of Chapter XI which precedes the account of the reign of Vijayabahu III give a graphic description of the political confusion which prevailed on the eve of \textit{Māgha}'s invasion.\(^3\) This text gives us the name of Vijayabahu's father as Vijayamalla, a detail not mentioned in any other source. The foundation of Dambadeniya as a royal residence, the recovery of the Tooth

\(^1\)\textit{Pjv.}, 140-41.
\(^2\)See colophon of the \textit{Saddharmālaṅkārāya}, ed. Śraddhā Tiṣya, Pānadura, 1934; \textit{Shd. Rām.}, 532-33.
\(^3\)\textit{Hvvr.}, 30, para 1.
Relic and the Alms Bowl, and the construction of the Tooth Relic Temple (at Beligala) by Vijayabahu III are mentioned together with a reference to his services to Buddhism in general and to the Hattahavanagalla Vihāra in particular.\(^1\)

More important information is available on the reign of Parākramabāhu II. This text mentions two important details not given in other literary works of the period. It gives the exact year of the consecration of Parakramabahu II reckoned from the Bodhi, which has helped to establish the date of the accession of this monarch to the throne. The other important detail that Candrabhanu invaded Ceylon from Tambraliṅga country (Tambaliṅgaviśaya), to which Paranavitana called attention, brings confirmation from a Ceylonese source that he was a ruler of the kingdom of Tambraliṅga in the Malay Peninsula as known from the Jaiyā Inscription where Candrabhānu is mentioned as the Lord of Tambraliṅga (Tambraliṅgesvara).\(^2\) The account of Candrabhānu in the Hattahavanagallavihāravamsa is valuable as it sheds light on these events about which a student of the islands history would like to know much more. This is not to suggest that its account of Candrabhānu's power and resources should be accepted at its face value, though there is no reason to doubt that he was a ruler who possessed

\(^1\)Hvy., 30-31, para 2.

\(^2\)Hvy., 31-32, para 3-7.
considerable resources. The reference, however casual, to the political conditions in Rājaratthā is similarly helpful. It also refers to the construction of the Tooth Relic Temple and the homage paid to the Relic by Parākramabāhu II together with an account of the miracle which this Relic is said to have performed as given in other works like the Pūjavaliya and the Gūlavamsa. Another interesting passage is found in the account of the construction of a vattulaghara (Sinh. vaṭageya) by Goṭhābhaya at the site where Siris-aṅghabodhi is said to have been cremated. He called his ministers and said:

'It is possible for me now to construct a many-storeyed and very large golden Circular (Relic) Shrine; in that case it will not last in the future for want of occupants; invaders may destroy it on account of their greed for gold (wealth). Therefore it is fitting that I cause to be built without delay a vattulaghara and a cetiya in it, which would be sufficiently comfortable for the occupants but not in such a way as to be coveted by others.'

This statement which refers to the destruction of shrines by invaders who coveted their wealth, and the desolation of monasteries, though attributed to the reign of Goṭhābhaya, is most likely to reflect the conditions of the times of the author in which the country was repeatedly invaded. But the possibility that it may refer to earlier times should not be ruled out.

1 Hvv., 31, para 3; Cv., LXXXII; Pjv., 113 ff.

2 etarahi anekabhūmakam ativisālam kanakamayavattulagharam sakka, ayati parihaṇākānum abhāvena nappavattati, rattavilopakāpi suvaṇnalobhena naseti, tasma alobhaniyam sukhāparihaṇāram pamānayuttam vattulagharaḥ ca cetiyaḥ ca nacirass'eva kātum yuttan ti, Hvv., 26-27, para 6.
The account ends with a description of the contributions to the Hatthavanagalla Vihāra by Parākramabāhu II both personally and through his minister Devapatirāja, by way of restoring the existing edifices and by erecting various other new buildings such as residences, image-houses and so forth and by providing for the maintenance of their inmates.

That the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa enjoyed a high degree of popularity is evident from the fact that it was translated into Sinhalese twice in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries respectively. The first translation is dated in the Saka year 1304 (1382 A.D.) during the reign of Parākramabāhu V (1360-91) of Gampola. The translator is not named, but it is stated that the translation was undertaken at the request of a minister named Satrīṃha Kuṇijara. The second translation is said to have been undertaken by an (un-named) pupil of the reputed Vīdāgama Maitrī Thera at the request of Parākramabāhu VI of Köṭṭe. Indeed to this day the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa enjoys a high reputation in the traditional centres of learning.

Though the Sinhalese versions are not word to word translations of the Pali text, they are generally faithful to the original. Certain modifications, however, can be detected. In Chapter X we are told that

in Malayadesa there were certain robbers (corā) who had gathered round them a following and were in the habit of plundering villages and rich monasteries whereby they had not only become rich, but were exercising their authority in that province disregarding royal authority in the time of Moggallāna, one of the kings of that name of Amurādhapura. (...Malayadesavāsino keci corā ekato hutvā gāma-vilopam katvā mahantena dhanalābhena mattā dhanam datvā balakāyam uppādetvā yebhuyyena sabbam janapadam hatthagatam rājūnam balaṁ ca abhibuyya serino hutvā...) This passage together with its continuation illustrates evidently a notable political phenomenon of the times of Parākramabāhu II, though it is projected on to the time of Moggallāna of Amurādhapura. What we wish to point out is that for the Pali words keci corā (some robbers), the translators substituted samahara siri vanni kenek using more explicit terminology from the politics of the time of these authors. The/Vannirāja and Vanni occur for the first time in the Cūlavamsa and the Pūjavaliya in their accounts of Vijayabāhu III and Parākramabāhu II and later in the Sandesa poems as vanni nirikdu, but as time went on vanni kings (forest chieftains) must have become more numerous and they are frequently mentioned in the Sandesa poems of the fifteenth century referred to above. The sense

1HVv., 28, para 3.
2Elu Av., 65.
of the phrase राजुनाम बलसि अभिभुयो is retained in the Sinhalese: rajadaruvage आज्ञावा da māda, but an additional word, svēcchācārīvā (independent) is inserted into the Sinhalese text for which the original contains no corresponding Pali word.¹ Similarly, the same chapter of the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa refers to a king named Upatissa who visited the Hatthavanagalla Vihāra on hearing that a therā attained Arhatship there. He is said to have erected amongst other edifices a five-storeyed residence and made endowments to the vihāra.² The name Upatissa may refer to one of the kings of that name who ruled from Anurādhapura. While the Pali text does not mention this fact the Sinhalese versions add that he came from Anurādhapura and returned to that city after his visit to the Hatthavanagalla Vihāra.³

These slight modifications and additions in the Sinhalese versions can be instructive in certain instances. But there is a danger in relying on such details in arriving at vital conclusions. For example, the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa states that the consecration of Parākramabāhu II took place after the lapse of one thousand eight hundred and twenty four years after the Bodhi.⁴ This date of the consecration of

¹ Elu Av., 65.
² Hvy., 28, para 1-2.
³ Elu. Av., 64-5.
⁴ Hvy., 31, para 3.
oration of this ruler is confirmed by other sources such as the Devundara Inscription set up by the same monarch. In the Sinhalese versions, however, the important detail concerning the exact event from which this date is reckoned is not given, but we are simply told that his consecration took place in the year one thousand eight hundred and twenty four of the Buddhist era (sri Buddha-varṣayen ekdahas atasiya süvisi havuruddak ikma giya kalhi). The omission of the reference to Bodhi is a detail, but it makes a difference of 45 years, for, according to the Sinhalese versions the date has to be reckoned from Parinirvāṇa, which is the starting point of the Buddhist era in normal practice. It is well known that the Parinirvāṇa took place forty five years after the Bodhi. Consequently, while the date of Parākramabāhu's consecration falls in 1236 according to the Hāthavanagallavihāravamsa, the omission of the reference to Bodhi in the Sinhalese versions would place it in 1281 — an impossible date for that event. Similarly, while the Pali text informs us that the fire of the funeral pyre of Sirisaṅghabodhi was extinguished on the second day (duṭiyādāvase), the Sinhalese versions would have us believe that it took place on the third day (tunvana davashi). It is therefore reasonable to bear in mind that though

2 Elu Av., 69.
3 Hvv., 26, para 6; Elu Av., 62.
the additions and modifications in the Sinhalese versions are not without value, the pride of place has understandably to be given to the original text in determining issues of vital importance.

Another important work which dates from the reign of Parākramabāhu II is the Daṃbadaṇi Katikāvata, the edict containing the code of disciplinary rules for the Samgha promulgated by the synod held under the patronage of this monarch with a view to eliminating the abuses which had crept into the discipline of the Buddhists monks. The text of this edict, however, is not preserved in the form of an epigraph as in the case of that issued in the reign of Parākramabāhu I. The text of the Daṃbadaṇi Katikāvata has come down to us in ola leaf manuscripts, and has been edited by Sir D. B. Jayatilaka together with the texts of other similar edicts in his Katikāvat Sangara.1 This katikāvata refers to the 'purification' of the Samgha effected during the reign of Vijayabāhu III headed by the respective heads of the Vanavāsi (forest-dwelling) and the Grāmavāsi (village dwelling) fraternities such as Samgharakkhita and Medhaṅkara. The reference to the defeat of foreign invaders both by Vijayabāhu III and Parākramabāhu II, and the statement that the members of the Samgha fled to Māyāraṭṭha for protection when Rājaraṭṭha was sacked by the Tamils are of considerable interest. In addition, this part of the text also gives a brief account of the services rendered to Buddhism

by these two kings. 1

By far the greatest value of this document lies in the portion which contains the rules of discipline for the Buddhists monks, enacted by the assembly of monks headed by such eminent theras as Medhaṅkara Mahāśāmi who is described as the Āsaṃāṇasāsaka. It gives a vivid picture of the abuses which had crept into the Samgha. This katikāvata undoubtedly forms an indispensable source for a study of the condition of the Samgha in the times of Parākramabāhu II. 2

A number of works which set out the history of the Tooth Relic were written from time to time. These works contain information which is primarily concerned with the history of Buddhism in general, and of the Tooth Relic in particular. Nevertheless, they provide useful information on political matters. The nature of the contents of these works, their language and authorship, have been discussed by previous writers.

The first in this group of works is the Pali Dāthāvamsa, written by Dharmakīrtti during the reign of queen Līlavatī at the request of her Prime Minister Parākrama, who is also mentioned in the Cūlavamsa as one who had been instrumental in raising her to the throne. 3 This author makes complimentary references to queen Līlavatī. Dharmakīrtti

1Ktk. Sng., 6-9.
3Dāthāvamsa, ed. Asabha Tissa Thera, Kāḷāṇiya, 1883; Cv., LXXX, 49-50.
states that his work was based on an older Dalāvamsa 'written in the language of the land'. The latter is no longer extant. The Dāthāvamsa gives certain details which are of interest for a study of the reign of Līlavatī. It gives an outline of the life of the Buddha followed by an account of his visits to Ceylon which are also recounted in the Mahāvamsa. Then it goes on to deal with the war that ensued between king Paṇḍu of Pātaliputra and king Guhasīva of Kalinga on account of the Tooth Relic which the latter possessed, and the circumstances which led to the bringing of the Relic to Ceylon by Dantakumāra, nephew of Guhasīva and his spouse Hemamāla, on the defeat of the Kalinga king. The work ends with the arrival of the Relic in Ceylon in the ninth regnal year of Sirimeghavanna who paid great homage to it.

In this account there are a few details which are of considerable interest for the early history of Ceylon. The most important detail is the reference to the existence of friendly relations between Guhasīva and Mahāsena, who was his contemporary in Ceylon. Guhasīva is stated to have instructed his nephew that, in the event of his defeat, the Relic should be taken to the island of Laṅkā. It was added that Mahāsena who ruled in Ceylon having unified it was a friend of his who would welcome the Relic and provide him with befitting maintenance.¹

¹ Dāthāvamsa, p.74, v.300-02 Dal. S., 30.
At first sight one may not attach much significance to this alleged relation between Mahāsena and the Kāliṅga king as it is mentioned in a twelfth-century work which is far removed from these events. But there are considerations which may give this statement some degree of validity. Firstly, we must not ignore the claim made by the author of the Dāthāvamsa that his work was based on the older Daladāvamsa. The Cūlavamsa in its first part makes reference to a Chronicle of the Tooth Relic and, if we accept Sirima Wickramasinghe's arguments that this part of the Cūlavamsa was composed during the Coḷa occupation of Ceylon in the eleventh century, which appear to us sufficiently convincing, then we have to accept that there was a Chronicle of the Tooth Relic before Dharmakīrtti wrote his Dāthāvamsa, though we cannot be certain whether this is the work meant by Dharmakīrtti when he refers to the Chronicle of the Tooth Relic 'written in the language of the land'.¹ There is no valid reason to doubt that Dharmakīrtti based his work on ancient tradition though it cannot be ruled out that additions were made in his poem. Prof. G. P. Malalasekara refers to Turnour's remarks that this old Sinhalese poem was extant as late as 1837.² At present, however, no manuscripts of this work are found. And we do not know whether Turnour confused this text with the later versions written in Sinhalese verse, present in

¹ Dāthāvamsa, Cey., XXXVII 93; Dalj S., 41.
² Pali Lit., 208.
manuscripts and noted by Godakumbura in his *Sinhalese Literature*.  

Whatever may be the case, we do not know how far Dharmakīrtti was faithful to the older *Daḷadāvamsa*, but there is no valid reason to suspect that this author inserted the reference to friendly relations between Mahāsena and Guhasīva. It is most probable that this detail was found in the old Sinhalese poem. There are other reasons why the relations of Mahāsena with the Kaliṅga ruler should not be dismissed as improbable. By the time the Relic arrived in Ceylon Mahāsena was dead and his son had succeeded to the throne. It is significant that Chinese evidence, which was brought to light by Sylvain Lévi, refers to an embassy to the court of Samudra Gupta sent by Sirimeghavanna (Chi-mi-kia-po-mo) in order to secure facilities for Ceylonese pilgrims to the Bodhi Tree. At this site a Sanskrit inscription refers to the foundation of a shrine by a sthavira Mahānāma of Laṅkā which, it is believed, is connected with this embassy.  

Saimhala is also mentioned in Samudra Gupta's Allahabad Prasasti. The details of this embassy sent by Sirimeghavanna need not concern us here. Suffice it to note that at this time Mahāsena's son and successor maintained relations with distant Indian

---

1 *Sinh.Lit.*, 115-16.


3 *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, III, 8.
territories. It is unlikely that this was an altogether new development, and it would not be surprising if Mahāsene had been in contact with a ruler in Kaliṅga, who had in his possession the venerated Tooth Relic. There are some indications in the accounts of Mahāsena which may be put forward in support of this hypothesis.

It is well known that Mahāsena accepted Vetulla doctrines, after being influenced by Sanghamitta who came over to Ceylon and was in charge of his education during the reign of his father. His ardent attachment to Vetulla teachings led to a conflict with the orthodox Mahāvihāra.¹ It has been shown that Mahāyāna was making progress in the Andhra Pradesh during this period.² The development of sculpture in Ceylon in this period bears the unmistakable influence of Amarāvatī and other centres in that area.³ Some specimens of sculpture found in Ceylon are indeed considered to have been imported from that region.⁴ One may also note that Paranavitana, while drawing attention to these points, indicates the possibility that even the particular variety of stone on which Mahāsene engraved an inscription in which he blames the inmates of the Five

¹MV., XXXVII.
Great Residences, evidently of the Mahāvihāra, for lack of discipline, may have been imported from that region. In any case, it is beyond doubt that Ceylon had relations with the Buddhist centres in Andhra Pradesh, as is confirmed by epigraphic evidence from Nāgarjunikonda datable in this period.

It is also striking that Sirimeghavanna decreed that the Tooth Relic be taken to the Abhayagiri Vihāra every year, a practice which was followed in the fifth century when the Chinese pilgrim Fa-hien visited Ceylon. The Mahāvihāra, which one might have expected to have a stronger claim on the venerated Relic, does not figure prominently in connection with its reception or the celebrations connected with it. In the first part of the Cūlavamsa we do not find information on the Tooth Relic consistent with the importance of this Relic, testified to by Fa-hien. One therefore suspects that Mahāsena's interest in this Relic resulted from its closer association with the Abhayagiri Vihāra which received his patronage and the evident lack of enthusiasm on the part of the Mahāvihāra.

In the light of these considerations, the Dāthāvamsa tradition of Mahāsena's relations with Kaliṅga appears to rest on some valid foundation. At any rate we should not hasten to dismiss it as a later

---

2Ep. Ind., XX, 22.
tradition. There is however one objection which may be raised against attaching much significance to the Dāthāvamsa tradition.

We have noted earlier Guhasīva's instructions to take the Relic to Ceylon in the event of his defeat in the war. Guhasīva refers to Mahāsena as the ruler of Ceylon at the time but, when the fugitives arrived in Ceylon with the Tooth Relic, Mahāsena was dead and his successor Sirimeghavanna had reached his ninth regnal year. We do not know how long the war lasted, but it appears that Guhasīva was not aware of Mahāsena's death. Though this may be a serious objection to the validity of this tradition Ceylon's relations with Kaliṅga appear to rest on a valid foundation.

We made this digression in order to illustrate the indirect value of works other than the principal Pali Chronicle in our understanding of problems connected with the early history of Ceylon, though they should not be preferred to the Mahāvamsa without adequate independent testimony.

The Daladasirita, written in the Saka year 1240 (1318 A.D.) by a dignitary referred to as Devradadampasaṅgināvan in the reign of Parākramabāhu IV is a Sinhalese work which follows the Dāthāvamsa. It gives essentially the same account of the bringing of the Tooth Relic to Ceylon as that of the Pali poem. This work also contains a brief historical sketch up to the time of Parākramabāhu IV with special reference to the services rendered by them to the Relic together with the rules of conduct to be followed in connection with the Tooth Relic. Here again, many aspects of this text, such as the significance of the
title of the book as well as that of its author, and its language
have been discussed previously, notably by Sorata Thera in his edi-
tion of the text, with a useful introduction and glossary.1 We there­
fore confine ourselves to the value of its historical information.

This work gives a list of kings from Kittisirimegha with brief
notices of their contributions to Buddhism up to the reign of Parã-
kramabähu IV. It gives a traditional list of twelve great poets who
flourished in the time of Aggabodhi. This account is considerably
elaborated from the reign of Vijayabahu III. The chief events of this
ruler and those of Parãkramabähu II are dealt with, though it adds
little to what we know of these rulers from the Pujävaliya.2 The
invasions of Candrabhanu are not recorded but the arrival in Ceylon
of Dharmakirtti Thera from Tamalimamu is mentioned. The tradition
that Mägha persecuted Buddhism is preserved. The historical outline
ends with an account of the reign of Parãkramabähu IV couched in
eulogistic terms. Though it adds little new to our knowledge, it
should be of some value for a study of the reigns of Parãkramabähu IV
and his immediate predecessors.

The concluding portion of the work, which deals with the rules
of conduct towards the Tooth Relic from which this text seems to de­
rive its title, is of great value to a student of history. Not only
the procedure of the observances but also how kings should conduct

1 Colombo, 1955, see Introduction, xxxi-lxi.
2 Dal.S., 41-46.
themselves in connection with the Relic is given. We may cite a few of these rules by way of illustration. When kings enter the Temple of the Tooth Relic once a day, they should leave their retinue outside and enter it tidy and with reverence, clean the floor with a broom themselves before they pay homage. When kings go into occupation of a new palace, the Tooth Relic should be brought in along with the Samgha who will recite the Paritta and sprinkle the sacred water (piritpāṇa) before it is occupied. Immunity shall be given to those who enter the temple for sanctuary. Not even a karsāpana shall be appropriated by the palace; even if the palace draws (from the temple resources) in times of adversity (nosaruveka) it should be returned with interest within six months. This practice is also known from South Indian temple administration. In times of drought homage should be paid to the Tooth Relic. A study of

1 Dal.S., 46-54.
2 Sirilaka raja pūmini dābāmin yut maha rajun visin davasa vitak Daladāgeta gos vāhāna kala siyalu pirivara pītata rāhāva pīrisuduvā adara bhuhumā nātivā geta vāda musun gema gema əmādā at deva ruvan hā mal adiya puda,........, Dal.S., 50.
3 rajadaruvan māligā praveśa vana kala palaṃ Daladāpātradhātūn⁵ vahanse vādā mahasāṅgana lāvā pīrī tāraṇa pīrī pūn isvā arak kārā tumrūvanata pūja kota praveśa vanuva isā, Dal.S., 51.
4 Kisiyam bayekin Daladāgeta vannavunṭa gahatayak nokaranuva isā, Dal.S., 53.
5 Daladāgen kahavanuvak vicarakut rajageta no gannāva isā, idin nosaruveka gata samasak āṭalata diyunā perala demuya isā, Dal.S, 53.
6 A.R.E., Nos. 262 and 266 of 1921.
7 vāsi novasnā kala mema lesin Dalada pūja karanuva isā, Dal.S. 53.
these rules would undoubtedly be instructive. It would be interest­ing to examine how far the present day observances connected with the Relic follow those laid down in the Daladā sirita.

Like certain other works cited earlier, the Daladāsirita provides information on other aspects of society apart from the history and observances connected with the Tooth Relic. To cite one example, the list of musical instruments given in this text, particularly that of the wide variety of drums which figures in the description of the ceremonies in the Tooth Relic Temple can be instructive to a student of the history of the musical arts in Ceylon, an aspect on which little is known.¹ The distinct influence of Tamil in some of the terminology in this list is also interesting.

Another Sinhalese work devoted to a history of the Tooth Relic is the Daladā Pūjāvaliya.² In the opening passage it is stated that its author's purpose in writing this work was to enable the three Prime Ministers, Alagakkōnāra, Patirāja and Jayasimha to gain merit. A king named Bhuvanekabāhu is also mentioned together with these ministers. As the ministers mentioned there are those of Bhuvanekabāhu V of Gampola, Godakumbura suggests that the Daladā Pūjāvaliya may have been composed in the reign of Bhuvanekabāhu V of Gampola.³ It may,

¹Dal. S., 49.
²Edited by Kanadullē Ratnaramsi Thera, Colombo, 1954.
However, be noted that in its historical sketch of the kings of Ceylon the author makes no reference to the kings who followed Parākramabahu IV up to Bhuvanekabahu V.

The Dalada Pūjāvaliya covers much the same ground as the Daladāsirīta, but as pointed out by Godakumbura it has drawn from other works like the Mahāvamsa, Jinacarita.¹ The list of the officers of Parākramabahu I is the same as that given in the Nikāyasamgrahaya.² The historical outline at the end of the work, which is brief and incomplete compared with that of the Daladāsirīta, is not of direct value to our study though it does contain a few details. Among them may be mentioned the reference to Vijayabahu III as Palabatgala Vijayabahu Vathimi Raja,³ a tradition not mentioned in the Cūlavamsa or the Pūjāvaliya. Parākramabahu I is referred to by the title Kalikāla Sāhitya Sarvajña which, as far as we know, was a title of Parākramabahu II. Similarly, his parentage is definitely attributed to Kīrttisrīmegha in accordance with the Pūjāvaliya.⁴ The list of Parākramabahu's successors is incomplete. Apart from this, this work contains certain traditions not mentioned in other sources. We are told that in the latter part of the reigns of the kings who belonged to the Cūlavamsa the Colas invaded Ceylon and ruled

³Dal. Pjv., 64.
⁴Dal. Pjv., 59.
for a time and carried away the Tooth Relic and the minibera. A
king named Šiša Sirisatgabō assembled his forces at Māvatutoṭa,
invaded the Cola country and returned with the Relic and the mini-
bera.¹ The Cūlavamsa which gives a fairly detailed account of these
Cola invasions does not say that the Tooth Relic was ever taken away
by them. Nor is it possible to identify the Sinhalese king who is
credited with the recovery of the Tooth Relic. The authenticity of
this tradition, however interesting it may be, is doubtful. This
account immediately afterwards refers to Gajabāhu's invasion of the
Cola country - a tradition elaborated in later Sinhalese writings
but not mentioned in the Mahāvamsa. Gajabāhu is credited in this
text with invasion of the Cola country, and it is stated that he re»
turned to Ceylon with the Tooth Relic.² If the former reference is
to the time of the Cola occupation of Ceylon, then one can easily
see the conspicuous confusion of chronology. For Gajabāhu ruled many
centuries prior to Cola occupation. Further, no other work mentions
that the Tooth Relic was taken away by the Colas. Hence it would be
difficult to give much credit to these traditions which appear to
have grown up in later times, in the absence of confirmation by other
sources.

In addition to the works devoted to the history of the Tooth

¹Dal. Pjv., 58.
²Dal. Pjv., 59; Pjv., 93; Rjv., 34-35.
Relic so far considered mention may be made of another Sinhalese work called the Daladāvamsaya which brings its account up to the reign of Kirttisri Rājasimha. Godakumbura has noted two other works on the history of the Tooth Relic, still in manuscripts, written in Sinhalese verse. Of these two one is the Daladahatana written in the Saka year 1615 (1793 A.D.). They are said to cover approximately the same ground as the works considered above.2

The Dambadeni Asna is a Sinhalese work which deserves mention in this survey.3 It mentions the foreign invasions which took place during the reign of Parākramabāhu II. These events are narrated with obvious exaggerations and their confusion will be shown in our discussion of these events. A great deal of caution is necessary in utilizing its data for the reconstruction of the political aspects of the reign of Parākramabāhu II. In spite of these limitations, the Dambadeni Asna can be of considerable value for a study of the social conditions and certain aspects of political life in medieval Ceylon. It gives a long list of functionaries engaged in various types of service to the court. Similarly, it contains a list of the different sections of the army. The weapons of war, particularly a large variety

---

1 Ed. Sārānāma Thera, 1916.
of arrows, are mentioned apart from a list of royal ornaments. This work also gives a list of musical instruments. Here again some caution is necessary in handling these data. The Tamil influence on this text is unmistakable and some passages are hardly distinguishable from Tamil.1

The Dañbadeni Asna ends with the mention of the names of Parākramabāhu (II), Bhuvanekabāhu Vathimiraja and Parākramabāhu, each being referred to as the son of his predecessor. There is no way of determining its authorship. But as Godakumbura has pointed out, if it was composed in the reign of Parakramabāhu IV, one should expect an account of his reign, too. This scholar believes that the names of kings appended to the work are an addition by a later scribe.2

Another interesting work useful to a student of the reign of Parākramabāhu II is the Kañdavurusirita, published by Sir D. B. Jayatilaka in his Simhala Sāhitya Lipi, based on a manuscript in the British Museum.3 The contents of this document have been utilized by Paranavitana in the section on the political conditions of this period appearing in the History of Ceylon.4 It gives the daily routine of Kalikāla Sāhitya Sarvajña Pañḍita Parākramabāhu (Parākramabāhu II).

1 Dmb.A., 32.
2 Sinh. Lit., 110.
Though it refers to the Brāhmaṇas and Brāhmaṇical practices at the court, a compromise with Buddhist ways has been made. We are told that the king begins his day with meditation on anicca, dukkha and anatma followed by concentration on the suttas. The king is also said to observe the sīla and pay homage to the Tooth Relic as part of the daily routine. Though this work purports to give the daily routine of Parākramabāhu II, one may yet wonder whether this reflects the ideal expected of a king rather than his actual routine. Godakumbura has indeed pointed out that the practices enumerated in it resemble those given in the Manunīti on royal conduct. But this does not detract from its value for a study of the role of the king in the administration of medieval Ceylon. The author of this work is not mentioned in the text, but it appears to have been composed in the reign of Parākramabāhu II, or not long afterwards.

Among other works which have a direct bearing on the reign of Parākramabāhu II attention may be drawn to a document entitled the Alutnuvara Devalaya Karavima, preserved in the British Museum. A part of this document was published by Sir D. B. Jayatilaka in his Simhala Sāhitya Lipi. As far as we know, other manuscripts of this

---

1Sinh. Sā. Lipi, 63-64.
2Sinh. Lit., 111.
3British Museum Library, Manuscript No. Or. 6606 (145).
4Sinh. Sā. Lipi, 67-68.
work are not available; at least it is not mentioned in the Cata-
logue of Manuscripts in the Temple Libraries of Ceylon compiled by
K. D. Sõmadāsa.¹ The published portion relating to the Āṣaḷa festi-
val at Devinuvara, where the date of this work is not discussed, may
create the impression that it was written in the reign of Parākramabāhu
II. But this is extremely doubtful.

Here we will mainly confine ourselves to the information it
contains on the reign of Parākramabāhu II. It gives useful details
such as the date of the accession of Parākramabāhu in the year 1779
of the Buddhist Era.² This date agrees with that given in other
sources, notably the Devundara inscription of Parākramabāhu II. We
are told that he fought many a war before he unified the three king-
doms. The interesting information on this ruler contained in this
work, but not known from other sources, is that he became afflicted
with an ailment which interfered with his speech in his twenty-second
year. All medical and other remedies proved of no avail. The impor-
ant officials of the court discussed the matter and decided to appeal
to the grace of god Utpalavanna. Parākramabāhu's minister Devapatirāja
of Dunuketuvamsa was made to proceed to Devinuvara and perform the
Āṣaḷa festival. This was done and various endowments were made to the

¹Laṅkāvē Puska Pot Nāmāvaliya, Colombo, 1959.
shrine of Utpalavanna. The minister tidied himself and observed atā sil and invoked the god. The god appeared at midnight in a dream, in the guise of a brāhmaṇa and made it known to him that the king's ailment was incurable. On hearing the news the king consoled himself that it was a result of a misdeed in a previous birth.

According to this work Parākramabāhu's death took place in his thirty-third year but we have already referred to a statement in the Pūjāvaliya that he was alive in his thirty-fifth year. The Cūlavamsa gives this ruler a reign of thirty-five years. It is therefore difficult to accept the tradition of this document that Parākramabāhu's death took place in his thirty-third regnal year.

After its account of Parākramabāhu II the work goes on to deal with the edifices built at Alutnuvara Dēvālaya by Bhuvanekabāhu I. Parākramabāhu's immediate successor, Vijayabāhu IV, is not mentioned. Then it gives an account of the grants of land and other endowments to the Dēvālaya by successive Sinhalese kings, making brief allusions at times to political events in their reigns.

In this part of the document which has not been published so far in addition to Bhuvanekabāhu referred to above, Parākramabāhu VI of Kōṭte, Māyādunne and Rājasimha I of Sītāvaka are mentioned together with their dates of accession in the Saka era. The last king mentioned

¹Pīv., 140; Cv., LXXXIX, 71.
in it is Vimaladharmasūriya I of Senkadagaalapura (Kandy) who is stated to have ascended the throne in Saka 1518 (1596 A.D.). It therefore appears that, unless successive endowments were added to from time to time, it would have been composed not earlier than the end of the sixteenth century. But there is some reason to believe that additions were made later, for, the narrative in the latter part often looks scrappy. It appears to us that, irrespective of the time in which this work took its present form, the information on Parākramabāhu II is based on old traditions dating back probably to the reign of this ruler. It is difficult to understand how the tradition concerning the ailment of Parākramabāhu II could have arisen without some foundation. It will be shown in this study that this tradition is in keeping with Parākramabāhu's comparative inactivity in the last part of his reign when his sons and nephew Virabāhu played a prominent part in the administration of his kingdom.

The information on the Alutnuvara Devālaya and the Devinuvara shrine given in this work would be useful in tracing the history of these important shrines.

Apart from the works so far considered, there are other texts which we do not propose to discuss here as they have been discussed by previous writers. The Nikāya Sangrahaya which purports to give a history of Buddhism from the earliest times up to the time of the author was written by Jayabāhu in the reign of Bhuvanekabāhu V of Gampola.¹ The

¹Ed. D.P.R.Samaranāyaka, Colombo, 1960; See Sirima Wickramasinghe, op.cit., chapter on Sources.
last 'purification' of the Samgha mentioned in this text is dated in the year 1941 of the Buddhist Era (1398 A.D.). The author has taken pains to show the hardships which befell the Sāsana over which it triumphed in the end. It contains information on the reform of the Samgha in the reign of Parākramabāhu II. Mention is also made of the hardships which the Samgha underwent in the times of Māgha. This work is useful not only for the times of Parākramabāhu II but also for any study connected with the history of Buddhism in Ceylon up to the reign of Bhuvanekabāhu V.

The Saddhārma Ratnakaraya was written by Vimalakīrtti Thera, a pupil of Dharmakīrtti II, in the seventeenth year of the reign of Parākramabāhu VI (1412-67). It is a large volume of thirty-six chapters devoted to the exposition of various points of the Dhamma. The section which deals with the history of the Sāsana is mainly based on the Nikāya Samgrahaya. The nature of this text and an analysis of its contents chapter by chapter is given by Godakumbura in his Sinhalese Literature. The information in the Saddhārma Ratnakaraya would be useful for an understanding of the course of events from the death of Parākramabāhu II up to the reign of Parākramabāhu VI. Particularly noteworthy are the data on the powerful minister Alagak-

konāra and the Alakesvara family, important for the role they played in the history of this period. Similarly, the colophon gives information on the line of Dharmakīrtti to which the author belonged.

Information of historical value comes sometimes from stray references in the literary works of this period. For example, the Sasadāvata written in the reign of queen Līlāvatī contains information on some aspects of her reign not known from the Pali Chronicle.\(^1\) Attention as been drawn to these passages by Paranavitana.\(^2\) Similarly, the Upāsaka Janālaṅkāra, a Pali text on lay ethics, sheds light on the condition of the country after it had been invaded by the Tamils, probably a reference to the times of Māgha.\(^3\) Its author Bhadanta Ānanda, as stated in the colophon of this work, was one of the many theras who fled from Ceylon to South India in search of protection when the country was sacked by the Tamils. It is stated that he wrote the Upāsaka Janālaṅkāra while residing in a vihāra in the Pāṇḍya country, constructed by a ruler described as a vaṭṭī-śāmanta, who appears to have been a feudatory.

Among the later Sinhalese Chronicles mention may be made of the Rājaratnākaraya, written by the mahāthera of Valgampāya who was the head of the Abhayarāja Parivena during the reign of Vikramabāhu of Kandy, who

---

1 Ed. Dhammapāla Thera, Colombo, 1934, verses 11-12.
ascended the throne in 1541.¹ This work gives a brief account of the kings of Ceylon from the earliest times, devoting greater attention to important rulers like Parākramabāhu I. It often merely mentions the names of kings. The account of Vikramabāhu is more detailed. This author refers to the main events of the reign of Parakramabāhu II, but adds little that is new.

The Sinhalese Chronicle Rājāvaliya has been discussed by previous writers, more recently by Godakumbura, who gives an excellent account of the nature of the text drawing attention to its various recensions.² Rājāvaliya attempts to give a history of the island from the earliest times. In the form of the text as we have it now, its account ends with the reign of Vimaladharmasūriya II. These works have not proved to be of primary importance to our study and, where they have been consulted, we have tried to exercise the necessary caution.

Works like the Kurunegala Vistaraya which are of a later date contain useful topographical information together with local traditions.³ They add little to our understanding of the developments in this period.

¹Ed. Simon de Silva, Colombo, 1907.
²Sirima Wickramasinghe, _op. cit._; see chapter on Sources; 'Historical writing of the Sinhalese', C.B. Godakumbura in _Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon_, 72-86.
Mention may be made of a Pali Chronicle from Siam, the *Jinakālamālī* written by Ratanapaḷha Mahāthera of Rattavana Vihāra. It is stated to have been completed in the year 2060 of the Buddhist Era. The *Jinakālamālī* first appeared in an edition in Siamese characters; subsequently A. P. Buddhadatta Thera brought out an edition in Sinhalese script with a Sinhalese translation. More recently, Buddhadatta Thera edited this text for the Pali Text Society. The relevance of this work to our study lies in its account of a *Sīhalapatima* (Sinhala image), which is stated to have been secured for Rocarāja of Sukhothai by king Siridhamma of Siridhammanagara. According to some scholars this episode has a bearing on Ceylon's relations with the kingdom of Tāmbraliṇga in the Malay Peninsula in the time of Parākramabāhu II. This account will be examined in our discussion of Ceylon's relations with the Malay Peninsula. Whatever may be its importance in so far as its account of this *patima* is concerned, this Chronicle will be very useful in a study of Ceylon's relations with Thailand in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, as it contains information on this subject not known from Ceylonese sources.

Apart from the literary sources so far considered, a considerable amount of archaeological material has been utilized in this study.

1 Colombo, 1956.
particularly inscriptions both from Ceylon and outside. In studies on Ceylon history, in spite of the continuous records of the island's history in the Pali Chronicles, archaeological data, especially inscriptions, have proved very useful. Very often they confirm the Chronicle account and, at other times, they have helped to supplement and modify the picture of events given in the Chronicles. Thus the importance of epigraphic sources for our study cannot be underestimated.

For the period between the death of Parakramabahu I and the reign of Vijayabahu III we have a considerable body of archaeological evidence in the form of monuments in Rajarattha, some of which are in a good state of preservation. We are concerned here in particular with the inscriptions of this period. Though these inscriptions are not numerous, some contain information on political events. Quite a number of inscriptions belong to kings of the Kaliṅga line. In many of them these rulers have recounted the circumstances of their arrival in Ceylon together with details of their ancestry. They also sometimes refer to contemporary political events which are of primary interest to us. For example, inscriptions dating from the reigns of Vijayabahu II and Sāhasamalla - two princes who came over to Ceylon from Kaliṅga - contain information not only of their ancestry, but they give us an insight into the political conflicts of the period. ²

²For example: 'Polonnaruva Slab Inscription of Sāhasa-Malla; Ep. Zeyl.'
However, the largest number of inscriptions for any single ruler in any period of Ceylon history belongs to the reign of Nissanka Malla. These inscriptions throw light on many aspects of his reign not known from the Pali Chronicle. They also confirm to a great extent the brief account of his reign given in the Gūlavamsa. His visit to Samantakūta, the construction of a Tooth Relic Temple and the embellishment of the Jambukola Vihāra (Dambulla Vihāra) mentioned in the Gūlavamsa are confirmed by his inscriptions. His inscriptions refer to an invasion of South India in eulogistic language, but historians have been reluctant to take these claims too seriously. Owing to obvious exaggerations these records are sometimes not given due consideration, but weaned of their extravagance they could become useful sources of history. His inscriptions create the impression that Nissanka Malla was a ruler who devoted himself energetically to keep his kingdom intact and to promote Buddhism.

Similarly, useful information bearing on political events are found in the inscriptions of queen Lilāvatī and queen Kalyāṇavatī. Unfortunately so far no inscriptions of the reign of Māgha have come

(cont.) II, No. 36 (1923), 219-29; 'Polonnaruva: Slab Inscription of Vijayabahu II', No. 30, 179-84; Bōpiṭiya 'Slab Inscription of Kalyāṇavati', No. 32, 190-92.


2 Cv., LXXX, 18-26, See below, 120-32.

to light. As will be shown in our examination of the reign of this ruler he appears to have been a strange figure in some respects. Had we had the advantage of epigraphy, it would have been possible to bring in greater precision to our understanding of the reign of Māgha.

For the reigns of Vijayabahu III and Parākramabahu II we have very few epigraphic records which, in this respect, is in contrast to the reign of Parākramabahu I. The limited information contained in a few inscriptions datable in this period is of little assistance for an understanding of the political history on which our emphasis falls in this study. The available inscriptions, however limited their contents may be, will be examined in chapter VI.

One redeeming feature, however, is that a number of inscriptions from South India datable in this period throw light on an aspect of Parākramabahu's reign on which hardly anything is known from the Ceylon sources. We refer to the inscriptions of the reigns of Jātāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya and Jātāvarman Vīra Pāṇḍya, which mention invasions of Ceylon in the reign of Parākramabahu II. The inscriptions of the latter, particularly the prasasti from Kuḍumiyāmālai, referred to earlier, give details of Vīra Pāṇḍya's expedition to Ceylon and the circumstances in which it was undertaken. These records will be ex-

---

1See Chapter V.
2T.B.G., LXXVII, 251-68.
examined in detail in chapter V of this study. Despite their value, they raise difficult problems. For, the most important of these records, the Kuđumiyāmalai Prasasti for example, has a difficult text damaged in places which are vital to an understanding of the events mentioned in it. Other problems connected with these records will be discussed in Chapter V.

Similarly, the well known Jaiyā inscription of Candrabhānu from the Malay Peninsula is important for an understanding of the Jāvaka invasions of Ceylon in the reign of Parākramabāhu II.\textsuperscript{1} Thus, if the epigraphic records dated in this period are not numerous, at least some of them are of very great importance as they throw light on significant events.

Such then is the nature of the sources utilized in this study. It was considered necessary to stress the limitations set by our sources in several stages of this thesis. However, it would be clear from this survey that, though epigraphic records are not available in sufficient numbers with adequate details, we have a large variety of literary sources apart from the Cūlavamsa. Here again it is significant that quite a few of them, such as the Pūjāvaliya and the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa are contemporary works. Though their accounts sometimes lack precision and at times tend to exaggerate, nevertheless they have been of great value to our study. In these

\textsuperscript{1}G. Coedes, 
circumstances we have had to depend on literary sources to a greater extent, even where epigraphic testimony would have been most valuable, such as in the case of Māgha. This, however, is a limitation which cannot be remedied. Even so, the variety of literary sources, some of which, as stated earlier, date back to the reign of Parākramabāhu II, makes up for this limitation partially by supplementing the Cūlavamsa account. In spite of the value of these sources it must be stressed here that they, too, often lack precision and detail. In such cases, therefore, we were compelled to restrain ourselves by not pressing our conclusions beyond the point of safety even where one might have desired greater precision. Such difficulties are perhaps not confined to Ceylon history alone where medieval historical studies are concerned.
Chapter II

The Disintegration of the Polonnaruwa Kingdom.

The reign of Parākramabāhu I (1153-1186 A.D.), which has been the subject of unreserved eulogy in the Chronicles of Ceylon, is still considered a glorious chapter in the history of the island. The people of Ceylon regard Parākramabāhu I as one of their greatest national heroes. His achievements in the political, economic and religious spheres are described in the Culavamsa in glowing terms. It has to be borne in mind that this Chronicle, in the glorification of its hero Parākramabāhu, resorts to exaggeration and sometimes omits facts which would detract from his greatness. As Geiger has pointed out, these could easily be detected, and need not therefore present insuperable difficulties in gaining a fair idea of his achievements. Besides, epigraphic and archaeological evidence can throw considerable light on many aspects of his reign. The account of the Chronicle is on many points confirmed by epigraphic records and archaeological monuments dated in his reign. It appears from an examination of these sources that his rule, which lasted a little over three decades, was one of general prosperity, reflected in the construction of large-scale irrigation works, numerous mona-

1IHQ. VI. 228.
2GHJ. IV, 175-81.
stertories and other religious edifices, remarkable both for their size and number. The reign of Parākramabāhu was the subject of a detailed study completed by Sirima Wickramasinghe a few years ago.¹ It would, however, be useful to have an outline of Parākramabāhu's reign before we examine the developments that followed his death.

He effected the unification of Ceylon, which had remained divided into petty principalities torn by rivalry and internal dissension for nearly four decades after the death of Vijayabāhu (1055-1110). The chapters of the Cūlavamsa dealing with his early life contain matter that was apparently woven in to demonstrate the prowess and future greatness of the prince.² The dreams of his father, which augured the birth of Parākramabāhu and the prophecies of his future greatness, are literary embellishments also used elsewhere in the Chronicle in dealing with other heroes.³ He left Mahānāγakula where he lived with his mother and arrived at Saṅkanāyakatthali (Hatnāgoḍa) in Dakkhiṇadesa, where its ruler Kittisirimagha, who was his uncle, welcomed him and arranged for his education.⁴ He was, however, too restless to continue to stay

³Cv., LXII, 12-26; 27-29; Mv., XXII, 34 ff.
with his uncle and left in secret for Rājarāṭha – the kingdom of his brother-in-law (sūru-badu) Gajabāhu II. In the course of this flight he put to death one of the most loyal and trusted generals (senāpati) of Kittisirimegha whose hospitality he had enjoyed. Curiously enough, this act of ingratitude is the subject of a whole chapter in the Čulavamsa (LXV: The Killing of the Senāpati), the intention of which is to foreshadow the prowess of the prince. In Rājarāṭha he travelled about and gained an idea of its military strength, food supplies and other data which he considered useful for his future plans.¹

On the death of his uncle Kittisirimegha, who had no son to succeed him, Parākramabāhu became the lord (mahādīpāda) of the principality of Daksennadesa. It is interesting to note that, while the Čulavamsa makes it very clear that Parākramabāhu was the son of Mānābharana and queen Ratnavali, Sinhalese Chronicles state that he was a son of Kittisirimegha.² Besides, the Pali Chronicle also states that Kittisirimegha had no son.³ At first sight it may appear that there is no unanimity in these literary works on the paternity of a ruler whose achievements are treated with considerable de-

¹Čv., LXVI.
²Čv., LXII, 40-53; Pjv., 105; Dal. Pjv., 59; Rjv., 42.
³Čv., LXIII, 43-45.
tail even in the lesser chronicles. For example the Pujāvaliya, which does not mention Mānābharaṇa at all, refers to Parākramabāhu as a son of Kittisirimegha. This confusion may have arisen on account of the fact that Parākramabāhu was brought up by Kittisirimegha after the death of Mānābharaṇa. In other words, Kittisirimegha played the role of a father to the young prince during this period. This is not without precedent. The Mahāvamsa states that Vaṭṭagamanī Abhaya (103 and 89-77 B.C.) came to be called pitarāja (father-king) because he adopted his brother's son Mahācūli Mahātissa.¹ That this was indeed the case with Parākramabāhu too is clear from the fact that the Cūlavamsa in its narrative from the death of Mānābharaṇa also refers to Kittisirimegha and Parākramabāhu as father and son respectively.² There is no valid reason to doubt the authenticity of the Cūlavamsa version as to the paternity of Parākramabāhu. Some later writers, however, regarded Kittisirimegha as his father. The Daladā Pujāvaliya, in which we find a number of confused traditions, definitely states that Parākramabāhu was born to queen Ratnāvali through Kirtti Śri Megha. In spite of this contradictory statement in the Dalada Pujāvaliya this confusion is more apparent than real.

¹Mv., XXXIII, 35-36. For Paranavitana's interpretation of this epithet see God of Adam's Peak, 61-67.
²Cv., LXIII, 53; LXIV, 5, 13; LXVII, 55; Geiger, Cv.Tr., I, 242, note 1.
Having assumed the overlordship of Dakkhinadesa, the prince started to make preparations for his future campaigns against Rājarattha and Rōhana in order to bring the whole of Ceylon under his rule. Knowing that Dakkhinadesa could be the base of operations, he took steps to improve its administrative machinery and military resources. These activities are described in considerable detail in the chapters entitled 'The Improvement of his own Kingdom' (LXVIII) and 'The Collection of Military Forces and Money (LXIX). The main irrigation works were constructed by harnessing the waters of the Jajjārā-nadī (Dūduru Oya). Marshland in the Paṃcayōjana District (Pasdun Kōralē) was drained and rendered cultivable. A large number of officials with specialised functions was appointed to the different departments such as the sēnāpati (commander-in-chief of the army (and Military Services), gaṇakāmacca (accountant) and bhandāgāradhikāri (chief of the treasury). It is possible that the account in the Čūlavamsa was based upon knowledge of the administrative machinery in the royal capitals of Anurādhapura and Polonnaruva. On the other hand, his acquaintance with Indian texts on polity such as the Arthāśāstra can be detected in the narrative of the Čūlavamsa.

---

1 Cv., LXVIII, 16 ff.
2 Cv., LVIII, 51-55.
3 Cv., LXIV, 45-46; LXVI, 129 ff; LXIV, 1-5.
must have influenced his description of the administrative machinery which Parākramabāhu set up in Dakkhinadesa, which may have served as a basis for the more elaborate administrative system which he enforced from Polonnaruva. He also provided for the training of military personnel and strengthened and equipped the different branches of the army. All these measures contributed to making Dakkhinadesa a powerful principality from which Parākramabāhu could direct future operations in his bid to become the paramount ruler of the island. He set up his capital at Parākramapūra in the centre of his kingdom.

As a first step in his campaigns the area adjoining Malayadesa was conquered. We do not propose to follow the strategy and topographical aspects of these campaigns here. Malayadesa presents a difficult terrain covered by thick jungle and inaccessible hills with no more than foot-paths as lines of communication. The Cūlavamsa states that the planning of battles and the movement of troops was based on the lines prescribed in the ancient texts on polity such as the Arthasastra. It is clear from the narrative of the Chronicle

---

1 Cv., LXIX, 5 ff.
4 Cv., LXX, 56.
that attempts were made to win over Gajabahu's generals by presents and promise of honours. The conquest of Malayadesa was undertaken apparently to prevent the defeated troops of Gajabahu from taking refuge in its hills and forests. The annexation of Malayadesa was completed by war and intrigue without much loss of time, although the Chronicle does not state how long the campaign lasted.

The conquest of Rājarāṭṭha - the kingdom of Gajabahu - was his next major operation. The excuse given in the Chronicle that Parākramabahu took offence because 'the ruler Gajabahu had fetched nobles of heretical faith from abroad and had thus filled Rājarāṭṭha with the briers (of heresy)' is perhaps a pretext to justify his aggression into the latter's territory. In the course of the war Parākramabahu's forces scored early victories and Gajabahu was virtually reduced to the position of a prisoner in Polonnaruva. Gajabahu's ministers and high officials appealed to the ruler of Rōhana - Mānabharaṇa - for assistance. In spite of the previous understanding he had with Parākramabahu for common action Mānabharaṇa availed himself of this opportunity and sent forces to Rājarāṭṭha to relieve the hard-pressed Gajabahu. Gajabahu had to pay the price of the assistance he received.

1 Cv., LXX, 53-55.
2 Cv., LXX, 239-50.
3 Cv., LXX, 254-255.
Mānābharaṇa imprisoned Gajabāhu and set himself up as the ruler of Rājaraṭṭha. The Tooth Relic, the Alms Bowl and other valuable treasures were seized and taken to Rohana. Gajabāhu in his miserable plight approached Parākramabāhu for assistance, which the latter readily granted, for it was clear to Parākramabāhu that Mānābharaṇa was the greater threat to his ambition. Parākramabāhu's troops successfully entered Polonnaruva and released Gajabāhu, although this did not lead to an immediate cessation of the conflict. Intermittent fighting went on, but before long a peace settlement was arrived at. We learn from the Cūlavamsa that the Saṁgha was instrumental in bringing Parākramabāhu to terms with Gajabāhu. The request made by the Saṁgha to Parākramabāhu was:

'Now the Ruler of Men (Gajabāhu) has neither a son nor brothers, but he himself being so old, is near death. Thy pledged word that the gaining of the royal dominion has as object only the furtherance of the laity and the Order will thus shortly be fulfilled. Therefore shalt thou give up the state and return to thine own province hearkening to the word of the bhikkhu congregation'.

The peace settlement thus arrived at, the Chronicle goes on, was

---

1 Cū., LXX, 63-64.
2 Cū., LXX, 265-266.
3 Cū., LXX, 327 ff.
4 Cū., LXX, 333-335.
engraved on a stone tablet with the words: 'I have made over Rājarattha to Parākkama'. This record has not come to light so far but a copy of it has been discovered at Samgamu Vihāra, situated two miles to the north-east of Gōkarālla in the Hūṭahaya Kōralē of the Kurunagala District. Although this inscription confirms the event recorded in the Chronicle there are a few discrepancies in the two records. The Cūlavamsa would have us believe that Parākramabāhu returned the kingdom of Rājarattha to Gajabāhu out of sheer mercy. But according to the terms of the treaty (sandhaṇa), as recorded in the inscription, the two opponents seem to have met as equals. Precedence of rank is offered to Gajabāhu. It is reciprocally agreed that the enemy of one of their kingdoms was also the enemy of the other, which in effect meant mutual assistance in the event of their kingdoms being attacked. They also agreed not to make war against one another. In the event of the death of either of them, his kingdom should belong to the survivor. Thus the terms of the treaty are reciprocal and the Chronicle version that Gajabāhu humbled himself before Parākramabāhu and that the latter entered into the treaty as an act of mercy has been modified. The picture that emerges from the Cūlavamsa is touched up by the chroni-

1 Cv., LXXI, 3-4.
cler to make the transaction appear more favourable to its hero. On the other hand, as Paranavitana has pointed out, in reality it was Parākramabāhu who gained more from this treaty, for Gajabāhu was old, and the former would have had the opportunity of succeeding to the throne of Rājarattha before long. Moreover, by this agreement Parākramabāhu's claim to the throne of Rājarattha was strengthened, which was a clear advantage over Mānābharana, who could also put forward claims to the throne of that kingdom. Hence Parākramabāhu had undoubtedly all to gain and nothing to lose by this treaty. Though an analysis of the terms of the settlement would lead to this impression, yet the partiality of the chronicler is unmistakable.

In spite of this treaty, according to which Parākramabāhu was entitled to the throne of Rājarattha, events took a different turn at the death of Gajabāhu. Gajabāhu's ministers invited Mānābharana to cross over to Rājarattha with his troops. Parākramabāhu, however, lost no time in having the strategic points on the Mahavāli Gaṅga from Saro-gāmatittha to Gokanna, where Mānābharana's forces could cross the river, heavily guarded. Mānābharana's forces crossed over to Rājarattha at an unguarded point on the riverine frontier and Parākramabāhu's forces were forced to retreat as far as Parākramapūra and Kalyāṇi in Dakkhin-

---

1 Ep. Zeyl., IV, No. 1, 4-8.
2 Cv., LXXI, 7-10.
Before long Parakramabahu strengthened his forces and took the offensive and, as a line of strategy, an attempt was made to divide the forces of Manabharana by attacking them in several directions. After bitter fighting Manabharana was forced to abandon his campaign. He fled to Rohana leaving behind prince Siri Vallabha (his son) and much valuable treasure. He was not pursued into his kingdom. Manabharana died shortly afterwards, appealing to the princes of his family from his death-bed that they should obey the orders and follow the lead of Parakramabahu. It is difficult to understand why Manabharana, after fighting against Parakramabahu for many years, should have expressed such admiration for his adversary in his last days. It seems that the statement is no more than a pious wish of the chronicler.

Parakramabahu in this manner achieved his ambition and became the paramount sovereign over the whole of Ceylon. This victory was completed only after subjugating the recalcitrant queen Sugala, mother of Manabharana, who raised a revolt in Rohana. The fact that she possessed the Tooth Relic and the Alms Bowl must have been the main reason for her success in gathering a sufficiently large following. The determined resistance which Manabharana offered also shows that the people of Rohana followed his leadership faithfully and were not pre-

1 Cv., LXXII, 148-51.
2 Cv., LXXII, 301-310.
pared to succumb to Parâkramabâhu's aggression easily. At this stage Parâkramabâhu had to quell a revolt raised by the Siṃhala and Kerala soldiers along with the Vēļakkâra mercenaries, which in some measure was a setback to his efforts in subjugating Rohana. The situation did not get out of control, queen Sugalâ was captured and brought to Polonnaruva and the Tooth Relic and the Alms Bowl were secured. One of the main objectives of this campaign must have been to secure these relics, the possession of which added strength to his tenure of the throne. Without these relics his position on the throne would have been insecure in the eyes of the Buddhist population.

Having unified the country Parâkramabâhu gave the island three decades of peace and prosperity. Except for brief moments when dissentient elements rose in revolt the country enjoyed a period of comparative peace, which is sometimes referred to as the 'Augustan Age' of Ceylonese history.\(^1\) His reign stands out in unique relief when one considers the disorder and instability which had characterised the political life of the country since the death of Vijayabâhu I. He devoted his attention to the restoration of the Sāsana, which had been neglected for long and had consequently suffered for want of royal

patronage. In the field of irrigation and agriculture his undertakings were in some respects unparallelled.

Polonnaruva was restored and converted into a beautiful city, dotted with numerous religious edifices, secular buildings and parks. The Ġūlavamsa contains a vivid description of these building activities in the chapters entitled 'Account of the Rebuilding of Pulatthinagara' (LXXIII), 'The Laying out of Gardens and the Like (LXXIX), 'The Building of Vihāras' (LXXVIII). Archaeological exploration has brought to light the ruins of some of these buildings and it appears that, with the exception of the buildings erected by Nissanka Malla, Polonnaruva was largely the creation of Parākramabāhu. The attempt he made to purify the Sāsana may be mentioned as one of the most important steps taken to restore Buddhism. He effected the unification of the three fraternities which, according to the Ġūlavamsa, had remained divided since the days of Vattagāmaṇī Abhaya. According to the Nikāya Samgrahaya these three fraternities were the Dharmaruci, Sāgalika and the Vaitulyavādī sects. The Ġūlavamsa in describing the condition of the Sangha refers to the 'numerous unscrupulous bhikkhus whose whole task is filling their bellies'. Their disharmony

2GV., LXXIII, 17-19.
3Nks., 87.
4GV., LXXIII, 5.
was so great that they 'did not wish to have ceremonies in common nor even to see one another'. The task of organizing and effecting the 'purification' of the Samgha was entrusted to the learned mahāthera Mahākassapa, who was to have the assistance of other leading theras of the time such as Moggallāna and Sāriputta, who are known to us also from their literary works. The Galvihāra Rock Inscription of Parākramabāhu, which records the disciplinary rules for the guidance of monks, issued by the council set up for this purpose, gives a valuable account of this event. This document portrays the condition of the Samgha during the period and is of great value for the understanding of religious conditions in the period that followed. That his efforts at restoring and uplifting the condition of the Samgha yielded only temporary results is clear from the numerous similar 'purifications' effected by subsequent rulers.

Irrigation and agriculture were fields to which he paid particular attention, even before becoming the supreme lord of the island (dīpa-cakravarti), in his capacity as the mahādīpāda of Dākkhīṇadesa. Nicholas has pointed out that according to the Culavamsa

---

1 Cv., LXXVIII, 4.
2 Malalasekara, Pali Lit. Cey., 196 ff.
4 C. H. J., IV, 121, for example, Vijayabāhu III and Parākramabāhu II.
5 Cv., LXVIII.
he constructed or restored as many as 165 anicuts, 3910 canals, 163 major tanks, 2376 minor tanks, 341 stone sluices and repaired 1753 breaches. Some of these may be merely restoration work, for the Chronicle uses the words kāresi and kārāpēsi (built or caused to be built) in the sense of restoration, too. From these figures, even if their accuracy is open to doubt, Parākramabāhu's claim to be the greatest tank-builder of Ceylon receives confirmation. His most celebrated irrigation works, Parākrama Samudra, in its restored form has a bund 8½ miles long, with an average height of 40 feet above the ground level. The area of the tank is 5350 acres with an irrigable area of 18,200 acres. Projects of this magnitude, which aimed at the economic development of the country, must have led to the general prosperity without which his bold attempts at conquests in countries across the seas would not have been possible. The maxim which, the Culavamsa says, emanated from this ruler — that not a drop of rain water should be allowed to reach the ocean without having served man, is to this day remembered by the people of Ceylon.

---

1 Cv., LXXIX, 23-84; Nicholas, C.H.J., IV, 60.
2 Cf., MV., XXXIII, 6 and XXXVI, 25.
4 Cv., LXVIII, 31.
Parākramabāhu having strengthened his sovereignty over the whole of Ceylon does not seem to have been content with a power confined to the island. Surprisingly, he seems to have come into conflict with the king of Rāmaṇa - a country with which Ceylon had maintained friendly relations over a long period, as is categorically stated in the Chronicle.¹ The precise reason which gave rise to this breach of friendship is not clear but, if the Cūlavamsa is to be trusted, it seems to have arisen out of a conflict of interests in the elephant trade, in which both countries were concerned.² Subsequently it is also stated that a princess whom Parākramabāhu sent to the king of Kamboja was seized by the king of Rāmaṇa.³ In retaliation, Parākramabāhu dispatched forces, a section of which landed at a port called Kusumī (Bassein), destroyed the country of the Rāmaṇa king and slew the king himself.⁴ Burmese Chronicles make no mention of this event. The Kalyāṇi Inscriptions of king Dhammaceti of Pegu dated 1476 A.D. refer to the religious relations between Burma and Ceylon during this period but add nothing to elucidate our problem. But, that Parākramabāhu's generals at least

²Cv., LXXVI, 15 ff.
³Cv., LXXVI, 35.
⁴Cv., LXXVI, 59-68.
raided the coasts of Burma, is confirmed by the Devanagala Inscription of Parākramabāhu, which records a grant of land to Kitnuvaragal (Kittinagaragiri) in recognition of his services in the campaign against Aramana (Rāmaṇa), who according to the Cūla-vamsa was the general who figured prominently in this war. There is no evidence at present to believe that it was anything more than a raid of the coasts of Burma to chastise the king, and there is still less evidence to hold that Parākramabāhu derived any economic or political rewards from this adventure.

Parākramabāhu's intervention in the Pāṇḍya war of succession entangled him in the struggle for supremacy in which the Pāṇḍyas and the Colas were then involved. From about the ninth century it became the settled policy of the kings of Ceylon to ally themselves with the Pāṇḍyas against the Colas. Sena II (853-87) successfully intervened in Pāṇḍyan affairs and placed a prince favourable to him on the throne of that kingdom. From that time onwards the alliance continued, but apparently brought no positive benefit to the Sinhalese kings, for the Pāṇḍyas could hardly maintain their own independance against the rising power of the Colas. The Sinhalese kings

---

4 The Colas, 120 ff.
did not abandon this tradition of maintaining friendly relations with the Pāṇḍyas and Parākramabāhu also followed it. Vijayabāhu I who expelled the Colas from Ceylon gave his sister in marriage to a Pāṇḍyan prince.\(^1\) Parākramabāhu too had a Pāṇḍyan queen.\(^2\) Parākramabāhu's intention must have been to maintain the balance of power in South India by assisting the Pāṇḍyas. Perhaps he also felt that such a step would add lustre to his crown. In the Pāṇḍyan kingdom war broke out between the two Pāṇḍyan princes, Kulasekhara, son of Māravarman Śrī Vallabha, and Parākrama Pāṇḍya over the succession to the throne of Madurai.\(^3\) Which of the two princes was the legitimate heir to the throne cannot be determined in the present state of our knowledge. Parākrama appealed to Parākramabāhu for military assistance when Kulasekhara besieged his capital.\(^4\) Parākramabāhu ordered his general Lamkāpura to lead his forces to Madurai and reinstate Parākrama on the throne of Madurai. But before Lamkāpura could set out from Ceylon, Kulasekhara had murdered Parākrama and had captured Madurai.\(^5\) Lamkāpura continued his ex-

\(^1\)Cv., LIX, 41.

\(^2\)See below, 124.

\(^3\)The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom, 128 ff.

\(^4\)Cv., LXXVI, 76-79.

\(^5\)Cv., LXXVI, 86.
pedition on the orders of Parākramabāhu to oust Kulasēkhara and to place on the throne a scion of the family of Parākrama. Lamkāpura 'embarked his great army on many hundreds of ships' and landed in the Paṇḍu kingdom at the port of Talaḍilla. The Cūlavamsa would have us believe that the Sinhalese forces scored victories throughout. 'Needless to say the Sinhalese general was victorious in all of them, killing many Tamils.'

Although the Cūlavamsa records no Sinhalese reverses South Indian inscriptions fill the void and helped to modify our picture. The Pali Chronicle does not preserve any chronology in its narrative of these campaigns and even South Indian inscriptions are not decisive in that respect. The Arpakkam Inscription of the fifth year of Rājādhirāja II confirms the Cūlavamsa narrative in that Lamkāpura at first gained victories over Kulasēkhara. It states that Pāndimandala was captured and Kulasēkhara was driven out of Madurai and so far the Chronicle and our inscription are in agreement, but the latter adds the important piece of information that Jayadratha, Lamkāpura and the Ceylon army later suffered defeat. The Pallavarāyanpetṭai Inscription

1 Cūv., LXXVI, 87-93.
2 Cūv., LXXVI, 94 ff.
3 A.R.E., No. 20 of 1899.
of the eighth year of Rājadhirāja II, while stating that Kula-
sēkhara was ousted from Madurai, adds that later Kula-sekhara was
reinstated on the throne of Madurai and that Lāmkāpura Daṇḍanā-
yaka and others were killed and their heads were nailed on the
gates of Madurai.¹ A Tamil inscription of the twelfth year of
Rājadhirāja (issued in duplicate, one at North Arcot and the other
in Tanjore District) also refers to Parākramabāhu's unwillingness
to accept defeat and states that he was building ships at Ceylon
ports such as Māṭottam, Vallikāmam, Māṭivāl to invade the Cola
country by way of retaliation.² These inscriptions recording grants
made to two generals, who scored victories for the Colas in these
campaigns, claim to have invaded Ceylon, devastated the country
and that much loot was taken away. We have, however, no confirmation
of this episode from Ceylon sources but it is clear from the silence
of the Gūlavamsa with regard to the fate that overtook Lāmkāpura in
the end; as shown by Geiger³ and from the inscriptions cited above,
that Parākramabāhu's forces ultimately suffered defeat. The war it-
self dragged on, and the recipients of assistance from the Sinhalese
king seem to have adopted an opportunist attitude by changing loyalties

¹ A.R.E., No. 433 of 1924; Ep. Ind., XXI, 184-93.
³ Gv. Tr., II, p.100, note 1.
whenever it suited them.¹ What we are concerned with in particular here is the possible repercussions of Parākramabahu's exploits in South India on the subsequent history of Ceylon. To this we will draw attention in the sequel.

Politically, the unification which Parākramabahu effected seems to have lasted throughout his reign. The Chronicle, however, does record attempts to challenge his authority rather early in his reign but each of them was successfully suppressed.² Parākramabahu's intervention in South Indian politics, though with limited success, shows that he had a fair claim to be called the Supreme Lord of the island (dīpa-cakravartī).³ The measures he adopted for the economic development of the country and the construction of numerous monasteries and various other religious edifices would not have been possible but for the effective unification of the country, which paved the way for over three decades of peace.

However, the relative peace and stability which the country enjoyed during the reign of this monarch could not remain after his reign. With the death of Parākramabahu in 1186 we enter a period of disorder and confusion, which culminated in the invasion and sack

¹Ch.H.J., IV, 51.
²Uy., LXXIV, 22 ff, 40-49; LXXVI, 1-9.
³Nks., 85.
of Rājaraṭṭha by Kāliṅga Māgha about the year 1215. Factionalism and rivalry at the court, deposition or murder of the rulers by powerful generals who were a power behind the throne, were characteristic features of the political climate of this period. Evidence of peaceful termination of the reigns of kings and normal succession to the throne is almost absent. In fact the opposite appears to have been the rule.

The reconstruction of the history of this period is beset with numerous difficulties, and the picture that emerges from an examination of the data in the Chronicles and the epigraphs would be far from complete or coherent. Indeed, the detailed narrative in the Culavamsa, which runs through the reign of Parākramabāhu, weakens into a sketchy and colourless record in chapter LXXX (The Sixteen Kings). The brevity of the reigns of kings and the frequent 'palace revolutions' alone cannot explain this position, for the reign of Nissanka Malla which lasted nine years, certainly remarkable for that period, receives a notice of nine verses only. If his epigraphic records are to be trusted, his reign was one of incessant activity and the Chronicler had ample scope for making more than this brief notice. This change in the tone and content of the Culavamsa at this point was discussed in the previous chapter.

\[1\] Cv., LXXX, 54-79.
\[2\] Cv., LXXX, 18-26.
Parākramabāhu was succeeded by Vijayabāhu II who, according to the Chronicle, was the sister's son (bhāgineyyo; Sinh. bāna) of the former.\(^1\) The Polonnaruva Inscription of Vijayabāhu confirms and supplements the Gūlavamsa account of this ruler's reign of one year.\(^2\) The statement that Vijayabāhu was the sister's son of Parākramabāhu has given rise to considerable speculation, which is even more confounded by the addition that Vijayabāhu was called to Ceylon by Parākramabāhu from Simhapura in Kalinga and was appointed to succeed the latter on the throne of Ceylon.\(^3\) It also adds that he was trained in the science of arms (sāstra sāstrayehi nipuṇa karavā) and was invested with the title of himiyā before his accession to the throne.\(^4\) The Gūlavamsa mentions three sisters of Parākramabāhu. One of them, princess Bhaddavatī, was married to Gajabāhu II and the other two were the spouses of Mānābharāṇa, the ruler of Rohana.\(^5\) Wickramasinghe thinks that the sister in question was 'no other than Bhaddavatī, the spouse of Gajabāhu II'.\(^6\) But this assumption would

---

\(^1\)\textit{Cv.}, LXXX, 1.


\(^5\)\textit{Cv.}, LXVI, 147-50; LXIII, 6-17; LXIV, 24.

dismiss too summarily the statement in the Cūlavamsa that Gaja-
bāhu had 'neither a son nor brothers'.

That Vijayabāhu could have been a son of either of the two sisters married to Mānābharana has been ruled out, for the latter was opposed to the ascendency of the Kaliṅga line. The two sons of this marriage, Siri-Vallabha and Kittisirimegha, were later taken captive and were removed to the court of Parākramabāhu.

We hear no more of them or the fate that overtook them. It is not, however, altogether impossible, although Wickramasinghe would take objection to it, that a son of Mānābharana born of one of these two princesses was selected for succession to the throne, as he does not appear to have had a son of his own. Mānābharana, from his death-bed, appealed to the princes of his family: 'Go though, without ruining thyself as I (have ruined) myself, to the sovereign Parakkama, do that which he orders thee, and live devoted to him as he shall direct thee.'

If he actually made such an appeal in his last days, was it an understanding arrived at by the two cousins in their final settlement of conflicts after many years of fighting that a son of Mānābharana should succeed to the throne on the death of Parākramabāhu? The latter would not have taken objection

---

1 Cy., LXX, 333.
2 Cy., LXXII, 291; LXXIV, 24; LXXII, 303.
3 Cy., LXXII, 307-308.
to this proposition for he does not appear to have had a son of his own. If such was the case, and if the purpose of this arrangement was to pacify the rebellious province of Rohana, it seems to have failed, for queen Sugala, Mānabharaṇa's mother, raised the banner of revolt some years later. The suggestion offered above has some weaknesses. Firstly, the inscription of Vijayabāhu referred to above states that Vijayabāhu came from Kaliṅga, and it is difficult to explain how a son of Mānabharaṇa would have gone to live in that country, when the latter did not look upon the Kaliṅga line with favour. Secondly, if such an arrangement was made by Parākramabāhu for succession to the throne, one may expect it to be mentioned in the Cūlavamsa less ambiguously. Thirdly, if a settlement of that nature was reached, queen Sugala would have had no valid reason to raise a revolt in Rohana which was the principality of Mānabharaṇa. In view of these difficulties, if we are to look for an alternative, we are left with that offered by Geiger, that Parākramabāhu must have had a third sister who was married to a Kaliṅga prince and Vijayabāhu II was an issue of that marriage.¹ This again lacks confirmation, but it would be a less objectionable assumption, placed as we are with insufficient data to arrive at a conclusion on the relationship of Vijayabāhu to Parākramabāhu and

¹ Ov. Tr., II, p. 125, n.1.
the parentage of the former.

Vijayabāhu's reign came to a tragic end after one year. It is significant that, though his reign was so brief, the Chronicler deals with his reign in complimentary terms and compared him with a Bodhisatta.1 He is also credited with having carefully observed the political precepts of Manu while living up to 'the four heart-winning qualities' (catussamgahavatthu).2 The Chronicle devotes fourteen verses to his brief reign, while even that of Nissaṅka Malla which lasted nine years of enthusiastic activity receives only nine.3 What precisely caught the imagination of the chronicler in favour of Vijayabāhu we cannot say. That he was a pious ruler is clear from the narrative in the Cūlavamsa, and that he was a man of some learning is suggested by the epithet pandita.4 Besides, the Cūlavamsa states that he himself composed in the Māgadha tongue a letter, which was sent to the king of Arimaddana (Pagan) and that a peace treaty was concluded with that monarch.5 Burmese Chronicles give no reference to this treaty. The Kalyāṇi inscriptions dated 1476 A.D., which were set up with the object of giving a ruling on the upōsatha,

1 Cv., LXXX, 12.
2 Cv., LXXX, 9; LXXX, 1-14.
3 Cv., LXXX, 18-26.
4 Piy., 107; Nks, 87, Piy., 36.
and  pavañcana as well as the manner of consecrating a simhādo refer to a Buddhist embassy to Ceylon headed by Uttarajiva mahāthera in the reign of Parākramabāhu, which ultimately led to the establishment of the Sīhala Samgha in Burma. These records reflect cordial relations between the two countries, but contain no reference to the treaty of Vijayabāhu II. However, the Cūlavamsa statement of Vijayabāhu's treaty, taken along with the data contained in the historical introduction of the inscriptions referred to above, will make it clear that Parākramabāhu's conflict with that country had not led to a permanent breach in the traditional friendship between Burma and Ceylon and indeed good relations were already restored. Friendly relations appear to have been restored not long after the conflict.

The Bodhisattva qualities which Vijayabāhu is said to have had do not seem to have been of much avail, for his position on the throne was challenged from the time of his accession to power. Though the Chronicle fails to mention this episode, Vijayabāhu's inscription from Polonnaruva referred to above states that on the day after his consecration disturbances were caused by treacherous ministers (dustamātyayan) who became traitors (rājadrohivā), and that a general named Vijyāyān-tān-nāvan quelled the revolt and restored the kingdom to Vija-

\[1\] Ind. Ant., XXII (1893), 14; The Glass Palace Chronicle, 142 ff. also mentions this embassy of Uttarajiva, head of the Buddhist clergy in Burma in 1180, and states that five bhikkhus including Chapata, pupil of Uttarajiva, who studied the Three Pitakas in Ceylon returned to Burma in 1190.
The purpose of this epigraph is in fact to record a grant of land along with certain privileges in recognition of his loyal services. In spite of the services of this general who was on his side, opposition to his rule appears to have mounted seriously for, at the end of one year he was put to death by Mahinda of the Kuliṅga clan. The Pūjāvaliya states that the latter put him to death on account of an affair, which Vijayabāhu is said to have had with Dīpanā— the daughter of a cowherd. That opposition to Vijayabāhu's rule had arisen from a more deep-seated cause is evident, for we have already referred to the revolt which broke out on the day after his consecration. It would be clear from the events that followed, that from the death of Parākramabāhu the ministers and the generals and such other high officials were divided in their allegiance and in turn attempted to place on the throne princes of Pāṇḍyan or Kaliṅga descent, depending on the predilection of the factions concerned. It has been postulated that there was even a third party who preferred to have a Sinhalese prince on the throne.

Mahinda VI who succeeded to the throne after putting Vijayabāhu II to death is said to belong to the Kuliṅga clan. The Pūjāvaliya gives

---

2Cv., LXXX, 15-17.
3Pjv., 107.
5Cv., LXXX, 15; Pjv., 107.
the name of this personage as Kesdā Kilim Mihindā, and the Sin-
haelese text Simhala Bodhivamsa has the form Kiliṅgu in its refer-
ence to the Kuliṅga clan. The first reference to Kuliṅga in the
Mahāvamsa occurs in its account of the clans that came to Ceylon
along with the Bodhi Tree. In that account Kuliṅgas are mentioned
along with the Taraccha (hyena) and they appear to be clans of
totemistic origin as the case could be with the Balibhojakas (crow),
Lambakaṁṇas (hare) and Mbiyas (peacock). Geiger with good reason
corrects Wijesinghe's translation, and has shown that the superficial
similarity of the forms - Kuliṅga and Kaliṅga, should not lead to an
equation of the two, for Kuliṅgas are mentioned as a distinct clan
already in the older part of the Mahāvamsa. Kesadhatunāyaka appears
to have been a title of distinction which, for instance, Parākrama-
bāhu I bestowed on one of his trusted generals, Rakkha. As such,
Kesdā (kesadhātu) which is prefixed to his name indicates that he was
a person of high rank at the time when Mahinda made his bid for king-
ship. His reign of five days obviously created little impression,
for the Minipe Slab Inscription, which gives a list of the names of

---

1 Simhala Bodhivamsa, 195.
3 My., XIX, 1-6.
4 Gv., LXX, 278, 280.
kings who succeeded to the throne after Parākramabāhu I, omits his name altogether.\(^1\) It is clear from the Cūlavamsa that he was not acceptable to the people or even to the army personnel who mattered in the politics of the day.\(^2\)

Mahinda was succeeded by Nissaṅka Malla who put the former to death. The reign of Nissaṅka Malla, which lasted nine years, is a bright spot in the troubled history of this period. The most remarkable aspect of his rule, apart from his services to the laity and the Order, is the large number of epigraphs he set up - the largest number of inscriptions credited to any individual king in Ceylon. These records throw light on many aspects of his reign.

The Cūlavamsa attributes to him the building of the Tooth Relic Temple in Polonnaruva, which Geiger thinks was merely a restoration of the one built by Parākramabāhu.\(^3\) What lends support to such a view is the statement in the Pūjāvaliya that the construction of the daladāgeya was completed in sixty hours.\(^4\) The Satmahal Pāsāda in Poḷonnaruva is generally attributed to this ruler, but here again we are far from certain whether the original construction was a work

---


\(^2\) Cv., LXXX, 15-17.

\(^3\) Cv., LXXX, 19; Cv.Tr., II, p. 127, n.2. this claim is made in his inscriptions too.

\(^4\) Pīv., 107.
of Nissanka Malla. Jambukola Vihāra (Sinh. Dambulla), where he has left an epigraph, benefited from his munificence. That vihāra was made 'resplendent with walls and pillars shimmering in gold and silver, where the floor was of red lead, and the bricks of the roof were of gold, the wise (Monarch) had rebuilt and placed therein seventy three golden statues of the Master'. Here one can note the obvious exaggeration, which is met with in his epigraphic records as well. His inscription engraved on a rock at the site refers to his embellishment of these caves and that they were named Suvannagiriguhā. Thus the restoration of that vihāra by this ruler is confirmed. He made pilgrimages to places of religious importance such as Kālaniya, Mahagama and Mahiyāgana and Samanola and these were perhaps a means to win the good will of the people. Some of his inscriptions refer to the attempts he made to bring about the unification of the Saṅgha. In this connection it is sufficient to note that the efforts of Vijayabāhu I and Parākramabāhu I to purify the Saṅgha had produced but temporary results. In this manner Nissanka Malla made an energetic attempt to help the

---

1 Cv. Tr., II, p. 127, n.2.
2 Cv., LXXX, 22-23.
4 Cv., LXXX, 24; Ep. Zeyl, II, No. 29, p. 173, lines 29-33; No. 25, p.147, line 1; p.111, lines 9-10.
Sāsana: when it most needed royal patronage. However, that these services to help the course of Buddhism were not without a political motive is hinted at, when he appeals to the inhabitants of the country not to allow non-Buddhists such as the Cola and Kerala princes to aspire to the throne of Ceylon. The position is even clearer when he brushes aside the claims of the people of Govikula and declares that the Kaliṅga line alone had a rightful claim to the throne of Ceylon.

On the political plain Nissanka Malla seems to have maintained his authority throughout the island. The provenance of his inscriptions in widely scattered areas of the three kingdoms (tun-rajāya) shows that the impact of his administration was felt even in the outlying provinces. It is, however, difficult to believe that the central authority could carry the weight of its command into the distant areas so effectively as it did in the days of Parākramabahu I, but that Nissanka Malla tried his best to achieve that end is clear from the contents of his records. He travelled widely outside the capital and visited the out-lying provinces, and made an attempt to contact the people whose goodwill he desired to win. In spite of these efforts, that

2 Ibid., line 12 ff: p. 114, lines 21-23.
hard times had set in can be seen from some of his statements in
his own epigraphs. We have already referred to his appeal to his
subjects not to enthrone non-Buddhists such as the Cola and Kerala
princes. This statement shows that threats to his power from ex­
ternal sources were not ruled out. This statement appears some­
what strange as the Sinhalese never had Cola or Kerala princes on
the throne on their own choice. Kerala were an important element
in the army, and when they turned rebellious royal authority was
in great danger.\footnote{Cv., LX, 36-41: LXXIV, 44-46.}

The Vēlaikkāra Inscription of Vijayabāhu I informs us that even after expelling the Colas from Ceylon at the
end of a protracted struggle Vijayabāhu entrusted the Vēlakkāras
with the important function of being the custodians of the Tooth
Relic.\footnote{Ep. Zeyl., II, 252-255; Ep. Ind., XVIII, 330-38.}
This is regarded as a recognition of their influence, which
even Vijayabāhu had to reckon with. But, it is equally possible
that Vijayabāhu preferred to have foreign mercenaries entrusted with
this responsibility. Once the controlling hand of Parākramabāhu
was removed these mercenary Vēlakkāras must have gathered greater
confidence, and it is not strange if they even aspired to kingship
On the other hand, those elements who were opposed to the Kaliṅgas
could make common cause with these aspirants to royalty. That in
fact is what appears to have happened, for Nissānka Malla declares
'Those who join them and cause disturbances shall be called traitors'. The exclusion of the Pândyas from this indictment of Nissaṅka Malla against the Coḷas and Keralas has been interpreted to mean that the statement was in point of fact aimed at the Pândyas themselves. The danger from the Coḷas and Keralas could not have been underestimated, although the Pândya faction in Ceylon was a strong threat to the power of the Kâliṅgas in Ceylon. It would have been undiplomatic for Nissaṅka Malla to cast aspersions on the Pândyas, for the latter had close connections with the Sinhalese royalty. Parâkramabâhu's mahesi Lilâvatî was a princess of Pândyan stock, and the latter queen was an influential factor in the country for she ascended the throne on three occasions shortly after the reign of Nissaṅka Malla. Even the Chronicle refers to them with reservations, so much so that even the invader Parâkrama Pândya who occupied the throne at the time of Mâgha's invasions, and who suffered at the hands of the latter, is referred to in complimentary language. In these circumstances, we have no reason to be surprised at the Pândyas being excluded from the scope of Nissaṅka Malla's rebuke.

1 Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 29, 163-64.
3 Cv., LIX, 41; also see Genealogical Table V, U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, after page 850.
4 Cv., LXX, 51-53.
Nissanka Malla mentions another class of people, namely those of the Govikula, as being unfit to aspire to kingship. 'People of the Govi caste should never aspire to the dignity of kingship, (for this should be) like the crow aping the swan, the donkey the Saindhava steed, the worm the cobra king, the fire-fly the sun-shine, the snipe the elephant, the jackal the lion. However powerful the people of the Govi caste may be, they should not be elected to rule the kingdom. Those who pay obeisance to persons of the same class as themselves and render them the honours due to kings, and those, too, who accept from them offices and titles shall indeed be called traitors. Such people with their families and their worldly possessions will be rooted out as soon as a royal prince appears on the throne.'

What necessitated this indictment against the people of the Govikula is a moot point. The people of the Govikula represent in a broad sense the equivalent or counterpart of the Indian Vaisya caste, engaged in agriculture, trade, commerce and arts and crafts. By the time of Nissanka Malla this community seems to have increased its power and wealth and occupied positions of influence. Paranavitana has argued that kingship in Ceylon was of Vaisya rather than Kṣatriya origin in his examination of some of the royal titles of the early Sinhalese kings. Although that view has not gained ground it cannot be denied that the people of the Govikula were an important

---

community. That this particular class had shown signs of ambition to elevate themselves to kingship would not be an unreasonable inference. It is relevant to note here that, when Māgha invaded Ceylon, a good deal of his ruthless attack appears to have been directed against this community. The Culavamsa possibly refers to the people of the Govikula, who had increased their wealth and power, when it says: 'After they had put fetters on the wealthy and rich people and had tortured them and taken away all their possessions, they made poor people of them'. Their wealth appears to have consisted of 'villages and fields, houses and gardens, slaves and cattle and buffaloes' and so forth, and from this account we may infer that they were an important community in that society. Whereas Nissāṇka Malla adopted the peaceful method of appealing to the people not to elevate persons of the Govikula to kingship, Māgha resorted to violence and suppressed this class mercilessly. In the light of these circumstances, Nissāṇka Malla's indictment against the people of the Govikula appears to have been based on the fear of a threat to his power from that community.

While Nissāṇka Malla was faced with these odds it must have been a difficult task for him to maintain the unity of the country. He appealed to the people of Rohana not to open themselves to the rebuke of the inhabitants of Māyāraṭṭa (Māyaraththe) and Pihitiraṭṭa (Patiṭṭ-

1Cy., LXXX, 64, 76.
(harattha), and this statement shows that special effort was necessary to hold that province together with the other two kingdoms.\(^1\) The visits of the king to the tum rajaya (the three kingdoms, viz. Ruhunu, Mayā and Piti) and to such distant places in them as Yudaganāva, Kāliya, Devinuvara, appear to be a recognition of the need to hold his kingdom together through immense personal effort.\(^2\) To achieve that end he resorted to remind the people that he hailed from Simhapura in Kalinga, from where Vijaya, the first king of the Sinhalese, hailed and that he belonged to the same dynasty as Vijaya.\(^3\) He tried to strengthen his position on the throne on the strength of this claim. Missanka Malla also adds that he was invited to Ceylon by the kulajetu (Vijayabahu II ?) and that he enjoyed the positions of āpā (ādipāda) and himiā (svāmi) prior to his accession to the throne.\(^4\) His statements in favour of the divinity of kingship in the style of Manu that a king is a god in human form and his comparison of 'an upright king' to a Buddha are but a link in a chain of measures which had the calculated objective of reconciling the people of Ceylon to the rule of the Kalinga

---


\(^3\) Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 17, pp. 109-10, lines 4-7; p. 114, lines 22-23.

The bestowal of great tulābharas and the building of almshouses in and outside Ceylon, shorn of the evident exaggeration in the relevant passages, must be treated as part of his programme to enhance his position and goodwill in the eyes of his subjects. It is especially noteworthy that Nissaṅka Malla is one of the very few kings in this period who was alive to the need of the restoration of the irrigation works, apart from embarking on new projects. The chronicle is silent on this aspect, but some of his inscriptions would make us believe that some restoration work was undertaken, perhaps with limited success.

In the light of what has been stated in the foregoing paragraphs it may be inferred that Nissaṅka Malla, despite the stark realities of the political situation of his times, succeeded in giving the island more than a semblance of unity for nearly a decade. But extreme caution would be necessary before accepting his claims of conquests abroad. He claims to have exacted tribute from the Cola, the Pāṇḍya and various other countries. His general named Lak-Vijaya-Sīṅgu-Senevi-Tāvurunāvan is stated to have offered his services for the conquest of Daṃbadiva but, before the general could

\[1\] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 17, p. 113, lines 4-5; Laws of Manu, VII, 5, 7, 8.


\[4\] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 25, p. 148; his other inscriptions repeat these episodes.
proceed far in this war the Pāṇḍya king and his mother are said to have surrendered their kingdom, 'leaving to us only a village that will be enough for our maintenance'.\(^1\) It is recorded in his inscriptions that he crossed into the Pāṇḍya country twice accompanied by the fourfold army, and that he ascended the scale pans at Rāmeśvarām where a devālaya named Nissaṅkēśvara... was built.\(^2\) That is not all, for we are told that he formed friendly alliances with the princes of the Kārnāta, Nellūru, Gauḍa, Kaliṅga, Tiliṅga, Gurjara, Aramaṇa, Kamboja and other countries which were desirous of his friendship, but struck terror into those who did not desire such friendship.\(^3\) From the nature of these statements, the reluctance that some scholars have shown to accept these great claims is justified.\(^4\)

Unfortunately the Cūlavamsa has not a word on these conquests. Considering his services to the Order, it is strange that the chronicler should have observed silence on an aspect of his reign which could add to the glory of that ruler. The Sinhalese chronicles, too,

\(^1\)Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 25, p. 148, B.

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 152, D.

\(^3\)Ibid., p. 152, C.

are silent on the exploits of Nissanka Malla in foreign lands.\textsuperscript{1} What we may infer from this silence as well as the extravagant nature of his claims is that his belligerent intentions were hardly crowned with worthwhile success, even if we concede that he did cross over to South India, on the strength of his record at Rāmesvaram.\textsuperscript{2} At best, the position appears to be an attempt to dwell on reflected glory which perhaps lingered on from the days of Parākramabāhu I. It is repeatedly mentioned in several of his records that he chastised the rulers of Karnāṭa, Nellūru, Gauḍa, Kaliṅgu, Ti(liṅgu), Gu(rjāra), and so forth, whoever did not desire his friendship, and caused tribute and princesses to be brought to his harem.\textsuperscript{3} Paranavitana is of opinion that Nissanka Malla was backed by naval assistance from the Śrīvijaya empire, a contention which has already evoked serious criticism.\textsuperscript{4} Even if Nissanka Malla had a few princesses in his harem who came from some of these countries it need not cause surprise, for the Sinhalese kings had traditions of friendly relations with some of these countries, particularly from the time of Vijayabhāhu I. Kaliṅga,

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{1}Pjv., 107; Rjv., 36; Rjv.Tr. p. 52.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{4}J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. VI, p. 34; VIII, 125-40.
\end{flushleft}
Karnāta, Aramaṇa and Kamboja are especially noteworthy, and Sinhalese kings had matrimonial links with the royal houses of some of them.¹ If the rulers of these lands sent some of their princesses to Ceylon, it must have given ample scope for Nissaṅka Malla to declare before his subjects that the countries concerned heeded to his command. On the other hand, we have already shown that Nissaṅka Malla's task within his own kingdom was not an easy one, and there are clear signs of troubles he had to reckon with.² In these circumstances we would hesitate to concede to this monarch his eloquent claims to far flung conquests across the seas. That, however, is not to deny the credit due to him for the attempts he made to improve the lot of his subjects and to restore the Sāsana amidst great odds. Nissaṅka Malla is undoubtedly the most noteworthy monarch among the successors of Parākramabāhu I, who ruled from Polonnaruva.

The Cūlavamsa and the Sinhalese Chronicles do not mention the manner in which the reign of Nissaṅka Malla ended. We have no way of ascertaining whether he too was slain or deposed like nearly all his successors on the throne of Polonnaruva. If he came to a tragic end, it would not have escaped the notice of the author of the Pūjāvaliya. Nissaṅka Malla was succeeded by his son Virabāhu,

¹Cv., LIX, 29-30; LX, 24-27; LVIII, 8-10; LXXX, 6-8; LXXVI, 35.
who 'ruled for one night and fell to the power of death'.

We learn from the *Pūjāvaliya* that Viñrabāhu was put to death by Tāvuru Senevirat because he was of 'unequal birth'. We have the instance of Kassapa I (473-91) who was of 'unequal birth' and Moggallāna I (491-508) who was of 'equal birth' - both sons of Dhātusena (455-73). Kassapa's accession to the throne was preceded by the murder of his father, and many years of fighting with his brother of 'equal birth' marred his reign which saw little peace. It was considered necessary for a king to be of equal birth on the father's as well as the mother's side. Sinhalese kings in their marriage alliances sought to live up to this prerequisite. In the epigraphs of the Sinhalese kings they took pains to make out that they were of 'equal birth'. As such, if the succession of Viñrabāhu was challenged on that account, we have to assume that he was a son of Nissāṅka Malla by one of the many princesses brought to his harem from foreign lands, who was not quite equal in rank according to the then prevalent notions. Here again the difficulty is the statement of Nissāṅka Malla that Viñrabāhu was 'my own legi-

---

1 *Cv.*, LXXX, 27.
2 *Piv.*, 107.
3 *Piv.*, 99.
As pointed out by B. J. Perera, the undue stress given by Nissaṅka Malla to this point was perhaps to make up for some inadequacy, and the Pujāvaliya statement may not be unfounded. The fact that general Tāvuru, having put Virabāhu to death, raised Nissaṅka Malla's younger brother Vikramabāhu to the throne shows that he had no opposition to the Kaliṅga family as such but to the unfortunate prince Virabāhu. It is only a few years later that queen Kalyānavatī is said to have 'separated the four castes which have been mixed'. A statement which suggests that distinctions of birth must have mattered in the selection of nominees to the throne. Hence the demand for princes on the throne to be of 'equal birth' can be appreciated.

Vikramabāhu's reign was very brief and lasted only three months. He was put to death by a prince called Codagānga referred to as a nephew (bhāginīyya) of Nissaṅka Malla, and he too could reign only nine months. The Upāsakajanaṇalakara mentions a Codagānga who is described as a Vañño Sāmanta in the Pāṇḍya country. The author of this Pali work states that this Codgānga built Vihāras.
for Buddhist monks who left Ceylon when the island was ravaged by the Tamils. This chieftain appears to have been a Pāṇḍya feudatory. Therefore, he may not be identified with the Codaganga who was the sister's son of Nissanka Malla.¹

At this stage we may draw attention to a prominent feature of the political life of this period, namely, the emergence of several powerful generals as a determining factor in the succession to the throne. One such general, on whom Nissanka Malla himself leaned very heavily was Lak-Vijaya-Sīṅgu-Senevi-Tāvurunāvan, who figures prominently in the account of the Pāṇḍya conquests contained in the epigraphs of that monarch.² Shortly before the accession of Nissanka Malla to the throne a general called Vijayāyān-tān-nāvan, who is stated to have protected the person of the king from Ruvan-dambu, served Vijayabahu II (1186-87), the unfortunate successor of Parākramabahu I.³ In an inscription of Vijayabahu II it is recorded that this general quelled a revolt which broke out on the day after his consecration.⁴ Two other important personages were Lak-Vijaya-Sīṅgu-Kit-Senevi, who deposed Codaganga

¹ Gv., LXXX, 29; Upāsaka janālaṅkāra, see verses in the Colophon.
to place queen Līlāvatī - mahēśī of Parākramabāhu I - on the throne, and the general called Lak Vijaya Siṅgu Senevi Ābonāvan, who raised successively Sāhasamalla and evidently Kalyāṇavatī and Dhar- māsoka, too, to the throne. Although these are the more important personages who figure prominently in the lithic records and the Chronicles, there must have been others who played less significant roles. There is no doubt that these generals were a power behind the throne, the rulers themselves having hardly any opportunity to assert their authority without incurring the wrath of the generals who helped them to the throne.

Opinion among scholars as to the identification of these generals has not been unanimous. The fact that their activities cover a comparatively brief period of about twenty years, along with the similarity of the forms of their names and titles, and the lack of more precise data on their background, are some of the difficulties one is faced with in an attempt at their identification. Wickramasinghe was of opinion that Lak-Vijaya-Siṅgu-Senevi-Tāvurunāvan, Lak-Vijaya-Siṅgu-Kit-Senevi and Lak Vijaya Siṅgu Senevi Ābonāvan all refer to one and the same general. Paranavitana has expressed the view that Lak-Vijaya-Siṅgu-Ābonā who placed Sāhasamalla on the

---


throne, and Lak-Vijaya-Singu-Senevi-Tavurunāvanvan who led Nissanka Malla's expedition to the Pāṇḍya country and who was also in charge of building the Vaṭadāgē at Polonnaruva, refer to one and not two personages. This was in fact the opinion of Geiger too. The view that the personages in question are three different individuals has also been expressed.

With regard to the identification of Lak-Vijaya-Singu-Senevi-Abōnāyan with Ayasmanta of the Gūlavamsa and Elulu Abō-Senevirat of the Pujāvaliya and the Rājāvaliya there cannot be serious difficulty. According to the Gūlavamsa Ayasmanta belonged to the Khandhāvara-kula. The Chronicles do not give further references to the Khandhāvara family, but Sinhalese literary works of the fifteenth century contain allusions to members of this family. The Salalihini Sandesaya, a poem composed in the thirty-fifth year of the reign of Parākramabāhu VI, by Totagamuva Rāhula Thera - one of the greatest literary figures of that century - states that its author belonged to the Kandavuru-

---

2 Cv. Tr., II, p. 130, n.2.
4 Cv., LXXX, 33-34; Pjav., 107-108; Rjv.Tr., 52-53.
5 Cv., LXXX, 37-38.
kula (Pali: Khandhāvara-kula), and that he was like unto a gem (set) lamp in the mansion of the Kandavuru family. In the Kāvyasekharaya, another literary work of the same author, the latter is again referred to as a member of the Kandavuru-kula. The name suggests that they were worshippers of god Skandha. Although this family appears to have played a prominent role in the politics of the troubled days that followed the death of Parākramabāhu I, its generals are not heard of again. The tragic end of the generals in question, as we shall/in the sequel, appears to have led to the political eclipse of that family.

As we noted earlier, this general is called Āyasamanta in the Cūlavamsa, Lak-Vijaya-Singu-Senevi-Ābōnāvan in the inscriptions, and Elulu Ābō Senevirat in the Pūjavalīya. One can clearly recognize the Sinhalese equivalent of Āyasamanta - 'one who possesses long life' in Ābō. The Sinhalese word 'ā' is used in the sense of 'life span'.

\(^2\)Kāvyasekharaya, see Colophon.

\(^2\)Kāvyasekharaya, canto I, verse 23.

\(^3\)Malalasekara, Dictionary of Pali Proper Names, 712.
(Pali: āya; Skt: āyuj), and 'bō' is the same as 'bōhō' (Pali: bahu) which means 'much' or 'many', an adjective indicating quantity.\(^1\) As such Āyasamanta of the Cūlavamsa could be identified with the Abō Senevirat of the Pūjavaliya and Ābhāvan of the inscription referred to above. However we are not free of all difficulties, for the general in question belonged to the Khandhāvara-kula according to the Pali Chronicle, and to the Lolu-pālu-kula according to the epigraph of Sāhasamalla.\(^2\) The form Lolu-pālu-kula finds no mention in the lithic records of this period or in the Chronicles, but the Pūjavaliya appears to preserve the name of the general's family as given in the epigraph, when it refers to him as Elulu-Abō-Senevirat.\(^3\) The relation between the two forms of the name of his family as given in the two sources, cannot be satisfactorily explained in the present state of our knowledge. But, as will be shown in the sequel, there is no discrepancy with regard to the events with which he was associated, in the literary works as well as in the epigraph, and we may hold that Āyasamanta and Ābo- nāvan are one and the same general.


\(^2\) Cv., LXXX, 37; Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 36, 225, lines 16-17; the word Dittiti of which the reading is uncertain precedes Ābo- nāvan, p. 225.

\(^3\) Piy., 107.
One of the arguments adduced by Wickramasinghe in favour of the view that Lak-Vijaya-Siṅgu-Senevi-Abonāvan and Lak-Vijaya-Kit-Senevi refer to the same person is that Āyasmanda (Skt. Ayuṣmat) is an honorific title applied especially to senior Buddhist monks and elderly persons in high positions and that Senevi-Abonāvan would mean 'the venerable general'. Wickramasinghe is probably right in his observation, but that is, however, no argument in favour of the supposition that Kit-Senevi and Abonāvan denote the same person. On the other hand, even if Abonāvan were an epithet, by common usage it may have acquired the significance of a proper name when it was applied to that general. Two other points he makes are the close similarity of the two names Lak-Vijaya-Siṅgu-Kit Senevi and Lak-Vijaya-Siṅgu-Senevi-Abonāvan, and the contemporaneity of the bearers of these names, as well as the similarity of the role they played in the politics of a period of only twelve years. The similarity of nomenclature is no bar to differentiating the individuals in question. Some of the early Sinhalese kings are known to us in their epigraphs with almost identical titles; Duṭṭha-Gāmaṇi Abhaya and Vaṭṭa-Gāmaṇi Abhaya both appear in the inscriptions attributed to them as Devana-piya Maharaja Gamaṇi Abaya, and there are of course other examples. Parākramabāhu I had several generals with the names Kitti and Rakkha,


with titles that are similar, but they were different individuals.\(^1\) Besides, the contemporaneity of the generals with whom we are concerned and the similarity of nomenclature cannot be considered serious arguments, for, during these twenty years events were swift-moving, with kings frequently deposed or assassinated, and the brevity of the period in which they appear is therefore not a difficulty either. Even powerful generals would have required extraordinary ability to weather these storms, in this brief period of about two decades. The fate of the generals appears to have been not so different from that of the kings on an ever uncertain throne.

So far as the name Kittī is concerned, it may be regarded as a personal name — a name borne by Vijayabāhu in his early years, and by many Sinhalese generals. The view that the three forms of the names of the generals, Tāvurunāvan, Kit Senevi and Ābonāvan, all refer to one and the same person meets with difficulties. The Pujāvaliya leaves no room to equate Tāvuru Senevirat, who figures there as the slayer of Virabāhu, with Elulu Ābō Senevirat who elevated Sāhasamalla, Kalyāṇavatī and Dharmāsoka to the throne, with the Kit Senevi who slew Coḍagaṅga and placed Parākramabāhu's queen Līlāvatī on the throne.\(^2\)

The author of the Pujāvaliya was removed from these events only by

\(^1\) Cv., LXX, 278-284; LXXVI, 59ff; LXXIV, 178-180, 89-98; LXXII, 161-163, 41, 55 ff.

\(^2\) Piv., 107-108; Cv., LXXX, 27-44.
about sixty years, and the latter text and for that matter even
the Cūlavamsa mention them as three different individuals.¹ B. J.
Perera has rightly pointed out that these generals figure in dis-

tinctly different episodes.² Moreover, if they are given separate
identity based on the order of their occurrence in the lithic records,
that would be in harmony with the chronological order in which they
appear in the Chronicles. Lak-Vijaya-Singu-Senevi-Tāvurunāvan
(Pīv.: Tāvuru Senevirat) figures in the epigraphs of Nissānka Malla
as one of his trusted generals, and as the slayer of Virabāhu in the
Chronicles, and his name is not mentioned in the inscriptions or the
Pūjāvalīya there after. Kit Senevit (Pīv.: Kit Senevirat) figures
as the general who deposed Codagānaga and placed Līlavatī on the
throne.³ Ayasmanta (Pīv.: Elulu Abō) is met with in the Chronicles
as the general who was instrumental in elevating Kalyāṇavatī and
Dharmāsoka to the throne and deposing the former as well as Sāha-
samalla, who also appears to have risen to the sovereignty of Ceylon
with his aid, according to the epigraph of the latter.⁴ Sāhasamalla's
inscription is in no way in conflict with the narrative in the Chronicles

¹ Pīv., 107-108.
³ Cv., LXXX, 30-31; Pīv., 107.
with regard to the activities of general Ayasmanta (Abō), but gives us the additional information not contained in the Chronicles, that this general was responsible not only for the deposition of Sāhasamalla, but also for his accession to the throne amidst great opposition. It is very unlikely that the Fujēvaliya would have used three different names in the narrative of events which were linked together in a comparatively brief period, if the same individual was meant. It has also been pointed out that, while Ayasmanta belonged to the Khandhāvara-kula, Kit Senevi was a member of the Ruvanpā-kula as given in the Sasadāvata.¹

In support of this position, it may also be observed that, while Lak-Vijaya-Siṅgu-Senevi-Tāvurunāvan was a loyal and ardent supporter of the Kaliṅga line, Kit Senevi upheld the claims of queen Līlāvatī who was of Pāṇḍya stock, and the two generals appear as members of two rival factions – those of the Kaliṅgas and the Pāṇḍyas. This, however, is not to deny the possibility that a general could change his allegiance from one faction to another, but in this instance that was very unlikely. Hence we may infer that Lak-Vijaya-Siṅgu-Senevi-Tāvurunāvan, Lak-Vijaya-Siṅgu-Kit-Senevi, and Lak-Vijaya-Siṅgu-Senevi-Ābonāvan were three separate generals who played a prominent role in the power politics of this period.

We have so far not considered the identity of the general Vijaya-yän-tän-nävan, who served Vijayabahu II faithfully and quelled a revolt which broke out on the day after his consecration as recorded in the only extant epigraph of this monarch. \(^1\) Whether he was identical with the general of Nissáka Malla, Lak-Vijaya-Sing-Senevi-Tavurunävan, whom we have already considered, is difficult to establish, but the probability is that they were two different generals, who served the Kaliṅga family faithfully. Tävuru, which forms part of the name of Nissáka Malla's general, distinguishes the latter from Vijayabahu's general. Wickramasinghe proposes to identify Vijaya-yän-tän-nävan with the general Bandärapota Pirivatubim Vijaya-yän-nävan, who figures in Kalyañavati's inscription at the Ruvanvëlī Dagūba,\(^2\) referred to in that record as a powerful minister even at the time of Parákramabahu I.\(^3\) This general, however, does not figure in the politics of the intervening period of about fifteen years, which had seen the rise and fall of five rulers on the throne up to the accession of queen Kalyañavati. This identification which is quite probable would lead us to assume that the general in question was forced into the background and suffered a temporary eclipse of power in the intervening period.


From Vijayabahu's inscription referred to above we learn that this ruler came from Kalinga to take over the reins of government in Ceylon, on the invitation of Parakramabahu I. In that record it is stated that Vijayayān-tān-nāvan protected the person of the king from Ruvandambu, a place which must be sought in Kalinga where Vijayabahu hailed from. It is clear from this statement that this general came over to Ceylon from the mainland, along with Vijayabahu II.


2. Wickramasinghe has noted a suggestion of Sir D. B. Jayatilaka that yān-tān-nāvan may mean the 'chief of the bed chamber'. (Ep. Zeyl. II, p. 179, note 2.) The word yān in Sinhalese literature conveys among others the meaning 'bed'. (Dal. S., 49 Kavsiluma, v. 598). tān may be the same as Skt. sthāna, and nāvan as Skt. nāyaka or nātha. The word nāvan is frequently mentioned in Sinhalese inscriptions and literature as part of personal names and titles. Badalnāvan, Ep. Zeyl., II, p. 225, lines 18-19; V, 21, B, line 2; Loke arakmenāvan, IV, 87, line 4; Dampasaṅgināvan, Dal. S., 54. Kavsiluma, op. cit., verse 598 gives yahan tan (Skt. saṅgha-nāthāna) for 'bed chamber'. Therefore there is some basis for this suggestion. But if there was such an important officer in the Sinhalese court, then we should expect reference to him in the inscriptions and the literature of the period. However, no reference to an officer called Yān-tān-nāvan has been found. In this connection attention may be drawn to a number of South Indian Inscriptions (S.I.T., XIII, No. 330, 175: No. 333, 125: No. 100, 48: A.R.E., No. 27 of 1922: No. 321 of 1927) where the term Tennavan occurs as a prefix to personal names, indicating their southern origin. Though it may appear that there is a connection between the Sinhalese term and the Tamil word Tennavan there is no basis on which it could be confirmed. Thus both these suggestions must remain tentative in the present state of our knowledge.
The word Tāvuru, which occurs as part of the name of Nissānka Malla's general Tāvurunāvan has given rise to similar speculation, but so far no satisfactory explanation has been found. Paranavitana has hinted at the possibility of a Malayan origin for this word, but the term yet remains unexplained. The Sinhalese word tāvuru or tahavuru would be the equivalent of Sanskrit स्थायरम् which means 'firm'. From this context it can of course be postulated that Tāvurunāvan conveyed the sense of 'firm leader or general', but this would not preclude the possibility that the word goes back to some Tamil origin which is now obscure.

The data are unfortunately very limited so that it is impossible to arrive at finality on their identification or origin. If the Tamil garb of their nomenclature is conceded, it would not be unreasonable to believe that at least some of these generals who played so prominent a role in the politics of this period were of South Indian origin. We have already seen that the South Indian element in the Sinhalese military organisation was quite considerable. So far as general Vijayāyān-tūn-nāvan is concerned, we can be fairly certain that he came from the mainland as appears from the Polonnaruva Inscription of Vijayabāhu II. Perhaps he was not the only one of that kind.

2Sorata, Sumaṅgala Sabdakosaya, 367, 368; Sidat Sangarava, 81; Dhampiyā Atuvā Gūtapadaya, 128.
We may now return to our survey of the history of this period in which the generals whose identity was considered above played a leading role. Tāvuru Senevirat, having slain Virabāhu, appears to have placed Vikramabāhu on the throne.\(^1\) According to the Čulavamsa: Vikramabāhu was a younger brother of Niśānka Malla.\(^2\) From the Ḍādāge Vestibule Wall Inscription of the latter we learn that Vikramabāhu held the position of Ṛpā in the reign of Niśānka Malla.\(^3\) He was also associated with the tulōbhāras which the latter claims to have held.\(^4\) In spite of his association with the royal family and possibly also with the administration during the reign of his elder brother, he was not equal to the task before him. After a brief reign of three months he was put to death by Coḍagaṅga.

Some manuscripts of the Pūjāvaliya give Vikramabāhu a reign of three years (tun avuruddak). This is obviously a corruption in the text, for a copyist could have easily mistaken tun vasak (චෝඩවෙසක = three years) for tun masak (චෝඩවෙසක = three months), which the original text contained. The length of Vikramabāhu's reign, therefore may be taken as three months as given in the Čulavamsa and the

---

\(^{1}\)Pv., p. 107.  
\(^{2}\)Cv., LXXX, 28.  
more reliable manuscripts of the Pujavaliya.¹

Both these sources are in agreement that Codaganga, who put Vikramabahu to death, was a sister's son of Nissanka Malla (Pali: bhāgineyya, Sinh: బెంగా).² Codaganga reigned for only nine months for he was put to death by general Kitti to whom we have already referred.³ General Kitti placed queen Lilāvatī - the first mahesī of Parākramabahu I on the throne.

Geiger notes that the Rajavaliya mentions Codaganga as the general who carried on the government for three years for queen Lilāvatī, and that Kitti is not mentioned at all in that text.⁴ But the printed text of the Rajavaliya contains no such discrepancy when it states: 'After him, the Commander of the Army put Codaganga to death, and caused the kingdom to be administered for three years by the principal queen of (the late) king Parākramabahu'.⁵ The commander of the army in question can be no other but general Kitti referred to by name both in the Cūlavamsa and the Pujavaliya.⁶ Hence, we see no discrepancy between the Pali Chronicle and the Sinhalese Chronicle at this stage of the narrative.

¹P.jv., 107, note 7; Cv., LXXX, 28.
²Cv., LXXX, 29; P.jv., 107.
³Cv., LXXX, 30-31; P.jv., 107.
⁵R.jv., 52.
⁶See above n° 3.
From the death of Nissanka Malla up to the accession of queen Lilävatī to the throne we have seen the tragic end of three Kalinga princes within one year. We have also referred to the threats to the continuation of the Kalinga dynasty, which Nissanka Malla appears to have foreseen and attempted to remedy. If the power of the Kalinga family was challenged by the faction that desired to have a Pândyan prince on the throne, as well as by the growing importance of the Govi-kula and such external elements as the Colas and the Kerálas, then that family appears to have been seriously weakened in its efforts at meeting the mounting opposition from these quarters by the disunity within the royal family itself. The murder of Vikramabahu by Codagaṅga reveals serious disunity within the royal family, and that agreement on the succession was difficult to achieve, a factor which must have added to the strength of the opposing elements. Though we cannot be certain, it is possible that Codagaṅga and Vikramabahu were the two Kalinga princes named Colangaṅga and Vikkantabahu, who lived at the court of Gajabahu II. This identification is not improbable, for we have already seen that at least Vikramabahu was previously associated in the administration of the country in the capacity of Ṛṣe, during the reign of Nissanka Malla. Hence, if these princes with their associations at the court spread over many years harboured ambition to succeed to the throne, it would not be surprising. And

\[1\] Cv., LXX, 238.
Vikramabahu as Nissanka Malla's brother, and Coḍagaṅga as the latters sister's son, could both point to precedents in support of their claims. These rival claims and the means adopted to achieve them had unfortunate consequences that weakened the Kaliṅga family in particular, and added to the general political instability in the island.

The reign of queen Līlavatī lasted three years, and during this period the real authority must have been exercised by general Kitti, who elevated her to the throne. The fact that she occupied the throne on two more occasions subsequently would show that she was acceptable to the courtiers and the generals who sponsored her. Līlavatī was the first mahesi of Parākramabahu I, the memory of whose greatness was still fresh in the minds of the people, and on that account she is likely to have wielded considerable influence in the country.

Queen Līlavatī is referred to as a member of the Solar as well as the Lunar dynasties. Being a daughter of Siri-Vallabha and Sugalā, she was properly speaking of Pāṇḍya stock, and the Dāthāvamsa - a literary work written in her reign positively states that she was

---


of the Panduvamsa. General Kitti, therefore, was a protagonist of the Pāṇḍya faction as against Tāvurunāvan who, we have seen, was an ardent supporter of the Kaliṅga family. What fate overtook Tāvurunāvan ultimately is not known from our sources, but the probability is that he either perished, or was forced to the background in the turmoil that led to the emergence of general Kitti and the Pāṇḍya faction who, for a time, gained the upper hand.

Though the Cūlavamsa would have us believe that she ruled without mishap (nirupaddavam) and her inscriptions state that the people and the Buddhist Order were in a 'peaceful state', there is some reason to believe that her reign was disturbed by foreign invasions, quite apart from the threats of the factions who wished to have a Kaliṅga prince on the throne. Paranavitana has drawn attention to a verse in the Sasadāvata, a poem composed under the patronage of Līlāvatī's Prime Minister, general Kitti, where the latter is praised as 'a lion in destroying the pride of the herd of elephants - the Colas'. The Paraphrase of Sasadāvata, in justifying the praise of Kitti, adds that

1Dāthāvamsa, I, v.5; see Genealogical Table, Cv.Tr., I, p. 358.
2Cv., LXXX, 30-31.
he was like unto a lion in destroying the herd of elephants - the Colas, for he defeated the latter on three occasions. Once they are said to have landed at Mēvaṭutota and marched up to Anurādhapura, and on the second occasion having landed at Salāvattoṭa they are said to have marched up to Śripura. The Paraphrase adds that on each of these occasions general Kitti defeated the Cola invaders.¹

Unfortunately Līlāvatī's inscriptions do not refer to these episodes. According to one of her inscriptions, however, 'By creating a council of wise, brave and faithful ministers, she has freed her own kingdom from the dangers (arising) from other kingdoms'.² One may wonder whether this contains a hint of these calamities which marred her reign. But it would be unsafe to give this passage such an interpretation as 'other kingdoms' (para-mandala) can simply mean the other two principalities, namely Māyāratha and Rohaṇa, a probability which is made the more likely by the reference to her attainment to the sovereignty of the Tri-Simhala, in the early portions of the same record.³ Moreover 'paramandala' is also

found in the Cūlavamsa and in inscriptions in the sense of 'the other principality'. Hence, we are reluctant to consider the passage in that epigraph as a reflection of the events in question.

Līlāvatī's Cola contemporary in the mainland appears to have been Kulottuṅga III, whose initial regnal year has been placed about the year 1178, and whose last known date from his records is his fortieth year, which would be 1217. The three-year reign of Līlāvatī has been placed between the year 1197 and 1200. Kulottuṅga III has been referred to as the last great Cola Monarch and, like his predecessors Rajādhīrāja II, he tried zealously to maintain the integrity of the Cola empire, which was shaking before the growing imperialism of the Pāṇḍyas and the rebellious feudatories. Praśastis of this ruler from the ninth year onwards claim victories over Ceylon. An inscription of his ninth year from Cidambaram says that Ilagam was subdued and that the Siṅgala soldiers had their noses cut off and rushed into the sea. An inscription of the sixteenth year from Tiruviḍamarudūr refers to an order of Kulottuṅga to 'capture Ilam in the South so that the Tennavar (Southerners: Pāṇḍya, Pāṇḍya,

---


2 The Colas, 375, 379.


4 The Colas, 375 ff.

5 A.R.E., 547 of 1902; S.Ind.Insc. III, 86; Nellore Inscriptions, N.85.
Kerala and Śiṅgala (?) may come and prostrate themselves, and the head of the Śiṅgalavan may be cut off, fill the wavy sea to make a causeway.\(^1\) A record from Tirumānākuli dated in his twenty-first year says that Kulōṭṭuṅga adorned with his feet the crown of the Ceylonese king (Ilāttān) in order that he may prosper.\(^2\) As late as his thirty-fourth year Kulōṭṭuṅga claims to have conquered Ceylon in a record from Pudukkoṭṭah state.\(^3\)

Paranavitana states that Kulōṭṭuṅga's inscriptions from his twelfth year to his twentyninth year refer to the conquest of Ceylon.\(^4\) Properly speaking his claims to the conquest of Ceylon extend beyond that date to his thirty-fourth year, as known from the Pudukkoṭṭah inscriptions referred to above. The earliest mention of victories over Ceylon is in fact not his twelfth but his tenth year.\(^5\) If the initial regnal year of Kulōṭṭuṅga is placed at 1178, the period of these references would be 1188 to 1222, a period which covers the reigns of thirteen kings of Ceylon from the commencement of the reign of Nissanka Malla right up to the reign of Māgha.\(^6\)

\(^1\) A.R.E., 288 of 1907, The Colas, 380 ff.
\(^2\) A.R.E., 170 of 1902.
\(^3\) 163, 166 of Pudukottai Inscriptions.
\(^5\) Nellore Inscriptions, N.85.
It is not impossible that the country was invaded by the Tamils during this period of political instability. The Cūlavamsa and a few inscriptions make vague references to such invasions, but do not give us sufficient data to warrant definite conclusions. The Mișipe Slab Inscription of the army commander Bhāma and the Bōpiṭiya Slab Inscription of queen Kalyāṇavatī speak of the Tamil menace in the latter's reign. The Mișipe Slab Inscription records that in the eighth year of Kalyāṇavatī, Tamil forces landed in Ceylon, destroyed the minister Āti, and 'swept over the whole of Lāṅkā in the manner of world consuming flames at the end of an aeon having destroyed the entire social structure and the religious organisation'. Calculating from the certain date of the accession of Sahasamalla which took place in the year 1200, the eighth year of Kalyāṇavatī would be 1210, in which these Tamil forces would have landed in Ceylon. Now this would show that the claims of Kulōttuṅga to have conquered Ceylon are not mere stylistic exaggerations, but that they have some claim to the truth. As the claims of Kulōttuṅga to have conquered Ceylon date back to a

1Ep. Zeyl., V, No. 12, 158-59; Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 32, p. 192, the word kandavura is translated as 'stronghold'; see, however, Pīv., 117, 131 where this term refers to Polomaruva.


period much anterior to the eighth year of Kalyāṇavatī, it is not unlikely that he invaded Ceylon more than once. Perhaps the allusion in the Sasadāvata and the details given in its sanne referred to above, contain a reiteration of such an invasion, which could very probably have taken place in the confusion that followed the death of Nissāka Malla and continued into the reign of Līlāvatī, in which they took place according to that text. Nilakanta Sastri hesitates to give credit to the Sasadāvata reference as well as to the claims of Kulōtuṇga on the ground that they are too vague.\(^1\)

The caution shown by Nilakanta Sastri is very often justified, for the Sinhalese kings as well as the Colas made extravagant claims to conquests, often without foundation. But in this instance, the details given in the Sasadāvata Sanne coupled with the troubled political situation at the time are too significant to be dismissed. It is true that Kulōtuṇga was too preoccupied with the domestic front in the suppression of turbulent feudatories and guarding against the rising power of the Pāṇḍyas, and the claims of conquests in Malay Peninsula would be unfounded, for they receive no confirmation from that quarter.\(^2\) But we have seen the reverses suffered by the forces of Parākramabāhu I in South India at the hands of the Colas, and in

\(^1\) The Colas, 412, note 76.

\(^2\) The Colas, 377-398.
continuation of the success of Rājādhirāja II, his predecessor, if Kulottuṅga raided Ceylon by way of retaliation making capital out of the political confusion in the island, it could not be regarded as an improbable course of events. The invasions themselves would not have produced marked dividends for the Colas as in the days of Rājendra I (1012-44) at the heyday of Cola imperialism, but they would have tended to aggravate the political instability which then prevailed in Ceylon. However, this form of chastisement would have given some justification for Kulottuṅga to boast in his records that he was a conqueror of Ceylon.

Regarding Līlāvati's successor Sāhasamalla, all that we learn from the Cūlavamsa is that he was of the Okkāka family and that he ruled two years. The Sinhalese Chronicles do not add to our knowledge of this ruler either. The Rājāvaliya which refers to him as a king of the Okkāka family and not by name, gives him a reign of nine years, an unlikely length in view of the circumstances which preceded and followed his accession to the throne. Fortunately this ruler has left behind an important inscription which gives useful information pertaining to his reign not contained in any other source. We are told that he was born in Simhapura as a son of king

---

1 Cv., LXXX, 32.
2 Piv., 107; Rjv., 43.
Sri Jayagopa of the Kalinga Cakravarti Dynasty by queen Lokamahadevi, and adds that he was a brother of Nissanka Malla. Obviously, Sahasamalla was a son of Sri Jayagopa - the father of Nissanka Malla, by a different queen, namely Lokamahadevi. It is stated that on the death of his brother Nissanka Malla, Lolupuluku Dutti Abonavan, an adhigar of Ceylon, in collaboration with his friend Lolupuluku Budanalvan, who were desirous of reinstating the Kalinga family on the throne of Ceylon, sent to Simhapura a Kalinga noble named Mallikarjuna, and invited Sahasamalla to come over and occupy the throne of Ceylon. In response to this request the latter set out from Simhapura, and after two years during the course of which the adversaries who were opposed to the succession of Sahasamalla to the throne were subjugated, he became king. We learn that during these two years Sahasamalla had to remain at Kahakondapatnam (Tangakondapatnam?) in the Cola country until his supporters referred to above suppressed the opposition to his succession and made the conditions favourable for his arrival in the island. In recognition of their services Abonavan was granted the rank of senevirat and was made Prime Minister (agra-mantri). This minister was granted land and other riches, while his mother was given the title Lahkutilaka-mahadevi.

In addition to these data, this record contains a very important detail, namely the exact date of his accession to the throne, as Wednesday, the 12th day of the waxing moon in the month of Binara after the expiration of 1743 years, 3 months, and 27 days of the Buddhist era. This is indeed the first known instance of the use of the Buddhist era in dating a public document of which the date has been satisfactorily established. Fleet has worked out this date and has arrived at the result that his accession took place on Wednesday, 23rd August 1200, which is regarded as a definitely fixed point in the later chronology of Ceylon.

From this account it appears that Līlavatī would have had to face serious opposition from the generals, who worked hard to uphold the cause of the Kalinga princes. That would strengthen the possibility of the Colas having made capital out of that situation to invade Ceylon. We have also referred to the general Ābonāvan of this record earlier, whose identification was considered above.

We receive no further information on Lāmkādhikāra Lolupūḷū-kulū Budalnāvan, who collaborated with Ābonāvan to promote the cause.

---

3 Cv., LXXX, 33-34; Pīv., 107-108.
of Sāhasamalla. He belonged to the same family as Ābonāvan. In the Panākaṛuva Copper Plate Inscription of Vijayabāhu I, we meet a personage called Ruhunu Daṇănāyaka Sitnarubim Budalnāvan, who looked after Vijayabāhu and his family in the days of adversity, when that royal family fled in fear of the Colas, who had taken control of Rājarattha. In that record, however, the family to which Vijayabāhu's benefactor belonged is not indicated. It is not improbable that the Budalnāvan of Sāhasamalla's record was a descendant of that family, which protected the royal family during the time of Vijayabāhu I. Budalnāvan of Vijayabāhu's Copper Plate was an important personage, for he was the Daṇănāyaka of Rohana, and if we grant that Budalnāvan of Sāhasamalla's record was a descendant of the family to which the former belonged, then it would appear that Sāhasamalla had protagonists to champion his cause, who had traditions of royal service rooted in the past.

As to the name of the place in the Cola country, where Sāhasamalla stayed two years until the conditions in Ceylon improved, the reading in the text is not free of doubt. Wickramasinghe gives Kaha-koṇḍa, Taṅgakoṇḍa and Kaṅgakoṇḍa-pattanama as possible readings, and of them the last may be taken as the nearest to the original, for

---

Rājendra I had the title Kangai-konda, and the place in question would have been named after that ruler. The word paṭṭanama (Sinh. patuna) which forms the second part of the name indicates that its location was on the sea coast. The identification of this place remained uncertain. We can now be almost certain that it is the same Gaṅgaikondapaṭṭana mentioned in two South Indian inscriptions. These Tamil inscriptions at the Kakolanātha Temple on the Tirukkalakudi Hill in the Tiruppattur Taluk of the Ramnad District, record a grant of land issued by a Pāṇḍyan ruler with the titles Tribhuvanacakravartin Koṇerimēlkonḍōn (Māravarman Kulasekhara I?) when he was encamped at Gaṅgaikondapaṭṭana. There seems to be no doubt that these Tamil inscriptions and the Sinhalese inscriptions refer to the same port.

Sāhasamalla's sojourn in the Cola country has given rise to a belief that there was some kind of political alliance between the Colas and the Kaliṅgas of Ceylon, and that the Cola invasions of Ceylon during this period were an indirect mode of supporting the Kaliṅgas as against the Pāṇḍyas. We would hesitate to subscribe to this view

---


as evidence in favour of it at present is too slender.

Just as Sāhasamalla ascended the throne amidst strong opposition, also the end of his reign appears to have been sudden. Even during the two years of his rule, that all was not well is hinted at in the Kevulgama Inscription attributed to this ruler, in which a grant of land is made to one of his loyal supporters named Gulpītī. But Gulpītī Pāmbul-le-daruvan 'for the wounds which he got in loyalty to the king from the weapons (of the king's enemies)'.¹ The record is dated in the first year of his reign and therefore this loyal personage would have been wounded either in the struggle which preceded his accession to the throne or in the first year of his reign. Thus the brief occupation of the throne would have been a difficult one for Sāhasamalla.

Sāhasamalla was deposed by the same Ayasmanta who, as we have seen, was responsible for his accession to the throne amidst great opposition.² Neither the Cūlavamsa nor the inscriptions of the period offer any clue as to why this general turned his back on the king whom he supported so actively in the beginning. The fact that Ayasmanta could raise to the throne three rulers, two of whom he deposed, shows that he was the strong man of the time - a king maker - who wished to reserve power for himself while having his nominees on the throne as

²Cy., LXXX, 33-34.
mere figure-heads. If Sāhasamalla showed signs of asserting his authority beyond the mark, Ayasmanta would not have hesitated to put an end to his rule.

Thereafter Ayasmanta elevated Kalyāṇavati, the first queen of Nissaṅka Malla, to the throne.1 Though the Cūlavamsa refers to her as the aggamahesi, according to Nissaṅka Malla's inscriptions Kāliṅga Subhadrā was the chief queen.2 Perhaps she became the chief queen after the death of Subhadrā. In the inscriptions of Nissaṅka Malla it is on record that Kalyāṇavati was associated with his tulābhāras.3 We have already referred to the Tamil invasions which seem to have taken place in her reign. The Bōpiṭiya Slab Inscription says that 'her stronghold having been broken up through the Tamil insurrection, was carried away on the shoulder'.4 Attention has been already drawn to the Mīṇipe Slab Inscription, which refers to a Tamil invasion which took place in the eigth year of her reign in which Amati Āti, who has been rightly identified with Abonāvan

1Cv., LXXX, 33-34; Pīv., 107-108.
4Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 33, 192. 'Demala viyavulin kandavura bindi...... nē (kara) hinduva gena'. The word kandavura translated by Wickramasinghe as 'stronghold' may refer to Polonnaruva as this city is also called Kandavuru-muvara and Kandavuru-pura and Kandavura, Pīv., 131-32; Dal. Pīv., 59.
was destroyed.\(^1\) In spite of these calamities which disturbed her reign, the queen and the general helped the cause of Buddhism by erecting vihāras and providing for their maintenance.\(^2\) The parivena called Rājakulavaddhana, which Āyasamanta caused to be built at Valligāma is noteworthy, and its name survives to this day as the name of a vihāra in that locality, probably at the old site.\(^3\) Kalyāṇavati and her general were in power for six years, quite remarkable for that period — a sufficient breathing space in which they could undertake the benevolent activities referred to in the Gūlavamsa.

The Gūlavamsa gives her a reign of six months only.\(^4\) Both the Pujāvaliya and the Rājāvaliya record that she ruled for six years, and we may rely on the latter.\(^5\) The Gūlavamsa account of Kalyāṇavati suggests a longer reign than a brief six months. In addition, it should be mentioned that the Minipe Slab Inscription refers to her eighth regnal year.\(^6\) The eighth year, however, would correspond to the second regnal year of Dharmāsoka. Paranavitana's

\(^2\) Cv., LXXX, 33-41.
\(^3\) Cv., LXXX, 37-40; on Buddhadatta Thera's suggestion 'Sarājakulavaddhana' has been emended to 'Rājakulavaddhana' ('the furtherer of the royal family'), see Cult. Cey. Med. Times., Additions to Cv. Tr., p. 249.
\(^4\) Cv., LXXX, 34.
\(^5\) Piv. 108; Riv. Tr., 52.
explanation of this discrepancy is that although Kalyāṇavatī was deposed, still sections of the people recognized her as the lawful ruler of the island, in preference to Ayasmanta who ruled at Pōḷonnaruva in the name of the infant prince Dharmāsoka.¹

The Cūlavamsa does not mention how the reign of Kalyāṇavatī came to an end. The narrative in the Pūjavaliya suggests that she was deposed and a five month old infant Dharmāsoka was raised to the throne by Elulu Abō Senevirat (Ayasmanta).² The Tamil invasions which are referred to in the Mipipe Slab Inscription could not have been the cause that led to the termination of her reign, for that event is dated in the eighth year, two years after she had ceased to occupy the throne. For some reason or other not known from any of our sources, Ayasmanta appears to have deposed queen Kalyāṇavatī and carried on the government himself through the infant prince referred to above. Dharmāsoka’s reign lasted one year according to the Cūlavamsa, but six years according to the Rājavaliya.³ A six-year reign is unlikely in view of the unhappy circumstances in which he was placed on the throne and the tragedy which ultimately overtook the prince and his regent.

²P.īv., 108; see also R.īv., 43.
³Cv., LXXX, 42; R.īv., 43.
Gülavamsa mentions that one mahādipāda Anīkaṅga came with a great army from the Cola country, slew the ruler Dharmāsoka and the general Ayasamanta and took over the reins of government. Dharmāsoka's relationship to his predecessor is not given in the Gūlavamsa. The Pūjavaliya, however, gives the important detail that Dharmāsoka was Anīkaṅga's son. Whether the father and son were of Kaliṅga extraction we cannot be certain, but the name Anīkaṅga was well known in the geneologies of the Eastern Gangas of Kaliṅga during this period, and it is not unlikely that they too were scions of the Kaliṅga family. One other reason in favour of this supposition is that, although Ayasamanta deposed his protégés at his will, there was some consistency in his support of the Kaliṅga princes, for both Sāhasamalla and Kalyāṇavatī, whom he deposed, were clearly of Kaliṅga origin. Hence, we may tentatively take these two princes also to be of Kaliṅga stock.

The Gūlavamsa refers to Anīkaṅga with the title mahādipāda which was normally given to the heir to the throne. This has been taken

---

1 C.V., LXXX, 43-44.
2 Piv., 108, tama putu Dharmāsoka nam raja kumāraya (his son called prince Dharmāsoka).
with some justification to mean that he had a claim to the throne.\(^1\) This may not be improbable, for, it may be for that reason that the latter's son was placed on the throne by Ḍharmāśoka, having deprived his father Anīkaṅga of the opportunity of succeeding to the throne. We have seen that the personages whom Ḍharmāśoka promoted to the throne earlier had reasonable claims to the throne, and this general seems to have had the political sagacity to see that his protégés on the throne were not upstarts. Perhaps Dharmāśoka's father had some claim to the throne, though we have no way of determining as to when he held the post of mahādīpāda, or how he came to occupy that position.

Now, the Cūlavamsa states that Ḍharmāśoka met his death at the hands of Anīkaṅga.\(^2\) The Minipe Slab Inscription mentions that the minister Āti met his death at the hands of the Tamil forces, who landed in Ceylon in the eigth year of Queen Kalyāṇavatī.\(^3\) The date of this Tamil invasion as given in the inscription corresponds to the time when the Cūlavamsa speaks of the invasion of Anīkaṅga with the Tamil forces, which also led to the murder of Ḍharmāśoka.\(^4\)


Paranavitana is right in his opinion that both these sources—the inscription and the Chronicle—refer to the same event.\(^1\) Amati Ati has been identified with Ayasmanta of the Cūlawamsa, and it is noteworthy that both these sources are in agreement that this general met his death at the hands of the invading Tamil forces. Thus ended in tragedy the career of general Ayasmanta, one of the most powerful generals of that period, who survived many a political storm and still dominated the political scene for nearly a decade.

It has been supposed that there was an alliance between the Cola rulers and the Kalingas of Ceylon at the time, and that therefore Anīkaṅga was able to raise an army in the Cola country.\(^2\) It is doubtful whether such an alliance existed, for, it must have been possible to collect a sufficiently large mercenary army provided they were assured adequate remuneration even without the connivance of the rulers of that country. Māgha's forces estimated at 24,000, who invaded Ceylon some time later in this period, appear to have consisted of such mercenaries, and we have no evidence to suggest that he was in alliance with any South Indian power. Even if Anīkaṅga's army was raised with the connivance of the Cola rulers, it achieved little

\(^1\)Ep. Zeyl., V, 150-152.

success, if the aim was to place Anikaṅga on the throne. He could reign only seventeen days.¹

Anikaṅga was put to death by general Vikkanta-Camūnakka, who placed Parākramabāhu's queen Līlavatī on the throne for the second time.² It is possible that the disappearance of the powerful general Ayasmanta from the scene had adverse repercussions on the Kaliṅga family. This general appears to have favoured the Kaliṅga princes even though he deposed his nominees on the throne at his will. The Cūlavamsa reveals that he was also known as Rājakulavaddhana ('the furtherer of the royal family'), and a vihāra he built was so named.³ The royal family which he supported, as known from the previous events, was the Kaliṅga family. The loss of Ayasmanta, in spite of his arbitrary behaviour towards those whom he raised to the throne, and that of a trustworthy general in Tāvurunāvan would have been a serious disadvantage to the Kaliṅga family whose very existence was now being challenged.

The rise of Līlavatī to the throne for a second time and later for a third time, and the capture of the throne of Rājarattha by a

¹ Cv., LXXX, 43-44.
² Cv., LXXX, 45-46.
³ Cv., LXXX, 40; earlier Geiger read this name as Sarājakulavaddhana, Cv.Tr., 130, note 5, but corrected it to Rājakulavaddhana by accepting a suggestion from A. P. Buddhadatta, Cult.Cey.Med.Times, 249.
Pândya prince called Parākrama Pândya some time before the invasion of Māgha would show that the Pândya faction had grown in power and influence at the expense of the Kaliṅgas. ¹ The Pândyas, however, could not maintain their power for long, for queen Līlāvatī was deposed by Lokissara, who came with a Damila army from the opposite coast. ² The Chronicles do not indicate the relationship of Lokissara to his predecessors. Fortunately, we have an inscription of this ruler, which informs us that he belonged to the Kaliṅga dynasty. ³ It is therefore possible that he was in some way connected with the ruling family, though this is not specifically stated.

What is significant about this epigraph is that it was set up to record a grant of land in recognition of the services rendered by Loke Arakmena 'for the valour shown in disposing of the Colas for His Majesty'; ⁴ This statement appears strange for this monarch secured the throne with the aid of a Damila army, and what led to this conflict with the Colas is not clear. It has been surmised that the forces which assisted him were not a Cola army, on account of the

¹Cv., LXXX, 45-46, 49-50, 51-53;
²Cv., LXXX, 47-48.
³Ep. Zeyl., IV, No. 11, p. 87, lines 1-3.
conflict with the Colas recorded in this inscription.\textsuperscript{1} Whatever be its composition, if the army was a mercenary one, its interests might have been in conflict with those of the king one he achieved the objective of securing the throne.

The \textit{Cūlavamsa} refers to Lokissara as a king 'who had been wounded in the shoulder by a spear' - a statement which also suggests that he had to face considerable opposition on his accession to the throne.\textsuperscript{2}

Lokissara's reign was very brief. While the \textit{Cūlavamsa} records a reign of nine months, the \textit{Pujāvaliya} gives him a reign of five months.\textsuperscript{3} Lokissara was either put to death or deposed by a general named Parākrama, who belonged to the Kālanāgara family, and queen Līlavatī was made to take over the reins of government for a third time.\textsuperscript{4} The \textit{Dāthāvamsa} - a history of the Tooth Relic - brings out useful details about her reign not known from the \textit{Cūlavamsa}. The \textit{Dāthāvamsa} gives the name of this general's family as Kālanāgara.\textsuperscript{5} The \textit{Dāthāvamsa} \textit{Sanne} (Paraphrase) gives the form Kalunnaru as its equivalent,\textsuperscript{6} the

\textsuperscript{1}U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 520.
\textsuperscript{2}Cv., LXXX, 47; see also Paranavitana, \textit{J.R.A.S.Cey.Br.}, NS. VII, 38.
\textsuperscript{3}Cv., LXXX, 47-48; \textit{Pjv.}, 108.
\textsuperscript{4}Cv., LXXX, 49-50.
\textsuperscript{5}Dāthāvamsa, strophe 4.
latter was the Sinhalese form of the name of that family then in vogue, while Kalanāgara was a result of the 'Palification' of that name by the Pali writers of that age. The same process has been at work in the case of Bimtānna and Attanagalla where they were given the Pali forms Mahiyānga and Hatthavangalla respectively, and in the former case both the Pali and the Sinhalese forms of the name of that place have survived side by side to this day. Hence we may take Kalunnaru as the name of the family to which general Parākrama belonged.

The name Kalunnaru occurs in the list of tanks built by king Dhātusena (455-73), as contained in the Pūjāvaliya. This tank is later attributed to Aggabodhi II (604-14). Nicholas has noted that this name occurs in a tenth-century inscription, but gives no reference. However, we get a more useful reference to some leading personages, who seem to have belonged to that family, in the Ambagamuva Rock Inscription of Vijayabāhu I. It records the offerings which the king made to the sacred Foot Print on the Samantakūta, and the charitable institutions and the endowments made for the convenience of pil-

\[1\] Pīv., 99, 101.
\[2\] Pīv., 101.
Among the four ministers of the King's Council, who carried out this order, three of them, namely, Hakka-gam-kitu, Kolomba-galu Dovu and Mahakiliingam Ki(t)i-destu, are represented as members of the family of Mekappara Vādārum Kalunnaru-bim A(yannata)van. Mekappara vādārum of course is an official title which occurs in the inscriptions from an earlier date. The general Parākrama who placed queen Līlāvatī on the throne, and who, according to the Dāthāvamsa Sanne, was a member of the Kalunnaru family, may be regarded as a descendent of the family to which the ministers of Vijayabahu I who carried out the order recorded in the epigraph referred to above belonged. Therefore, we have reason to believe that Parākrama belonged to an important family, which had traditions of service to royalty in the past.

During her third term on the throne Līlāvatī reigned only seven months. She and general Parākrama were deposed by a prince referred to as Pāndu King Parākrama, who landed in Ceylon with a Pāṇḍya army. 'Having cleared Lāṅkā from the briers (of revolt)' he is said to have

---

3For details of these titles see Ep. Zeyl., I, 193-194.
4Gv., LXXX, 51.
ruled the realm in the superb Puḷatthinagara for three years, without transgressing the political precepts of Manu'.

Thus the prince who deposed Lilāvatī and captured power was of Pāṇḍya stock. The Dāthāvamsa referred to above mentions a prince named Madhurinda (Madurapperumāla in the Sannaya) of the Pāṇḍya royal family who was being trained for kingship. The identification of Madurinda (or Madurapperumāla) of the Dāthāvamsa with the Pāṇḍya king Parākrama of the Cūlavamsa is very likely. Having received the training for kingship, he perhaps thought it opportune to have the queen deposed to occupy the throne for himself. If such was the course of events, this Pāṇḍya prince may have raised an army, probably a mercenary force, to assist him in the achievement of his objective. In any case he would not have been more than an adventurer for his reign of three years which, according to the chronicler, was a beneficient one, came to a tragic end with the invasion of Rājarattha by Māgha of Kaliṅga which took place about the year 1215.

In the survey of the events from the death of Parākramabāhu I, which we have so far made, the gradual but steady deterioration of the political situation in the island is clear. The central authority had weakened, and nearly all the rulers were deposed or slain before

---

1 Cv., LXXX, 51-54
2 Dāthāvamsa, p. 3, strophe 7 and its paraphrase.
the normal termination of their reigns by the generals and other army officials, who appear to have been the arbiters of the political destiny of the times. We have also referred to the struggle for power which ensued between rival factions, who had their own nominees for the throne. It was when the affairs of the country were in this state of confusion that Magha invaded Ceylon. His 24,000 strong army looted, plundered and sacked Rajarattha on an unprecedented scale. The activities of Magha require detailed examination not only for their far-reaching consequences, but because the Dambadeniya kings, Vijayabahu III and Parakramabahu II, had to wage a protracted struggle with this invader almost to the end of their reigns. Hence, the reign of Magha will be taken up for a detailed examination in Chapter IV.

In our survey of the political history of the period from the death of Parakramabahu I we have seen the gradual disintegration of the Polonnaruwa kingdom until the conditions were further aggravated by the invasion of Magha. The political conditions prevalent at the time are reflected in a passage of the Hatthavangallavihāravamsa describing the condition of the country on the eve of the invasion of Magha:

'When (those) many lords of Lanka, who were like unto ornaments to (the island of) Lanka, who were endowed with immensely meritorious and miraculous prowess, who

1 Cv., LXXX, 54-80.
were devoted to the Triple Gem, (had passed away) leaving but their aura of glory, and when the (other) lords of Lāṅkā who had gone astray from the path of justice, who were deficient in the customary cannons of statecraft, who were weaklings lacking in fortune (bhāgya), and also when the ministers of similar nature were living embroiled in mutual antagonism, then as a result of a heinous evil deed committed by the dwellers in Lāṅkā in the past, the enemy forces from different regions who were ignorant of the Dispensation of the Teacher, who have entered the thicket of wrong beliefs, having arrived here from the Jambudīpa converted the whole island of Lāṅkā into one of confusion and danger.¹

Though the description is garbed in general terms it appears to be a summary of the troubled politics of the period. The Hatthavānāvallavihāravamsa was composed in the reign of Parākramabāhu II, and therefore its author was removed from these events by less than about seventy-five years so that the calamities referred to would not have faded away from living memory. We have already discussed the activities of the kings 'who were deficient in the customary canons of statecraft' and also 'the ministers of similar nature who were living embroiled in mutual antagonism', and the political confusion which resulted. A Sinhalese version of the Pāli text cited above, compiled in the reign of Parākramabāhu VI adds that the kings were 'of diminished power of command' (pirihunu āgā-bala āti).² That the kings of

¹ latha Lāṅkālaṅkārabhūtesu visālapumāddhivikkamesu ratanattayamāmakesu anekesu Lāṅkanathesu kittipuṇjāvasesesu jātesu apetanitimaggesu rajja-paripālanocitavidhānavirahītesu mudubhūtesu nihinabhāgadheyyesu Lāṅkisaresu tādisakesv' ēva sacivajanesu ca yebhuyyena aññameaññaviruddhesu vattamānesu Lāṅkāvasinam purakatena kena pi darunena papakammanā nānādesavāsino aviditanesathusayamā pavīthamahāchāditthigahanā paccthi-senā Jambudīpa idhāgama sakala Lāṅkādīpe anekataṅkasaṅkulaṁ akāsi, Ḥvv., 31.

² Elu Av., 67.
this period were of less consequence is also reflected in the
literary works.

An interesting passage in the Rajavaliya goes on to explain
the divisions of the kings of Ceylon into the Greater Dynasty
(Mahāvamsa) and Lower Dynasty (Cūlavamsa) in these words:

'The Lower Dynasty is distinguished by the father or
mother (of the reigning sovereign) being a descendant
of the Solar line. It is designated "Lower Dynasty"
because the pedigree of the sovereigns is heterogeneous,
being a mixture between the descendants of those who
brought the sacred Bodhi Tree and those who brought
the Tooth Relic; because of the non-existence of Bud­
hist clergy endowed with supernatural powers; because
Sakra does not protect this illustrious Laṅkā; because
Anurādhapura declines for want of meritorious personages; and
because the produce of agriculture is failing. The Lower
Dynasty commences with the reign of Kitsirimevan, son
of Mahāsenā'.

It must be noted that, according to these works some of the
greatest Sinhalese kings such as Vijayabāhu I and Parākramabāhu I
also belonged to the Cūlavamsa. The explanation given in the passage
cited above, therefore, is not justified. However, it appears that
these writers record impressions of an age of decline in later times,
although it has been traced back to ancient times. The reference to
the decline in agriculture is particularly noteworthy. This passage,
as well as that cited above from the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa, seems
to bear some hints as to why the later kings were not considered equal
in rank to their predecessors. A period of decline, politically as

1Rjv., 37. We have modified Gunasekard's translation slightly.
Rjv.Tr., 45.
well as economically, is portrayed in them. We propose to consider that respect in the sequel.

Before we take up the invasion of Māgha for consideration it would not be irrelevant to draw attention to the dislocation of the administrative machinery and the decline of the economic life of the country in the period which followed the death of Parākramabāhu I. Beneath the disintegration of the political unity of the country, which we have already discussed, one can also notice the tendencies towards a declining economy. The administrative machinery itself was showing signs of stress before it suffered heavily at the hands of the ruthless invader Māgha. We propose to take note of them here not only because they have a bearing on the decline and the ultimate abandonment of the Polonnaruva kingdom as well as the success with which Māgha established his power in the Rājarattha, but it also would bring into clearer perspective the circumstances in which the Dambadeni kingdom was founded, and the background to the problems with which its rulers grappled almost throughout their rule.

When one considers the heights which the political and economic power of the country attained during the reign of Parākramabāhu I, it is indeed surprising that this kingdom disintegrated and was virtually abandoned by the Sinhalese kings less than half a century after his death. Parākramabāhu not only established his authority throughout the island, but maintained his garrisons in South India and made his presence felt in that region for over a decade.¹ We have also

¹See above, 106-111.
referred to his campaigns against Rāmaṇa, although his success in these ventures appears to have been limited. As a tank builder, Parākramabāhu stands out not only for the large number of tanks credited to him in the Culavamsa but also for their remarkable size.¹ Taking the archaeological remains into consideration, if Nissaṅka Malla's edifices are left out, Polonnaruva could be regarded as the city of Parākramabāhu.²

If this position continued well into the last quarter of the 12th century until the death of Parākramabāhu in 1186 it would be by no means an easy task to explain the speedy decline and disintegration which set in soon after his death. The chroniclers themselves seem to have found it difficult to understand the reasons for it, and were satisfied by attributing the ruthless destruction caused by Māgha to the negligence of the gods who were entrusted with the protection of Laṅka.³

A closer examination of the available data, however limited they may be, would make it clear that the edifice which Parākramabāhu so painfully built contained the seeds of its own decay. Soon after he disappeared from the scene, the repercussions of the policies he fol-

¹C.H.J., IV, 52-68.
³Cv., LXXX, 54 ff; Hvv., 31; Piv., 108.
ollowed began to have an overwhelming impact on the developments that followed.

The Culavamsa in its account of Parākramabahu's immediate successor Vijayabahu II (1186-87) makes an interesting statement:

'When he had received consecration as a king the prudent one in his great mercy released from their misery those dwellers in Lāṅkā, whom his uncle sovereign Parakkama had thrown into prison and tortured with stripes or with fetters. By restoring at different places to various people their village or their field he increased the joyfulness of them all.'

This seems to be an unhappy epilogue to the epic of Parākramabahu and is not without significance. The only extant record of Vijayabahu II, however, does not bear any allusion to this aspect of his reign. One side of the slab in which this inscription is engraved contains further twenty-eight lines of writing, which are badly weather-worn, and therefore remain unpublished. Whether the unpublished portion of this epigraph contains data to confirm the accusation made against Parākramabahu cannot be decided. Even if it does refer to the benevolent activities of his brief reign, it is unlikely that Vijayabahu would directly cast aspersions on his il-

---

1 Cy., LXXX, 1-3.
lustrous predecessor, for, he had taken pains to mention that he was invited to Ceylon by Parākramabāhu to take over the reins of government, the purpose of which was of course apparently to vindicate his claims to the throne of Ceylon.\footnote{Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 30, 182-83.}

Geiger has observed a hiatus in the manuscripts of the Cūlavamsa at this point, as shown in the previous chapter, which opens with an account of Parākramabāhu's immediate successor on the throne.\footnote{Cv., I, Introduction, iv.} It is noteworthy that the indirect blame attributed to Parākramabāhu in the passage cited above is in strange contrast to the tone of the preceding chapters, which extols the greatness of this ruler. We are therefore inclined to favour the view that at Chapter LXXX the narrative was resumed by some other compiler who held different opinions from those of the chronicler who previously glorified Parākramabāhu.\footnote{Sirima Wickramasinghe, The Age of Parākramabāhu I, Ph.D. Thesis (unpublished), 1958, University of London, Chapter I; U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 485-86.} If this is the case we have to believe that the compiler of the latter portion of the Cūlavamsa had not the same unstinted praise for this ruler. In any case, the passage in question is significant in so far as it throws some welcome light on a less known aspect of Parākramabāhu's reign, which had a bearing
on the developments that followed. The chronicler's charge against
the latter for his excesses does not seem to be unfounded.

We have even more unmistakable evidence of the rigours to
which the people were subjected by Parākramabāhu in some of the
lithic records of Nissaṅka Malla (1187-96). In the Galpota In-
scription it is stated that many people in Laṅkā lost their family
privileges and wealth 'through the unjust acts of some kings'.

It is further stated that he remitted taxes for five years, and
enacted a law that 'excessive taxes imposed by former kings' should
not be taken, and laid down the terms on which the taxes on lands
and fields were to be collected, depending on the degree of ferti-
licity in each case. The chēna cultivators 'who carried on with dif-
ficulty' were completely relieved of such taxation.

In spite of
the propagandist style of Nissaṅka Malla's records, these statements,
occuring as they do in the lithic records as well as the Cūlavamsa,
cannot be lightly dismissed.

Parākramabāhu's military undertakings abroad, which were ex-
pected to add lustre to his crown, seem to have demanded heavy sacri-
fices from the people of Ceylon. His intervention in the Pāṇḍyan war

---

of succession in particular, led to a protracted struggle spread over a period of not less than a decade. The payment and maintenance of garrisons on foreign soil for so many years would have led to heavy taxation and other exactions unless they were maintained by levies in South India or lived on booty. And we have seen that though some success was achieved at the beginning, his South Indian campaigns had ended in defeat. There is no evidence that these ambitious military undertakings earned for the country any political or economic benefits. On the other hand there is reason to believe that they led to a considerable drain on the human and material resources of the country even if we assume that part of the cost was met by booty. This, however, is not to suggest that these ventures led to adverse consequences which manifested themselves immediately. One must note that in spite of these costly expeditions Parākramabāhu had sufficient resources to undertake massive irrigation works and extensive building activities, which are amply testified to by the archaeological remains in Rājāraṭṭha. The repercussions of these policies were to be felt in the decades that followed his death. The measures adopted by Vijayabāhu II and Niśaṅka Malla to relieve the suffering of the people burdened with heavy taxes, as well as the


2 Cv. Tr., II, 100, note 1; C.H.J., IV, 46-51.
references to those people who Parākramabāhu 'had thrown into prison and tortured with stripes', and the restoration of the villages and land of which they have been deprived, may be taken as a reflection of the exactions imposed by Parākramabāhu on his subjects.

True enough, Parākramabāhu developed the country by undertaking great irrigation projects. In Dakkhiṇadesa marshy land was cleared and rendered cultivable. In Rājārāta a massive programme of irrigation works was undertaken. Similarly, he was strong enough politically as well as economically, to outdo his predecessors by resorting to conquests beyond the shores of Ceylon. His expeditions abroad, however, in the long run, seem to have added to and speeded up the decline of the Polonnaruva kingdom.

The elaborate administrative machinery which Parākramabāhu set up served him well as long as he was there at the centre to direct the affairs but, when his strong hand was no longer there, his successors were hardly equal to the task of exercising adequate control over it. The complicated irrigation system, as shown by Murphey Rhoads, presupposes a highly organised and centralised administration. Once the controlling hand of Parākramabāhu was removed, the close knit fabric

1C.H.J., IV, 52-68.
2J.A.S., XVI, 194-95
of administration gave way and could no longer function smoothly.
We have already seen the difficulties of Nissanka Malla in his at-
ttempts to keep his kingdom intact.¹ He was faced with the problem
of keeping in check a host of officials whose allegiance was no
longer a matter of course. The out-lying provinces such as Rohaṇa
do not appear to have heeded the command of the king at Polonnaruva
as readily as was expected of them.²

It is possible that excessive centralisation of the administration
also produced unfortunate results. If Parākramabāhu's policy led to
a weakening of the institutions of local administration, which served
as useful organs through which the central authority could make its
command reach the people, that again would have helped the tendencies
towards disintegration. This appears to have been the course of events.
Paranavitana has drawn attention to the disappearance of the princes
of Dakkhīndesa and Rohaṇa during this period.³ The mahaya of Dakkhina-
desa and the Ṛṣṇa of Rohaṇa, appear to have had an administrative
machinery, considered to have been almost a replica of central admini-
stration which functioned at the capital.⁴ Paranavitana summarises
the position in these words:

¹See above, 122-126.
²C.J.S.G., II, p.23, Inscription No. 386; Muller, A.I.C., No. 152a,
³U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 717,Śrī Leṁkādvīpayehi bahunāyakatvaya nokarana
sē rājya sūtraya pavatvamā yī sitā... Nks., 85.
⁴Ep. Zeyl., IV, No. 21, 176-180; No. 22, 180-186; No.23, 189-191;
II, No. 11, 57-63; III, No. 21, 219-225.
The centralisation of the administrative departments no doubt contributed towards efficiency so long as there was a strong ruler at the centre to direct affairs, and the state powerful enough to defend itself against aggression from without or to deal with internal discord. But once the strong guiding hand was removed and the capital city sacked by invaders, the administrative machinery dislocated with the loss of the archives and dispersal or death of the bureaucrats.¹

Once the administrative machinery was weakened, it would have been a very difficult task to maintain in good repair the elaborate irrigation system, which was the basis of the economy of the Sinhalese kingdom. Among the successors of Parākramabāhu on the throne of Polonnaruva, hardly any king with the possible exception of Nissanka Malla who probably undertook some restoration works, appears to have paid any attention to irrigation, quite apart from building new tanks on their own.² Once the irrigation works were neglected for want of repair, people could no longer continue agriculture with any assurance of good harvests.

It has been postulated that agriculture practised over a long period on a single-crop basis would have led to the exhaustion of the soil, which ultimately led to the abandonment of Rājarattha by its inhabitants.³ The Rājāvaliya has a vague statement in drawing

²Cr., LXXX, 1-80.
a distinction between the kings of the Mahāvamsa and those of the Cūlavamsa, that one of the reasons for this division was that Anurādhapura declined for want of meritorious personages and that agriculture and horticulture was yielding less and less produce.¹ Murphey Rhoads—himself a geographer who has given thought to this problem—has shown that this supposition is unfounded.² No evidence has so far come to light which could warrant the assumption that a change in the climate resulted in the abandonment of Raṇarattha. In these circumstances we are inclined to the belief that the decline of the irrigation system was to a large extent due to the weakening of the administrative machinery, consequent on political confusion spread over several decades, punctuated by foreign invasions which added to the confusion from time to time. The kings were hardly equal to the task of commanding the vast mass of labour and material resources required to maintain the elaborate network of irrigation schemes.³ Estimates of the labour required made by modern engineers who have studied irrigation in Ceylon do not seem to minimise the magnitude of the task.⁴ The weaklings on an ever

¹Riv., 37.
²J.A.S., XVI, 190-92.
uncertain throne, could hardly turn their attention to irrigation. Nicholas has shown that irrigation was undertaken on a large scale, precisely during those periods when the country enjoyed comparative peace and stability.¹

Some scholars have expressed the view that malaria also would have been one of the factors which led to the abandonment of Rājaraṭṭha. Codrington has given considerable emphasis to this factor.² Murphey has postulated the possibility that since malaria was known in the Mediterranean lands and China at a much earlier date, it would have reached Ceylon through South India in the course of time.³ Paranavitana is not in line with this view, and his words may be quoted here:

'Malaria, it is true, has been very effective in preventing the re-occupation of these regions during a period of about seven centuries after their virtual abandonment in the Daṁbadeni period. But whether malaria was the cause or consequence of that abandonment is a debatable point'.⁴

We are inclined to favour the latter view. Codrington refers to the map of Plancius (1592 A.D.) in which an entry in Portuguese reads

---

³J.A.S., XVI, 198-200.
'Kingdom of Jala deserted and depopulated for (three hundred) years by reason of unhealthiness'.  The identification of Jala with Yala in the south east of Ceylon may be conceded, but it would be unsafe to rely on the figure of 300 years, which must have been based on popular tradition. Even if the figure is taken literally, it would only take us back to the end of the thirteenth century. By that time Rājarattha had long been abandoned, and a whole dynasty of rulers had ruled from Dambadeniya. Murphey Rhoads has not produced stronger arguments so that, in the absence of valid evidence, this explanation is best a guess.

The real problem is whether malaria had taken such an endemic form at such an early date, and no evidence is forthcoming to establish the proposition that malaria was one of the factors which led to the abandonment of the Rājaraṭṭha. The Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa, which deals with the vihāra of that name and the life and reign of king Sirisaṅghabodhi (247-49 A.D.), speaks of a drought and a famine which occurred during the reign of the latter. These calamities were accompanied by the visit of a rakkhasa (demon) called Rattakkha ('red-eyed'), whose very sight turned the eyes of the people red, as they were infected with jararōga (disease accompanied with fever) called rattakkhamāraka. The disease always ended in the death of the victims and the demon devoured the corpses with relish. Anyone who happened

to see a patient who had caught this fever was also infected. It is further stated that the entire province was depopulated on account of the fear of this demon and the disease. The Mahāvamsa refers to all these calamities which took place in the reign of Sirisaṅghabodhi, but does not make direct mention of the jararöga. We would hesitate to interpret this passage as referring to malaria, although the disease if it actually spread, would have taken toll of a substantial number of human lives. Our hesitation is based on several grounds. Firstly, the events described therein refer to a time as early as the third century A.D. The Hatthavanagallavihāra-vamsa appears to have borrowed much of its material pertaining to the reign of this king from the Mahāvamsa, and the two versions agree to a very great extent, although the jararöga is not mentioned in the earlier Chronicle. Secondly, fever can be of various types, some of them infectious, at times perhaps reaching epidemic proportions. In times of drought, such as the devastating one which took place in the reign of Vatagāmaṇī Abhaya (89–77 B.C.), so vividly described in the Buddhist Commentaries, disease would naturally have taken considerable toll of human lives. But it would not be possible to con-

1Ev. 15, evaṃ nacirēna 'eva yakkhabhayena rogena ca janapado viralajano jāto.
2Ev., XXXVI, 73–97.
clude thereby that they had a debilitating effect on the entire population, leading in turn to the decline and collapse of the medieval Sinhalese Kingdom as a whole. Thirdly, the narrative in question is garbed in myth and legend to such an extent that it would be unsafe to pick out a detail and rely on it. We can be certain that, at least until the end of the 12th century, malaria had not become a threat when we take into account the vigour of the Sinhalese kingdom distinctly seen throughout the long reign of Parākramabāhu I (1153-1186). As Paranavitana has rightly pointed out, a population living under such conditions leading to debilitation would not have been able to produce the remarkable monuments extant in Amurādhapura and Polonaruva, or the vast irrigation projects.\textsuperscript{1} In these circumstances we are inclined to rule out the possibility that malaria was a factor which led to the abandonment of the Rājaraṭṭha.

Returning to our survey of the decline of the economy, the debasement of the metal and the disappearance of the gold coinage during this period is noteworthy. In the last centuries of the Amurādhapura kingdom, there is evidence to show that a considerable gold coinage was in circulation.\textsuperscript{2} By the time of Vijayabāhu I, the metal

\textsuperscript{1}U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 715.

\textsuperscript{2}H.W.Codrington, The Coins and Currency of Ancient and Medieval Ceylon, pp. 11 ff.
used was debased and the gold coinage had practically disappeared. During the reign of Parākramabāhu I and in the period that followed the metal used was virtually copper. In his study of the Coins and Currency of Ceylon, Codrington has clearly shown this marked decline of the coinage. ¹ It is believed that the policies of Parākramabāhu, particularly his ambitious military undertakings abroad, led to the disappearance of the gold coinage, resulting from the drain of the country's resources. ² Undoubtedly the maintenance of garrisons in foreign lands was an expensive item, and the mercenary soldiers had to be paid well, and the Chronicle bears ample testimony to the confusion they created when kings failed to do so. ³ But it would be unfair to blame Parākramabahu on this matter, for the debasement of the currency was already well marked in the reign of Vijayabāhu. ⁴ Moreover, the disappearance of the gold coinage and the general debasement of currency cannot be taken as an unmistakable sign of the decline of the economy. For it may even point to the contrary, as such a change might have taken place as a result of an expansion in the volume of trade, which made it difficult to meet the requisite

¹Op. cit., p. 73.
³Cv., LV, 1 ff; LXXVI, 133; XC, 12 ff.
supplies of gold, in a country where this metal is scarce. Hence, the debasement of the coinage cannot be taken as a safe indication of a general decline in the economy.

Foreign invasions appear to have been a menacing phenomenon in the early history of Ceylon. Invaders added to the political confusion in the island from time to time. But it would be an oversimplification to attribute the collapse of the Polonnaruva kingdom to foreign invasions. No doubt, as we shall see in the sequel, Māgha appears to have been ruthless in his recourse to violence and destruction.¹ His oppressive policies forced the princes and nobles to leave Rajarāṭṭha in search of safer homes in the southern and south-western parts of the island. On the other hand, from our discussion so far it would clearly emerge that Māgha invaded Ceylon when it was beset with a tottering economy and political chaos resulting from internecine struggle for power among rival factions, and a weakened administration with diminished royal authority. In these circumstances, the quick success which Māgha achieved on invasion cannot cause much surprise. This, however, is not to suggest that Māgha's sack of Rājarāṭṭha was the sole cause of the abandonment of the Rājarāṭṭha by its rulers and the inhabitants. Rather, it was the cumulative result of the operation of several factors, each in varying degree, to which we have drawn attention in the foregoing account.

¹See below, Chapter IV.
Chapter III

The Foundation of the Dambadeniya Kingdom and
the Reign of Vijayabahu III (1232-1236 A.D.)

The Culavamsa preserves scanty but valuable information on some of the local rulers who exercised authority in limited areas in Māyārattha and Rohana while Māgha held sway in Rājarattha. In the words of the chronicler, 'during this period of alien rule several virtuous people had founded on diverse of the most inaccessible mountains a charming town (or) a village and dwelling here and there protected the laity and the Order so that they were in peace'.

Similarly the Hatthavangallavihāravamsa states that, being oppressed by enemy forces, the ministers and such other important personages and the people left their villages and townships in thousands in search of places of protection in the rocky mountains (giridugga) and forest strongholds (vanadugga).

In this atmosphere of fear and uncertainty, a general (senāpati) named Subha established himself on the summit of the Subha-pabbata and 'founded a town as Vessavana the town of Alakamandā and dwelling here and fending off the Kerala devils he protected the (surrounding) country and

---

1 'Tasmim rājantare keci - mahāpuillumajanā bahu
tesu tesu mahāduggapabbatesu manoharan
Kāretvā nagaram gamam - nivasanta tahim tahim
Lokam ca saṣanam cāpi pālayimsu nirakulam' Cv., LXXXI, 1-2;
Geiger translates rājantara as 'alien rule' while noting that 'interregnum' is also permissible. Perhaps the latter is more suitable as the Pjv., p. 109, 130, has arājitaya, Cv. Tr., II, p. 135, note 1.

2 Hvv., 30.
the Order'. This is the first time the Pali Chronicle refers to the Subha-pabbata, which later came to be even more strongly fortified and played an important part in the military strategy employed by the rulers of this period in dealing with foreign invasions. Of the Senāpati Subha nothing more is known from the Cūlavamsa or any other source. Perhaps he was a general who was forced to flee from Rājarāṭṭha on account of the pressure of Māgha's forces. Though there is no way of determining the precise area of his authority it does not seem to have extended much beyond the region surrounding present Yāpahuva near Māhō in the Kurunāgala District. At any rate he does not appear to have succeeded in bringing under his rule the whole or even a large part of the province of Māyārāṭṭha.

In Rohana a chieftain of this type, named Bhuvaṇekabāhu, established himself on the rock Govindamala or Govindasela, identified with the place now known as Govindahela or 'Westminster Abbey', 'hard to reach by the rebels'. Like Yāpahu, Govindahela is a prominent rock rising to a considerable elevation, located 20 miles to the west of Tirukkovil in the Mahavədira Kərəle. Such a rock even without additional fortification would have offered the kind of protection which the

1Cv., LXXXI, 3-4; Keralarakkase for Kerala devils.


3Cv., LXXXI, 5-6.

rulers of this period sought. Nothing more is known of Bhuvanekabāhu or the family to which he belonged, but the title ādipāda, by which he is referred to in the Cūlavamsa, may suggest that he was a member of a royal family. His authority is not likely to have extended much beyond the region surrounding the rock of Govindahela from which he ruled.

The Cūlavamsa mentions one more ruler, viz. Commander (camūpati) Saṅkha, who set himself up 'on the lofty mountain Gāgādōṇi' in the district of Manimekhalā. He 'gave as little heed to the infamous army of the Ruler Māgha though it was but two yojanaś away as to a blade of grass and protected without fear that district and the Order'.¹ Paravāvitana has indicated the possibility that Saṅkham may be identified with the general (senādhīraṇa) Bhāma whose achievements on the battlefield are eulogised in the Miṅipe Slab Inscription.² Miṅipe, the site of this record, has been rightly identified with Manimekhalā of the Cūlavamsa, the district in which Saṅkhar ruled.³ Commenting on the two names Saṅkha and Bhāma and the apparent discrepancy of the two forms, Paravāvitana has pointed out that the former does not occur in any of the manuscripts consulted by Geiger but was taken over from the previous edition of the text by Sumaṅgala and Bātuvaṇṭava, and that the form Saṅkha is an emendation by these editors of a corruption from the original name

It may be noted that Saṅkhawas also the name of a trusted general of Kittisirimegha, the ruler of Dakkiṇadeśa, who was put to death on the orders of Parākramabāhu I in the early part of his career. But the two names Saṅkha and Bhāma are so different from one another that it is difficult to conceive that one is a corruption of the other. Nonetheless the identification of the two personages appears reasonable, and the difficulty may be overcome to some extent if we assume that this ruler had both these names, as a result of which he figures as Saṅkha in the Chronicle and Bhāma in the epigraph.

A Tamil inscription found at Pāṇḍuvāsnuvara in the Girātalana Koralē of the Dēvamādi Hatpattu in the Kurunagala District is dated the fifth year of a ruler styled Tennilaṅkaik-kon-Parākramabāhu Nic-Caṅka Mallar. It records the construction of certain religious edifices in Śrīpuranakara by the commander-in-chief (cēnevi-nātan) Matimānapahacara, alias Kulaṃtey, who had amongst others the title Īlankai Atikāri (Lankaṅdhikāri). It has been suggested that the title Tennilaṅkaik-kon may be taken as a rendering into Tamil of the title of 'the ruler of Dakkhinadesa' (South Ceylon). Paranavitāna is of opinion that he was a ruler of Dakkhinadesa but that he is not to be identified with the Kaliṅga king Niśaṅka Mala (1187-1196 A.D.) since the latter was the ruler of the

1Ep. Zeyl., V, 153-54; Cv., LXXXI, see notes to strophe 9; the manuscripts give Sabba and Pabba.

2Cv., LXV, 'The killing of the Sēnāpati'.

whole Island as is known from his inscriptions.\(^1\)

Professor K. Kanapathi Pillai, who recently edited this inscription, has confidently identified this ruler with the Kaliṅga king Nissanka Malla referred to above, and has sought to overcome the difficulty by interpreting the obscure title as signifying 'the ruler of Lāṅkā in the South'.\(^2\) The position taken by both these scholars is not free from difficulties. One possibility which may be offered is that, at the time of recording this epigraph in his fifth year, Nissanka Malla's authority was confined to Dakkhinadesa. Indeed some of his inscriptions, the Katugaha Galgē Inscription in particular, would suggest that there was some opposition to his rule, but this would in no way affect the overall picture presented by his numerous epigraphs found in various parts of the Island that he was the ruler of the whole country.\(^3\) They would rule out the possibility that he suffered a political adversity of such magnitude. Even in that case, however, neither he nor his general would have admitted it in a public document such as the present one, even if in fact his authority was confined to the South of Ceylon.

The interpretation of the title as 'the ruler of Lāṅkā in the South' suggested by Kanapathi Pillai may be objected to on the ground


\(^2\) U.C.R., XVIII, 158-59.

that there is no evidence of the existence of a Lanka to the north of the Island. The city of Madurai, the capital of the Pandyas, is referred to as Dakhina Madura in the Mahavamsa, evidently owing to the existence of a city of that name (Mathurā) in Northern India.¹

At this stage we may draw attention to a few South Indian inscriptions which belong to the time of Kulettunga III, Māravarman Sundara Pandy I and Jatāvarman Viṣṇa Pandy (accession c. 1253-54) from which we learn of the presence of Tennilaṅkaik Valaṇjīyar - members of a trading corporation of Ceylon - in the Cola-Pandy country.² The phrase has been rendered to English as 'Valaṇjīyar of South Ceylon'. One may, however, raise the question why the traders who went to South India from Ceylon should have specified that they belonged to the South of Ceylon instead of saying that they were from Ceylon. Can the term Tennilaṅkai convey a meaning other than 'South Ceylon'? Ceylon being situated at the southernmost point of Southern India could perhaps have been referred to as 'Laṅkā in (or 'of') the South', though this is certainly not the case in every instance of the numerous references to Ilaṁ or Ilaṅkai in South Indian inscriptions. Such a possibility is to some extent strengthened by the frequent occurrence of the prefix Tennavarān in the

¹ Mv., VII, 49; Nke., 83; Saddharmalāṃkārāya, 288, mentions Uṭṭara Madhurā.
names of persons in South Indian inscriptions, indicating that they were 'Southerners', applicable in large measure to those coming from the South of the Kāverī.¹ The Pāṇḍya king himself had the epithet Tennavan.² In the light of these data, it may be tentatively suggested that the meaning of the term at times extended to include the island of Laṅkā too, situated as it is in the southernmost extremity of the mainland. Therefore we are inclined to favour the suggestion of Kanapathi Pillai that the title Tennilaṅkaik-kon referred to 'the ruler of Laṅkā in the South', while admitting however that the difficulty is by no means completely resolved. An analysis of the data in this and other relevant inscriptions would agree with this interpretation and we are inclined to favour the view that the ruler figuring in this epigraph is the Kāliṅga king Nisṣaṅka Malla, rather than a local ruler of South Ceylon.

First, the appellation Nisṣaṅka Malla Parākramabāhu is well-known among the numerous titles by which this monarch is referred to in his inscriptions.³ This, however, does not exclude the possibility, though it seems unlikely, that a local ruler adopted the same style in his record. Second, on the basis of the astronomical data provided, the

¹S. Ind. Ins., XIII, No. 330, p. 175; No. 223, p. 125; No. 100, p. 48; A.R.E., No. 27 of 1922; No. 321 of 1927.
³Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 16, p. 97, line 1; III, No. 9, p. 130, lines 1-4; II, No. 20, p. 129, line 1.
nearest date arrived at has been either Thursday, 7th January 1188 or 7th January 1191. The former date agrees well with the fifth year of Nissanka Malla in which the epigraph is dated.\(^1\) Here again, it is unlikely, though not impossible, that two rulers of identical titles and names ruled in Rājarattha and Dakkhiṇadesa about the same time. It may also be noted that the name Nissanka Malla does not occur in the inscriptions or the Chronicles with reference to any other ruler than the Kaliṅga king, with the exception of the Alakesvara family which rose to importance in the 14th century with powerful dignitaries like Nissahka Alagakkōna or Alakesvara.\(^2\) Third, an inscription which undoubtedly belongs to the celebrated Nissanka Malla dated in his ninth year has come to light in Pañḍuvasmuvara where also the Tamil inscription in question was discovered.\(^3\) It is inscribed on the stone throne on which Nissahka Malla is stated to have been seated on his return from Samanola (Samantakūṭa) and witnessed sports and theatrical performances. It also recounts the greatness and achievements of this monarch as recorded in his other inscriptions. This would lend support to the identification of the two rulers figuring in the two epigraphs, unless it

\(^1\) This date has been worked out by Dr. G. S. Gai, Superintendent for Epigraphy, Arch. Survey Ind. on the basis of the astronomical data, U.C.R., XVIII, 158, note 4; Mr. K. D. Sivamathan kindly calculated this date and arrived at the same result.

\(^2\) Nks., 93; Sdh. Rtn., 316-17.

is argued that by his ninth year Nissanka Malla had ousted the local rular of Dikkhina?desa, who shared, as it were, not only his kingdom but also his name and title.

It is difficult to imagine that such a situation had arisen, not merely because his inscriptions state that he was the ruler of the whole island but the data contained in them dealing with his activities, as well as the accounts of his reign in the Pali and Sinhalese Chronicles, presuppose a period of vigorous activity. The provenance of his records in the different parts of the island would indicate that he had a fair control of the whole country. Further they inform us that his tours included important religious centres such as Kâla? and Devinuvara in the South and the South-west of Ceylon. He does not appear to have encountered any noticeable opposition to his rule in Dikkhina?desa; on the contrary he seems to have held out the people of that province and those of Rājara?tha as an example to the people of Rohana, who were admonished to conduct themselves in such a manner so as not to earn the rebuke of the former. It is therefore difficult to imagine that Dikkhina?desa was outside his control during any part of his reign.

Further, the general (genevi nātan) who set up the epigraph in question had amongst others the title Aivarakanta? (Destroyer of the Five)

---

which has been interpreted as a reference to the 'Five Pāṇḍyas'.

This would call to one's mind the claims of Nissānka Malla to have invaded the Pāṇḍya country as has been suggested by Kanapathī Pillai, but there is no strong reason to identify him with the general Lak-Vijaya-Siṅgu-Senevi-Tāvurunāvan who figures prominently in that expedition. It is, however, possible that this cenevi nāṭan also played some part in that venture.

This general is stated to have erected amongst other edifices: 'an alms-hall for the distribution of delicious food' in Śripurana-kara. We learn from Nissānka Malla's inscriptions that Śripura was one of the places where he established almshouses, and this suggests that he had influence in, if not actual control of, that region. It is therefore not improbable that this general too contributed to the welfare of the religious establishments in Śripura in which his benefactor and overlord had shown interest. Or else this monarch took the credit for himself for the establishment of an institution, which in fact was largely the work of his general, for it has been found that at least a few of the monuments which he claims to have erected in

---

1 U.C.R., XVIII, 160; see also reference to Five Pāṇya brothers in Cv., X0, 43.


Poḷonnaru were in reality the work of Parākramabāhu I. His contribution in such cases was probably the repair and restoration of these edifices. In these circumstances we are inclined to favour the view that the ruler who figures in this inscription should be identified with the Kalinga king Nissanka Malla rather than with a local ruler of Dakkhinadesa. It would be surprising if, five years after the death of Parākramabāhu I, which corresponds to the date of this inscription, a local ruler had become so independent as to be referred to in a public document without reference to the ruler at Poḷonnaruva, issued from Paṇduvasnuvara - the very city which that ruler founded and made his base of operations in his campaigns for the unification of Ceylon. This, however, is not to ignore the forces of disintegration which set in with the death of Parākramabāhu but the data from Nissanka Malla's inscriptions, coupled with other considerations given above, would lead us to the inference that he was not one of the local rulers of the period in the discussion of which the present digression became necessary.

From the meagre information we have gleaned from the Chronicles, it appears that the task before the local rulers struggling to maintain their authority in their respective areas was not an easy one. In the case of Saṅkha, or Bhāma if the epigraph cited above is attributable to him, we are told that 'the infamous army of Māgha was only two yojanas

---

Thus it would appear that the forces of Māgha had not confined themselves to Rājarattha but had also attempted to penetrate in the direction of Rohana. The account of Vijayabāhu would indicate that a similar advance was made into Māyarattha. The glorification of war in the Miñipe Slab Inscription as pointed out by Paranavitana, though largely intended to bring out the aspect of heroism, is unusual in Sinhalese inscriptions. (He thus) adorned the wide expanse of the earth with blood drawn out of the bodies of the enemies as if it were with a thick cluster of red lotuses, and pleased the goddess of Heroic Splendour with the play of the prowess of the arm.

Though such phraseology is often met with in the eulogies of Indian kings, in the Sinhalese inscription it reflects perhaps to some extent the bitter struggle to which these chieftains were committed in order to maintain a semblance of authority in their respective areas in the face of an enemy who was more powerful than they were.

If a parallel could be drawn the political situation which emerges from our data in some respects bears an analogy to that which prevailed

---

1CV., LXXXI, 14-16; PJV., 109. An inscription of the time of Parākramabāhu II states that he defeated 'the Tamils who came to destroy the Māya kingdom', Bell, Rep. Kg. Dt., 77, lines 1-2; Paranavitana has suggested that this record could also be assigned to Parākramabāhu IV, U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 634, note 74.


3It may be noted that only the Cūlavamsa contains a few useful details concerning these chiefs.
in the period immediately preceding the emergence of Vijayabāhu I (1055-1110 A.D.). There, too, we meet a number of chieftains—some of them princes belonging to foreign royal families who had come over to Ceylon—exercising limited authority in Rohana and Mayāraṭṭha but not equal to the task of driving the Cola invaders out of the Island.¹ There again those rulers could not organize a common front in their struggle to expel the invader until Vijayabāhu I succeeded in rallying the people of these provinces behind him. Generals like Saṅkha endeavoured in their own way to keep the enemy at bay and give the people and the Sāṃgha some degree of protection. But there is no indication that they succeeded in bringing the people under their banner in a movement of organized resistance against the invader, based on a plan of common action. Mutual antagonism appears to have been one of the factors which prevented the formation of such a united front, for in the Miṇipe Slab Inscription it is stated that Bhāma had to fight Tamil as well as Sinhalese soldiers.² Even the principality of Rohana hardly achieved the degree of unity required for such action. We have seen the existence of at least two chieftains, Saṅkha and Ādipāda Bhuvanekabahu, wielding authority in their respective districts, in Rohana, and there may have been more of their type


²'tamāṇṭa yuddhayāta ā noek Demala Simhala māra-bhaṭa pravā': 'many a Māra-like soldier Tamil as well as Sinhalese who had come to battle against him', Ep. Zeyl., V, 158-9, lines 19-21, p.161.
both in Rohana and Mayarattha possibly in the group of chieftains who are termed vanniraja or vanni-niripudu (king of the vanni). On the other hand, even if a sufficient degree of unity for collective action was achieved, it was evidently too big a task for them to overthrow the forces of Magha, who were strongly entrenched in several strongholds in Rajarattha. This is shown by the fact that Vijayabahu III himself achieved only very limited success; and even his son Parakramabahu had to struggle for many years before Magha could be dislodged from Polonaruva. It has, however, been pointed out by Parannavitana that there is another possibility why the province of Rohana, which in former times had been the core of resistance against foreign rule, failed to rise to the occasion in this instance: its manpower would have been greatly depleted by the ruthless suppression of the revolts there during the reign of Parakramabahu I.

It will be shown in the sequel that in the period after the foundation of Dambadeniya as the royal capital the province of Rohana receded to the background and that the organisation of resistance to the foreign invaders centred in Mayarattha.

There is no evidence to suggest that the local rulers considered above came into direct conflict with the forces of Magha, although they

---

1 Cv., LXXI, 10-11; Pjv., 109; Parakumbā Sirita, verse 28; Girā Sandeṣaya, verse 140.

2 Pjv., 116; Cv., LXXXIII, 15-20.

felt the impact of the latter's military strength. It was Vijaya-
bāhu III who succeeded in bringing Mēyārattha, which gradually became
a base of resistance to foreign rule, under his control.

For the reconstruction of the reign of Vijayabāhu one has to
rely to a large extent on the Pali and the Sinhalese Chronicles. No
record comparable to the Panākaṇuva Copper Plate, which has shed so
much light on the career of Vijayabāhu I, especially on his early life,
has so far come to light. In spite of the limitation of epigraphic
evidence it is however possible to analyse the data contained in the
Chronicles and to form a general picture of the political developments
of the time.

The beginnings of Vijayabāhu are shrouded in obscurity. The
Chronicles contain various traditions regarding the family to which
he belonged. According to the Gūlavamsa he was a member of the line
of king Samghabodhi. Samghabodhi was a king who reigned in Anurādha-
pura in the third century A.D. and around him many legends depicting
his great piety and generosity have grown. Subsequently, on account
of the great popularity and the veneration in which this monarch was
held, Samghabodhi became a title adopted by many Sinhalese and Kaliṅga

---

2Cv., LXXXI, 10.
3Mv., XXXVI, 58 ff; Hvv., 2 ff.
kings such as Parakramabahu I and Nissanka Malla. It became therefore attractive for Sinhalese kings to trace their descent back to the family of King Samghabodhi. The statement in the Cūlavamsa that the corpse of Vijayabahu III was laid in the precincts of the Hatthavanagalla Vihāra, where King Samghabodhi is said to have been cremated, and that a stūpa was built over it, would suggest that such a belief about the ancestry of Vijayabahu was current at the time. The keen interest taken in that monastery by Parakramabahu II to promote its welfare may give some confirmation to the tradition.

According to the tradition recorded in the Pūjavaliya Vijayabahu was a direct descendant of the Samghabodhi family which brought the Bodhi Tree to Ceylon. The same tradition is recorded in an elaborated form in the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa and its Sinhalese versions with the additional detail that Vijayabahu's father was a royal personage (narādhīpo) named Vijayamalla. Sinhalese literary works such as the Daladērita, Rājaratnākaraya and the Rājavaliya agree substantially with

---


2. Cv., LXXXV, 73-76. The present Attanagalla, 20 miles north-east of Colombo with which this tradition is now associated was not the spot where Samghabodhi was cremated which, according to the Mv. Tikā, p.671, lay to the south of the Issarasamana Vihāra in Anurādhapura, U.C.H.C., I, 190, note 26.


5. "tato pubbe Jayamahābodhidumindena saha sakala jambudīpādhipatina dinakarakaṭilakeṇa Dhammāsokanarindena pesitāṇaṁ attanā samānagottānaṁ rājaputtānaṁ nattapanattādiparamparamaparagatassa Vijayamalla-narādhīpamassa (cont.)"
this tradition of the descent of Vijayabāhu. At first sight it may appear that the authors of the Čūlavamsa and the Pūjāvaliya record almost the same tradition. It is, however, possible to show that the tradition is not necessarily the same in the two works. If we rely upon the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa, which deals with the life and career of Samghabodhi and the history of the Hatthavanagalla Vihāra, this ruler, namely Samghabodhi, does not appear to have had any connection with the family which brought the Bodhi Tree to Ceylon. For we are told that the khattiya named Selābhaya who lived in Rohana, fearing that his young son might be harassed by the Anurādhapura king Vohārika Tissa (209-231 A.D.), brought him to Mahiyaṅgana Vihāra where he entrusted him to the assembly of monks headed by Nanda maha therə. He sought refuge in the Samgha and the great Bodhi Tree for the protection of his son. Selābhaya requested the Samgha that his son be named Samghabodhi as he had sought protection in the Samgha and the Bodhi Tree. It is added that Samghabodhi was entrusted to the Samgha and the resident deity of the Bodhi Tree. Whatever may be the truth of this story, there is no indication either in the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa or the Mahāvamsa account of Samghabodhi that he was a descendant of the family that brought the Bodhi Tree to

(cont.) orasaputto Vijayabhāhunarināṃ nāma rājā', Ḥv., 30; see also Ḥv., XIX, 1-6.

1Dal., 43; Elu. Av. (Vidāgama), 68; Ṛjr., 37; Ṛjv., 44.

2Ḥv., 2; Elu. Av. (Vidāgama), 6-7.
Ceylon. If such a tradition existed it is strange that the author of the *Mahāvamsa*, who gives considerable prominence to this ruler, fails to record it. Besides, Samghabodhi and his two companions, who proceeded to Rājarattha and occupied the throne there, are referred to as scions of the Lambakānna clan and not of the Moriya clan which perhaps could have claimed a link with the family connected with the bringing of the Bodhi Tree (later referred to as the Bodhāhara-kula). In the Sinhalese chronicles and literary works several other kings including Parākramabāhu VI of Kōṭṭe are associated with the latter.

There are other Sinhalese works which refer to him as Vijayabāhu Vathimi raja or maharajānā. The *Dambadeni Asna* and the *Rājaratnākara* call him Kāliṅga Vijayabāhu - a name also applied to Māgha in the *Nikāya Sangrahaya* and the *Saddharma Ratnākara*. On account of this it has been suggested that some of these writers regarded him as a descendant of the Kāliṅga family. It may be noted that another Kāliṅga king Sāhasa Malla (1200-1202 A.D.) had the title Sirisaṅgabo Kāliṅga Vijayabāhu as known from his inscriptions.

---

1 cf. *Hvy.*, 2 and *Mv.*, XXXVI, 58 ff. Both works state that they were Lambakānna. *Hvy.*, 7.


3 *Ktk. Sng.*, 8; *Nks.*, 88; *Dal. Pjv.*, 64; *Sdh. Rtn.*, 314.

4 *Dmb. A.*, 30; *Rjr.*, 37; *Nks.*, 87; *Sdh. Rtn.*, 313.


An inscription of Parakramabahu II at Devundara refers to this monarch as a descendant of the family (parampārava) of Somarāja of Nembara. ¹ Nembara is usually identified with Nanbāmbara, a name applied to a locality close to Daṁbadeniya.² In the Kavsilumina, a poem generally attributed to Parākramabahu II, the author claims descent from the family of Pāṇduindu.³ The Kavsilumina reference to Pāṇduindu and Saṁdakula (Candra Vamsa) and the statement in the Devundara Inscription taken together have led Paranavitana to suggest that Parākramabahu was of Pāṇḍya stock.⁴ Little credit can be given to the statement in the Daladā Pujāvīya that the father of Mahalū Parākramabahu (Parākramabahu I) was a son of Kṛttiti-śrī Megha and that the latter had the title Kalikāla Sāhitya Sarvagha of Jambudronipura, which according to the Cūlavamsa was a title of Parākramabahu II.⁵ We have already given a possible reason why such an erroneous tradition is found in this text, as there is no doubt that Parākramabahu I was a son of Maṁabharna.⁶ It would therefore be difficult to accept the interesting suggestion of Paranavitana that

¹A.S.C.Mem., VI, 68, lines 16-18.
³Kavsilumina, p. 294, verse No. 2.
⁵Dal. Pjv., 59.
⁶See above, 93-94.
the confusion of the parentage of Parākramabāhu I could be attributed to the prevalence of fraternal polyandry at the medieval Sinhalese court.\footnote{U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 615, note 14.} The Daladā Pūjāvaliya statement can therefore hardly lead us to believe that there was any connection between the family of Parākramabāhu I and that of the Daṃbadeṇī kings for it has been admitted that the panegyrist of Parākramabāhu II would have taken full advantage of it if such a relationship existed.

In the above survey one is struck by the different and conflicting traditions regarding the family to which Vijayabāhu III and Parākramabāhu II belonged. Lack of unanimity on their ancestry is reflected even in the records dated in the reign of Parākramabāhu himself. For instance, while the Pūjāvaliya and the Hatthavanagallavīhāravamsa would have us believe that they belonged to the Samghabodhi family which brought the Bodhi Tree to Ceylon, the Devundara Inscription of Parākramabāhu is not only silent on such a connection but traces his ancestry to a Somarāja of Nembara. However, it is indeed strange that his own record does not state that he belonged to the Samghabodhi family, whereas at least two leading theras who flourished during his reign and received his generous patronage, namely the authors of the Pūjāvaliya and the Hatthavanagallavīhāravamsa, did so in their works. Anyhow, the tradition which appears to have gained wider acceptance as reflected in the works cited above and in several
others of a somewhat later date is that he belonged to the family of Samghabodhi connected with the bringing of the Bodhi Tree. The connection between the Dambadeni kings and the Pāṇḍyas, mentioned in some sources, has been attributed to the possibility that a Pāṇḍya lady should have been the queen of Vijayabāhu and that his son preferred to trace his ancestry to the family of his mother. Although there is no positive indication of such a matrimonial link in the accounts of the reign of Vijayabāhu, this possibility cannot be ruled out, for there is evidence of the prevalence of matrilineal descent in the royal families of medieval Ceylon. The literary works which contain hints of Kalinga affiliations are later in date than the Pūjāvaliya or the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa. It appears fairly certain that he had no direct connection with the rulers at Polonnaruva and, if he had a royal ancestry, it would have been a remote one. Paranavitana has suggested that the conflicting claims with regard to the ancestry of this royal family were either a result of the attempts made by their panegyrists to find for their patrons a respectable pedigree which they lacked, or resulted from the marriage alliances which their ancestors might have contracted with those royal families. The former is more likely to have been the case with the

1S.H.C., 76; C.A.L.R., X, 43-44.
Dambadeni rulers. It would have brought a measure of relief to
the Sangha and the people, who had been subject to severe hardships
during the oppressive rule of Māgha in Rājarattha. Consequently the
writers of the period—many of them monks who benefitted greatly
from his generosity—perhaps attributed to their patrons attrac-
tive royal ancestries in their poems of grateful praise. It may
thus be reasonable to hold, and this in spite of the various claims
made for them by the writers of the period, that Vijayabāhu III,
who founded this new dynasty of rulers, had no direct connection
with the Sinhalese royal houses of the preceding period. At best,
if such a link connected these royal families, it would have been a
remote one.

It is clear from the Cūlavamsa and the Pūjavaliya that the
attainment of the position of a king of the Vanni (vannirāja) was
the first important stage in the career of Vijayabāhu.¹ The term
vanni occurs here for the first time in the Pali Chronicle and re-
curs several times thereafter in the account of Parākramabāhu II.
This term has been traced to the Skt. vana (forest), though the pre-
cise etymology remains somewhat obscure. Vannirāja (Sinh. vanni-
nirindu) is regarded as a chieftain who exercised authority in a
forest tract.² We have already examined the reference to a Coḷa-
ganga in the Pāṇḍya country, who is called a vañño-sāmenta in the

¹ Cv., LXXXI, 10-11; Piv., 109.
Upāsaka Janālaṅkāra, a feudatory of similar status. There cannot be much doubt that the Pali vanni is a rendering into that language of the Sinhalese (?) term vanni. The Nikāya Saṅgrahāya states that Parākramabāhu I brought under his control three hundred and sixty four vanni districts. Parākramabāhu II had also to deal with this kind of chief and similarly Parākramabāhu VI is stated to have abolished the illegalities perpetuated by the vanni kings in their ignorance. The Vīdāgama version of the Eluattanagaluvamaya refers to vanni chieftains in connection with Sinhalese kings who ruled at Anurādhapura at a much earlier date. Gothābhaya (249-262 A.D.) who tried to wrest the kingdom from the pious Samghabodhi is stated to have set out from the northern gate of the city, collected robbers who lived in the forests and forest villages and occupied the city gate. The same text refers to the vanni kings of Galval-raṭa (Malaya), who disregarded the authority of a king named Moggallāna — evidently one of the kings of that name who ruled at Anurādhapura. As the Pali Chronicles make no mention of this

1 See above, 133-34.

2 Nks., 85; Dal. Pjv., 60 has the number three hundred and sixty.

3 Parakumbāsīrita, vv.28, 46; Girāsandesaya verse 1.30 states that he defeated eighteen Vanni kings; Pjv., 109, 129.

4...nuvarā uturuvāsal dorin nikmā palamu tānā tānā Vannikālūgam-سوراء un sorun rūskarava senanga genē ayt nuvara vāsal dora gata', Elu Av. (Vīdāgama), 51; cf. however, Hv. 21.

5 Elu Av., 65; cf. Hv., p. 28, para 3.
class of chieftain prior to the reign of Vijayabahu III it is not unlikely that the authors of these works projected a political phenomenon of their own times on to the more ancient past. It must not, however, be imagined that there were no rulers of this class in early times, but the change appears to have been that, with the decline of the central authority in the thirteenth century, their power and influence had increased so that they became a factor to reckon with in the politics of the period.

Paranavitana has drawn attention to the fact that this class of vanni kings is also known to have existed in South India, as they are mentioned in the epigraphic records there. In an inscription of Cola Kulottunga Cola II a Malaiyamān chieftain with the title Vanniyanāyar is mentioned, while epigraphic records of the time of Vijayanagara king Kṛnarāya refer to the eighteen vanni heroes. The Upāsaka Janālaḥkāra, too, would confirm the view of Paranavitana that vanni chieftains were known in South India roughly about the same period. In fact, some at least of the vanni chieftains of the period referred to in our sources were Damilas, as may be inferred from the claim of Parākramabāhu II that he subjugated the Simhala maha Vannin (the great Sinhalese vanni chieftains) whom his father failed


2 A.R.E., No. 315 of 1921; also cited by Paranavitana, Nos. 14, 19, 30 of 1926.
to conquer. Unless there were Damila Vanni chieftains too there is no need to describe them as Simhala maha Vannin. Therefore it is reasonable to hold that originally a 'vanni king' was a chieftain who exercised authority in a forest tract. Later on, however, this term might have included independent or semi-independent chieftains who exercised authority in limited areas, though not necessarily in forest tracts. Such a position Vijayabahu III reached when he attained the rank of a Vanni king.

There is no evidence to determine where Vijahabahu's initial centre of activity was but the fact that the Daladā Pujāvaliya calls him Vijayabahu Vathimi-raja of Pūṭabhattasela or Palabatgala may be the result of a tradition which arose from his likely association with that region in his early career as suggested by Codrington. Palabatgala - a mountainous locality in the Ratnapura District of the Sabaragamuva Province - situated at a distance of about 12 miles from Ratnapura on the old route to Samantakūṭa, would provide congenial surroundings to a vanni chieftain, offering protection in its rock-shelters. The monastery at Palabatgala, noted for the great piety of its inmates, founded by Parākramabahu II received the generous patronage

---

1 Cv., LXXXIII, 10; '..piyaraṇa jahu sādhāgata mahanu Simhala mahavannin taman hun palama hinda sādha', Pjv., 116.
2 C.A.L.R., X, 43.
3 On the original significance of the place name Palābatagala see Julius de Lanarolle, J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXXI, 511-12.
of this monarch. We have, however, no means of ascertaining whether Vijayabahu was associated with this region in his early career but there is no reason to discard this possibility.

Vijayabahu gradually expanded his area of influence and ultimately became the ruler of Māyārattha. To achieve this position he had to struggle for many years, for it was evidently in his old age that he succeeded in becoming the acknowledged ruler of Māyārattha. His youth was spent in this struggle during the course of which 'he had through fear of the foe withdrawn to diverse inaccessible forests and had long dwelt there'. His task would not have been easy for, on the one hand, he had to withstand the impact of the forces of Māgha even though they were mainly concentrated in Rajarattha and, on the other, the local chieftains of the type considered above would naturally have jealously guarded the parochial autonomy of the districts in which they exercised authority. They would hardly have surrendered to Vijayabahu without resistance. The Pujavaliya states that Vijayabahu set out with a Sinhalese army and won over to his side the powerful Sinhalese (chieftains) who lived in the Vanni regions in

---

1 Cv., LXXXIV, 22-24; Nks., 89, 96-98; Sdh. Rtn., 532-33 for information on the leading theras of this vihāra.

2 Cv., LXXXI, 10-16; 'giya yovun kālayehi ma rajaya lat heyin Dravida buddha kota Lamkava tanā natabun vehera karava lovāda kirimata kal mānda se dāna', Pjv., III.

4 'tam tam mahāvanam duggam pavisitvā'ribhi tiya nivasivā cirem Vannirajattam samupagato', Cv., LXXXI, II.
fear of the Damiillas but were willing to accept his authority. Those unwilling to do so are said to have been subjugated. It is possible that a certain amount of tact and diplomacy on the part of Vijayabahu might have contributed to bring some of these local rulers under his influence, particularly the weaker ones, while others, as the Pujavaliya would have us believe, accepted his overlordship only after resistance in defence of the integrity of their territories. None of our sources mentions by name the chieftains who were thus forced to accept the overlordship of Vijayabahu. It is unlikely that information on the activities of this ruler in his early career reached the writers who deal with his reign. This may partly explain the lack of more positive data relating to this part of his life.

On the basis of the Pujavaliya and the Culaavamsa there is reason to believe that there were Tamil settlements even in the province of Mayarattha and it is stated that they had to be dislodged before Vijayabahu could establish his authority there. Though it is not explicitly stated in the Pali Chronicle the printed text of the Pujavaliya records that these Damiillas were driven away as far as Polonnaruva. There is, however, no evidence to suggest that there was a confrontation of the main forces of Magha and those of Vijayabahu. Though he had freed

---

1Pijv., 109.
2Cv., LXXXI, 14-16.
3Pijv., 109. This reading is however, uncertain, see Pijv., 109, note 5; Bell, Rep. Kg. Dt., 77, lines 1-2.
the Māyārattha from the briers (of the foe), he evidently lacked the resources and the military organisation called for in such a trial of strength.

When he became the ruler of Māyārattha, he established his capital at Jambuddoni (Sinh. Dambadeni) - a rocky elevation, situated 18 miles to the south west of Kurunāgala, in the Udukaha Basnāhira Kōrale of the Dambadeni Hatpattu in the Kurunāgala District.¹ The Sinhalese form of the name in the Pujāvaliya still survives, but the name Dambadeni is now applied not only to the site of the royal city but also to a larger territorial division called the Dambadeni Hatpattuva. Jambuddoni is mentioned in the Gālavamsa for the first time in connection with the reign of Vijayabāhu III.² Prior to that there is no indication that it ever was a seat of royal authority. The Daladh Pujāvaliya and the Dambadeni Asna, both of which belong to a period later than the Pujāvaliya and are less learned than the latter, contain vague hints of its association with Kīrtti-sri-Megha and Mānābharaṇa but they inspire little confidence.³ It may be said with a fair degree of certainty that, judged by the data in our sources, Dambadeni became a royal residence only with the foundation by Vija-

¹ Cv., LXXXI, 15-16; Pjv., 109, J.R.A.S.Cey.NS. VI, 105.
² Cv., LXXXI, 15-16.
Vijayabahu of that city. The elevation of the site gives it a commanding position, although it does not rise to bolder relief than the Yapahu rock. Vijayabahu's capital was situated at a distance of about 75 miles from Polonnaruva, where Māgha held sway. Consequently Vijayabahu had the advantage of being at a safe distance from the enemy.

In the selection of the site for the foundation of his capital Vijayabahu would have given thought to its suitability as a base of operations in a future attack on the forces of Māgha in Rājarattha while, at the same time, it was less vulnerable in case the latter took the offensive. Thus Dambadeniya being a rocky elevation of the type resorted to by the rulers of the period had considerable strategic advantages. Vijayabahu strengthened it further by the addition of fortifications consisting of walls, gate-towers and so forth.

The area covered by the principality of Māyārattha, which thus became the kingdom of Vijayabahu, has a history going back to earlier times. The occurrence of Brāhmī inscriptions written in early characters indicates that this region had Aryan settlements dating back to the period when the island came to be colonised by the Aryan immigrants. In the Kāgalla and Kurunagala Districts in particular, Brāhmī inscriptions recording donations of caves to the Samgha, which belong to a date

---

1 Cy., LXXXIX, 13-14 gives the distance as five wojanas; Pjv., 138 gives twenty gavvas (visi gay), which would be about 45 miles but the actual distance is about 75 miles.

2 Cy., lxxxl, 15-16. Later royal residences like Yapahuva, Campola and Kotte also had strategic advantages in one way or another.
immediately preceding and following the Christian era, are found. However in this early period this region of dense vegetation and heavy rainfall of the South West monsoon was less attractive to the early Aryan settlers than the plains of Rājaraṭṭha, which provided more favourable conditions for paddy cultivation. In addition to disadvantages arising from heavy rainfall and thick vegetation, the terrain of Mayāraṭṭha was often interrupted by the outcrops of rocks and hills which consequently limited the available land suitable for paddy cultivation. Nicholas even hinted at the possibility that there was an exodus of the Aryan settlers from Mayāraṭṭha into Rājaraṭṭha through coercion of the kings in order to obtain the labour required for their ambitious projects in the field of irrigation. There is no strong evidence to support this view, and even less reason to believe that royal coercion was involved, but the possibility that some of the early settlers migrated to Rājaraṭṭha in the hope that their lot would improve under more favourable conditions to agriculture cannot be ruled out. The coastal region of Kālaniya in the proximity of Colombo seems to have been an Aryan settlement of some importance, as is reflected in the Pali Chronicles, even though the account is garbled in a legendary form. The discovery of early Brāhmi inscriptions in

1 For an account of these regions, their settlements and inscriptions, see J.R.A.S.Cey. Br., NS. VI, 92-126.


4 Nv., I, 71-6; XXII, 13 ff.
the hinterland along the Kālaṇi river would suggest the habitation of these areas by these settlers from an early date.¹

With the passage of time the southern and south western parts of the island rose to importance and the Anurādhapura kings were alive to it.

Already in the sixth century Silākāla (522-535 A.D.) conferred on his second son Dāthāpabhuti the post of Malayārāja and was entrusted with the administration of Dakkhinadesa. As Geiger has observed, the implication is that this prince was entrusted with the administration of both Malayadesa (the central Hill Country) and Dakkhinadesa.² Aggabodhi I (575-608 A.D.) conferred the dignity of Malayārāja on his sister's son, while 'the province of Dakkhinadesa with the appropriate retinue he made over to the Yuvarāja'.³ Thus by the ninth and tenth centuries the practice of placing the heir-apparent (Sinh. mahāpā, mahāvā or māvā) in charge of this southern portion of the Anurādhapura kingdom had been firmly established.⁴ This region evidently came to acquire the name Māyārattha (Sinh. Māyāraṭṭa) in consequence of this practice.


²Cv., XLI, 33-35; Cv. Tr., I, 54, note 4.

³Cv., XLII, 6-10.

Inscriptions recording the edicts issued by the princes who held this position have been discovered in Māyārattha. Thus by the end of the Anurādhapura period Dākkhiṇadesa, or Māyārattha as it came to be called later, embracing wider territory in that part of the island, had acquired considerable importance in spite of the distinctly secondary position it held in relation to Rājarattha.

It was, however, with Parākramabāhu I that this region rose to greater importance. We have already discussed the establishment of his capital at Paṇduvasnava (Parākramapura) in his early career, and his contribution to the development of irrigation and agriculture based on schemes which harnessed the waters of the Dāduru Oya, and the draining of marshland and the reclamation of cultivable land in the Paṇcayojana district (Pasdun Kōrale in the Kalutara District).

Parākramabāhu I thus developed the resources of this principality to a considerable extent when it became the base of operation in his campaigns for the unification of Ceylon. When he succeeded in becoming the sole ruler of the Island this region came to be directly administered from the central administration which operated from the capital city of Polonnaruva. Among the successors of Parākramabāhu I,

2See above, 93-96.
3U.C.H.C., I, pt. II. 531-32; note the words attributed to Parākramabāhu I in the Nks., 85; 'Sri Lanka dhāpye, bahunāyakatvaya nokarana sē rājya sutraya pavatvami yi sitā'.
Niṣṇāṇka Malla, whose records as we have seen were found at Pañ-ānuśavāsuvāra and elsewhere, visited in person its ancient shrines, such as those at Kālanīya and Devimiuvāra, and strove to keep this principality as an integral part of his kingdom.¹ The Čūlavamsa states that he laid out a fruit garden at Bhīmatittha Vihāra (now Bemtota on the western coast half-way between Colombo and Galle).² We cannot be certain how far the ruler's that followed on the throne of Polonnaruva exercised effective control over the South and South West of Ceylon, but it may be noted that in the reign of queen Kal-yāṇapāvati (1202-1208) a vihāra named Rājakulavaddhana was built at Valligāma, located 28 miles to the south of Galle on the west coast, indicating possibly that these rulers had some control over that region though not as effectively as in the time of their more powerful predecessors.³ Thus it is clear that Māyāraṭṭha rose in importance through the centuries.

When Vijayabāhu III (1232-1236) succeeded in establishing himself as the ruler of Māyāraṭṭha, he would have taken into account the development work launched in that region by previous rulers, though much of it is likely to have fallen into decay and neglect in the

²Čv., LXXX, 24-25: LXXXVI 16.
³Čv., LXXX, 39-40; Buddhadatta has pointed out that the name of this vihāra should be Rājakulavaddhana and not Sarājakula vaddhana, and it has been corrected accordingly, see Cult. Cey. Med. Times, 249.
troubled period which followed the death of Parākramabāhu I. Besides, though Māyāratttha lacked the advantages which Rājarattha had in so far as paddy cultivation was concerned, yet possibilities were not entirely absent. Low-lying land interlocked between hills often enabled paddy cultivation to be practised on some scale, though they had less assurance of the rich yields to which they were accustomed in Rājarattha. The chaotic political situation that followed the death of Parākramabāhu I would hardly have enabled his successors to devote much attention to irrigation or even to keeping the existing works in a state of good repair. The Chronicles hardly refer to new irrigation works built in this period, and even attempts at repair were few and far between. Nissanka Malla appears to have given some thought to irrigation, though it could have been little more than repair of existing works. The occupation of Rājarattha by the forces of Māgha and the oppressive policies he followed would undoubtedly have led to further neglect of the irrigation works. In these circumstances, the inhabitants who migrated to Māyāratttha would have naturally taken advantage of the possibilities of agriculture there, however limited they were. Apart from these, Māyāratttha had important areas such as Ratnapura in the Sabaragamuva Province, well-known for gems and other precious stones. We learn from the Cūlavamsa

that when Parākramabāhu I was the ruler of Dakkhiṇadesa he exported gems and precious stones. The ports of Uruvela, Kalpiṭiya and Colombo, which later acquired great importance for foreign trade, were also within the territory of Māyāratṭha. It is, however, unlikely that Vijayabāhu III grasped the significance of all these possibilities, which eventually were left for his successors to take advantage of, placed as he was in such adverse circumstances. Vijayabāhu would have been more alive to the strategic and military advantages of that part of the island rather than to economic considerations. Daṃbadeniya, where he founded his capital, offered some of these advantages which perhaps led him to select that site.

One important factor which strengthened his position in Māyāratṭha was his recovery of the Tooth Relic and the Alms Bowl of the Buddha. At the time when Rājaraṭṭha was ravaged by the forces of Māgha, the mahātheras of the time headed by Vacīssara are said to have removed these Relics from Pulatthinagara to Māyāratṭha to ensure their safety. Finding that the safety of the sacred Relics was yet in danger, they are said to have buried these Relics in the earth at Kotthumala mountain and these monks crossed over to the Cola and Pāṇḍya countries. This tradition of the monks going over to the Cola

\(^1\) Cv., LXIX, 33. For an account of 'A Sinhalese Embassy to Egypt' in the reign of Bhuvanekabāhu I (1272-84) see Codrington, J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., \(^2\) Cv., LXXXI, 17-29; \(^\text{Pjv.}\), 109. XVIII, 82-85.
and Pāṇḍya countries during the time of these Damila invasions is also confirmed by the Upāsaka Janālaṅkāra cited earlier, whose author, as we have seen, was resident in a Buddhist monastery in the Pāṇḍya country, having gone there on account of these adversities. The burial of the Tooth Relic at Kotmale as well as its recovery by Vijayabāhu III is referred to in the Pali and Sinhalese Chronicles as well as in the works dealing with the history of the Tooth Relic. Vijayabāhu recalled these monks from South India and with their assistance recovered and removed the Relics from the spot where they remained buried to Jambuddoni amidst great festivity and celebrations.

By this time the Tooth Relic had acquired such great veneration among the Buddhists in Ceylon that its possession seems to have become a sine qua non to justify the claims of the Sinhalese kings to the throne of Ceylon. King after king made generous endowments and paid great homage to it. Kings like Vijayabāhu I, Parākramabāhu I and even Niśaṅka Malla, if his claims are to be accepted, each built a Tooth Relic Temple, usually located close to the royal palace.

---

1 Upāsaka Janālaṅkāra, see verses in the colophon.

2 Dal.S., 43-44; Rjr.37-38, Rjv., 44-45; Nks. does not specifically mention the recovery of the Relics, see 87-88.


have seen that one of the reasons for Parākramabāhu's campaigns in Rohana was his desire to recover the Tooth Relic which was then in that province in the possession of queen Sugala. In the Gūlavamsa account of the subjugation of Rohana the words attributed to Parākramabāhu I are noteworthy:

'Shattered in combat the foe is in flight. They have seized the splendid sacred relics of the Alms-bowl and the Tooth Relic and are fain, though fear to cross the sea. So have I heard. If this is so, then the island of Lāṅkā will be desolate. For though here on the Sīhalā island various jewels and pearls and the like and costly kinds of various precious stones are found, yet of quite incomparable costliness are the two sacred relics of the Lord of the truth, the Tooth and the Alms-bowl.'

He arranged for a great festival for the reception of these Relics in Polonnaruva at the successful conclusion of these campaigns. The Relic was deposited in a temple built in Polonnaruva for the purpose. These facts underline the importance of the Tooth Relic during this period not only in the religious life of the people but also in the political life of the country, in so far as its possession gave the ruler a distinct advantage. This is likely to have been a vital consideration especially in a struggle for power with rival claimants to the throne.

Vijayabāhu, however, did not consider it wise to follow the practice of erecting a Tooth Relic Temple in his capital Jambuddōṇi, undoubtedly owing to the element of uncertainty and the threat of

---

1Cv., LXXIV, 100-103.
2Cv., LXXIV, 198 ff.
Magha's forces which gave an air of insecurity to the political climate of his time. He therefore constructed a Tooth Relic Temple on top of the Billasela mountain, situated at a good distance farther away from the enemy. Billasela is easily identified with the present Beligala in the Utara Pattu in the Kâgala District in the Sabaragamuva Province. Perhaps it was considered that Beligala was less vulnerable than Dambadeniya in the event of an attack by the forces of Magha. The words of the Chronicler would best explain the political uncertainty of the time: 'In order that if in future time another interregnum occurs, no evil from alien enemies shall befall these relics of the Sage, I will carefully provide for them a still more inaccessible place fast and secure'. Thus pondering he had the Billasela (mountain) made fast on every side with walls, gate-towers and the like, that save by the gods in the air it could not be trodden by human foes'. Archaeological exploration has brought to light the remains of the edifices erected by the Dambadeni kings at this site, although it has not been possible to identify the constructions of

---

1 Cv., LXXXI, 31-39; Piv., 109-110.

2 J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. VI, 124; see Cv. Tr., p. 138, note 4. For a topographical account of this region with popular traditions on the origin of place names (not a reliable account) see manuscript British Museum Library, OR. 6607 (12) 13 Aa.

Vijayabāhu III as distinct from those which may belong to his successors. The remains of a Tooth Relic Temple have been uncovered at this site.\(^1\) Broadly speaking this account of the Chronicle is confirmed to a considerable extent by the archaeological remains at Beligala even though so far it cannot be determined whether the remains there belong to Vijayabāhu or to one of his successors. More intensive excavations at this site may perhaps bring to light interesting data on this subject.

The recovery of the Tooth Relic and the erection of a temple to house it was undoubtedly an important step which earned for him the support and admiration of the Samgha and the lay Buddhists alike. This would be even more significant for, if Vijayabāhu had no strong claim to the throne, the possession of the Tooth Relic is likely to have considerably made up for such a deficiency, justifying his position on the throne, and making him acceptable to the people as their ruler. The fact that Vijayabāhu had on his side the support of the Samgha headed by such leading mahātheras as Samgharakkha and Dimbulagala Aranyavāsa Medhāṅkara would undoubtedly have gone a long way in winning the confidence of the people.\(^2\) We learn from the Daṁbadeṇi Katkāvata and the Nikāya Saṅgraha that Samgharakkha occupied


\(^{2}\)Cy., LXXI, 17 ff, 76-78; Ktk. Sng., 8
the position of Sāsanāmusāsaka - Head of the Buddhist Order - and that he was the chief dignitary of the grāmavāsī sect and a pupil of Sāriputta Mahāsāmi a leading mahāthera who flourished in the reign of Parākramabāhu I. Similarly, Dimbulāgala (Pali: Udumbaragiri) Medhakmara Mahāsāmi who co-operated with Vijayabāhu to effect a 'purification' of the Saṃgha, was evidently the head of the Vana-

vāsī ('forest-dwelling') sect. There is little doubt that these mahātheras wielded great influence with the Buddhist population, and their co-operation and goodwill is likely to have contributed in no small measure to strengthen his position as the ruler of Māyārāṭṭha. Thus Vijayabāhu had at once the support of two important communities of monks, namely the Vanavāsī and the Grāmavāsī sects led by their respective heads. In this manner the province of Māyārāṭṭha became the refuge of the Saṃgha and the people of Rājaraṇṭha, who were subjected to severe hardships resulting from the oppressive rule of Māgha.

---

1 Ktk. Sng., 8. According to the Sāh. Rtn., 313, he belonged to the Vanavāsī fraternity. Degammādā Sumanajoti Thera tells us that there are many instances showing changes in the affiliations of the members of the Vanavāsī and Grāmavāsī communities, and that this could have been such a case, Dāmbadeni Yugaya, 164, note 1. But I suspect that the use of the word vanavāsī is simply an error in place of grāmavāsī: 'Vanavāsī vū Śriyut māhinīyān vahanēge sīṣya vū trividha sāsana nāmātā sarvaratnāyān rakṣa karana samudrāyak vānīvu Samgharākṣita māhinīyān vahanē ha Dimbulāgala Arāṇyavāsī Medahkara māhāsthavirāyān vahanē pradhānakoṭa nīti tesu gamvāsī vanavāsī māhāsamghayā vahanē', Sāh. Rtn., 313-14. Here we have evidently the names of the respective heads of the two fraternities. If both belonged to the same sect viz. Vanavāsī, the phrase tesu gamvāsī vanavāsī māhāsamghayā vahanē ('and other members of the Saṃgha of the Grāmavāsī and the Vanavāsī (fraternities) would make little sense. The fact that Sāriputta who flourished in the time of Parākramabāhu I was of the Grāmavāsī sect is well known.

(cont.)
The steps taken by Vijayabāhu for the restoration of the position of Buddhism in the country by way of repairing the dilapidated monasteries, some of which are said to have suffered at the hands of the invaders, the foundation of new vihāras, his attempts at the promotion of unity in the Samgha by effecting a 'purification', the encouragement of the study of the Dhamma and the promotion of learning were certainly measures which earned him the unstinted admiration of the Samgha and the lay Buddhists, particularly at a time when they had been suffering alike under foreign rule.¹

It would now be possible to consider the extent of the territory in which he ruled. There are indications both in the Cūlavamsa and the Pūjāvaliya that his rule was mainly confined to Māyārattha. In the former it is stated that Vijayabāhu ordered the restoration of religious edifices in Māyārattha, but no mention is made of Rājaraṭṭha which was clearly outside his control, or even of Rohana.² Practically all the sites where he either founded new vihāras or restored the dilapidated

(cont.) His pupil Samgharakkhita might have belonged to the same sect and we may safely rely on the contemporary Dāmbadēni Katikāvata in preference to Saddharma Ratnākaraya written nearly two centuries later.²

¹Cv., LXXXI, 17 ff; Piv., 109-112.
²Cv., LXXXI, 62-63; Piv., 111.
shrines, Vijayasundararāma in Jambuddoni, Vattalagāma (now Vattala) and Kalyāṇi (now Kūlaniya) located within class proximity to Colombo in the Western Province were all within the territory of Māyāraṭṭha.¹ Important vihāras in Rohana such as the MahiyeOigana Vihāra do not figure in his programme of restoration. Such activities in Rājeraṭṭha would have been out of the question, for Māgha would not have allowed him to initiate measures to help Buddhism in his territory and win over its people to his side. In a statement attributed to Parākramabāhu II in the Gūlavamsa where the latter figures as giving paternal advice to his sons at the time of entrusting them with the administration of his kingdom, he claims that he inherited from his father the province of Māyāraṭṭha only, but that he 'brought the three kingdoms completely under one umbrella'.² It will be shown in the sequel that this was partly an exaggerated claim, as were many other claims made for him by the Chroniclers, but in the light of other indications referred to above, it would be reasonable to infer that Vijayabāhu's area of authority was mainly confined to Māyāraṭṭha, which thus Parākramabāhu inherited.

The Rājaratnākaraya states that Vijayabāhu 'established order in Māyāraṭṭa having driven out the Damilas into Pihiṭirata' (Rājaratṭha).³

¹Cv., LXXXI, 51, 58-63; Pjv., 111; Ktk. Smg., 8.
²Cv., LXXXVII, 24-25; 'mama piyānanyahansē maṭa genadu eka Māya rajaya gena dān tun rajayama eksatkota taba gatimi', Pjv., 129.
³Rir., 37.
This was in fact the objective of his son who for many years struggled hard to achieve it. That even in Māyārattha the element of insecurity was considerable is seen in his decision to erect the Tooth Relic Temple at Beligala and not in his capital Jambuddoni, for the former was 'a still more inaccessible place'.

The Pūjavaliya seems to indicate that Salgalkaṇḍura was a station on the frontier which separated the territories of Vijayabāhu and those of Māgha. On the basis of the foregoing survey we may not be far from the truth if we infer that the rule of Vijayabāhu was in the main confined to Māyārattha.

Though such was the extent of Vijayabāhu's kingdom as reflected in the Cūlavamsa and the almost contemporary Pūjavaliya the late Rājavaliya has credited him with achievements which are beyond credence and are indeed inconsistent with the picture which emerges from the former works. It is stated:

'Raising a Sinhalese army, he went out and caused the forts of the Tamils in the various villages to surrender, and the forts of the Tamils at Polonnaruva to surrender; attacked, expelled and destroyed the Tamils who dwelt in the Vanni districts. Thereafter he (re)built the Thūpārāma, Ruvanvēliṣṇya, crowned them with pinnacles and made great offerings. He cleared the jungle on the sites of the vihāras broken down by the Tamils in every part of illustrious Lanka............brought Māya and the other two countries under one canopy and received tribute.'

1 Cv., LXXXI, 31-37.
2 Pjv., Note the variant reading Salagam Kaṇḍavura, III, note 14.
3 '....Simhala senaga genagos gamagama ēē tūna siti Demala kaṇḍayuru aravā vannivala un Demala sen koṭā elavamin Demalun nasa Tupārāmaya da Ruvanvēliṣṇya da baḥdava Śri Lamkava mulullehi Demalun bīndi vihāra elikaravā....Māyārata ātuḷuva tunraṭama eksat karavāņena ayabadu gennā vēga inna sanda', Rjv., 44; Rjv. Tr., 54.
These are achievements which even his son Parākramabāhu achieved but partially and that only at the end of a protracted struggle. The exaggeration in the account of the late Rājavaliya is too obvious to need comment and can hardly be given credit.

The length of Vijayabāhu's reign is given as four years in the Čulavamsa and the Pūjāvaliya. But the Rājavaliya has credited him with a long reign of 24 years. There is good reason to trust the Pali Chronicle and the Pūjāvaliya on this point in preference to the Rājavaliya for a period of 24 years would be far too long if we take into account the indications contained in both these sources that Vijayabāhu ascended the throne at an advanced age 'when his youth had passed' (gīva yovun kala). It is stated that although Vijayabāhu cherished the desire to bring about the welfare of the world and the Śāsana, he realised that he had but a short time left to fight the Tamils in order to bring peace to Laṅkā, and to restore the dilapidated vihāras, due to the fact that he attained kingship when his youth had passed. The short reign of four years is in keeping with this statement in a contemporary work and confirmed by the Čulavamsa, in preference to the version given in a late Chronicle.

1 Čv., LXXXI, 79; Pīv., 112.
2 Rīv., 45.
3 Pīv., 111.
4 'Mahallakatte sampatte kālasim gatayobbane Maya rajjasiri laddha bhutta c'eva tato'dhunā'. Čv., LXXXI, 65, see also 66-67.
Geiger and Paranavitana placed the reign of Vijayabahu III between the years 1232 and 1236 A.D.\(^1\) According to Codrington, his rule terminated about the year 1234 A.D. as he thought that a usurper named Vathimi, who figures in a popular ballad entitled the *Kalundā Paṭuna*, ruled in the period between the death of Vijayabahu and the accession of Parākramabahu II for ten years.\(^2\) Paranavitana, however, does not give much credit to this work.\(^3\) Codrington’s view was largely based on a statement in the *Dambadeni Katikāvata* that Vijayabahu III promulgated a code of disciplinary rules for the bhikkhus 36 years after the death of Parākramabahu I, which would bring one close to the date suggested by Codrington reckoning from 1186 A.D., the date of the death of Parākramabahu I. Paranavitana has pointed out that the *Dambadeni Katikāvata* does not state whether these rules were issued before or after he became the acknowledged ruler of Māyāraṭṭha, and he is right in suggesting that this work would indicate two sets of disciplinary rules promulgated by him – one 36 years after the death of Parākramabahu when he was still a vanni king, and the other a more formal enactment made after his accession to the

---

\(^1\) *Cv. Tr.*, II, XIV, see Chronological Table; the text of the *Pīj.* consulted by Geiger seems to give a reign of 24 years for Vijayabahu III, but Suravira’s edition, p. 112, has satara avuruddak (four years); Medhaṅkara edition, p. 28, also gives four years. *U.C.H.C.*, I, pt. II, 846, 849.

\(^2\) *S.H.C.*, 76-77; *C.A.L.R.*, X, 44-46.

rulership of Māyārājītha with the assistance of the leading mahā-
theras of the time, Saṃgharakkhiṭṭha and Meḍhamkara.

There are difficulties involved in this issue on both sides. It may be noted that none of the important sources, the Cūlavamsa or the Pujāvaliya contains any hint of the intervention of a usurper in the period from the death of Vijayabāhu III and the accession of Parākramabāhu II. On the contrary, the impression created is that there was a smooth transfer of power from Vijayabāhu to his son.¹ But here it must not be overlooked that such an unpalatable circumstance is not unlikely to have been even ignored by these writers who had unstinted praise for the Dambadeniya kings. Besides, one has to explain how the tradition embodied in the Kalundā Patūna could have arisen without even a kernel of truth. This is perhaps partly the reason why Codrington took into account this tradition though there is no doubt that the work is of a very late date which is clearly suggested by its language and the treatment of its contents.² There is also the additional difficulty of placing this ruler in the present chronological scheme.

Neither the Cūlavamsa nor the Pujāvaliya mentions the date of the accession of Vijayabāhu or Parākramabāhu, but the Hatthavana-
gallavihāravamsa written in the latter’s reign states that Parākrama-

¹Cv., LXXI, 76-80; Pjv., 111-12.
²For this tradition see Kālinga Kumāraya, Colombo, 1924.
bāhu's consecration took place 1824 years after the attainment of Enlightenment by the Buddha.¹ The Sinhalese version of this text simply states that this event took place after the lapse of 1824 years in the Buddhist era.² Though this dating in the Hatthathanagallavaharavamsa may appear somewhat unusual there is no strong reason to distrust it, for the practice of dating events from the Enlightenment is known from the Pujavaliya and the Yogāravāha both written by Mayurapāda Thera in this period.³ But the Buddhist era is usually reckoned from the Parinirvāna and not from Enlightenment. The Sinhalese versions of the Hatthahanagallavaharavamsa cannot inspire greater confidence on this point, for their compilers appear to have dated the event in this manner by the omission of an important detail in the original text rather than by applying a correction of chronology based upon an important tradition.

There is no inherent difficulty in accepting the date given in the Hatthahanagallavaharavamsa. It may be noted that, apart from dating events in an era in vogue, they were sometimes also dated in relation to an important event which took place earlier. For example,

¹Huv., 31.
²Full Av., (Vidāgama), 69.
³The Yogārnaya, Pjv. (Medhaṅkara edition), p.1. The reading in Suravīra edition, p.82, as shown in earlier chapter I is evidently wrong;
the Mahāvamsa states that the Abhayagiri Vihāra was founded in the reign of Vattagāmaṇi Abhaya after the lapse of 217 years, 10 months and 10 days from the date of the foundation of the Mahāvihāra. The Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa tradition on the date of Parākramabāhu's accession is confirmed by at least two other independent sources. An inscription of Parākramabāhu II at Devundara, wherein, however, the portion which refers to the date of the accession of this monarch is not in a very good state of preservation, states that this event took place on the lapse of 1779 years from the Parinirvāṇa of the Buddha. Now this date agrees very well with that given in the Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa, i.e. 1824 years from the date of Enlightenment. It is well known that the period from the Enlightenment to the Parinirvāṇa is taken to be 45 years. Thus the literary text in question would yield the result that the accession of Parākramabāhu took place (1824-45 = 1779) 1779 years after the Parinirvāṇa of the Buddha, and is therefore in agreement with the date given in a document issued by Parākramabāhu himself. Further, an interesting work which deals with the construction of and the endowments made to the Alutnuvara Devalaya states that the accession of Parākramabāhu took place after the lapse

---

1 MV., XXXIII, 81-82.

2 A.S.C. Mem., VI, 68, lines 10-18.

3 E. J. Thomas, The Life of the Buddha, ch. VI and XI.
of 1779 years from the Parinirvāṇa of the Buddha. In the light of these data we may hold with a reasonable degree of certainty that the accession of Parākramabāhu II took place 1779 years after the Parinirvāṇa of the Buddha. Before we could convert this date in the Buddhavarsa into the Christian era it would be relevant to take note of new evidence which has come to light recently and which has a bearing on the Buddhist era in Ceylon.

Until recently the earliest epigraphical document which gives a date in the Buddhist era which has been satisfactorily worked out was that of Sāhassa Malla (1200-1202). Apart from this, there is the statement of Nissānka Malla in his Galpota Inscription that he was born after the elapse of 1700 years from the arrival of King Vijaya in Ceylon at the behest of the Buddha but the accuracy of this statement would be open to dispute in the light of another statement of his, that he effected the 'unification' of the Sanga in the year 1708 of the same era. Codrington suggested that the difficulty could be eliminated by assuming that the year 1700 may be taken as the date of his arrival in Ceylon and not that of his birth. However, the more important epigraph is that of Sāhassa Malla where it is stated

---

1 Sīh. Sā. Līpi., 67; here only a part of this work is published; for a complete manuscript, see British Museum Library, Or.6606, (145), 12 leaves.


3 Ep. Zeyl., II, 115. This implies the Buddhist era, S.H.C., 74-75.
that the consecration of this monarch took place after the lapse of 1743 years, 3 months and 27 days in the Buddhist era. Fleet worked out this date and arrived at the result that this event took place on Wednesday, 23rd August 1200, and it is regarded as a 'definitely fixed point in the later chronology' of Ceylon.\footnote{Ep. Zeyl., II, 220; J. B. Fleet, 'The Origin of the Buddhavarsa, the Ceylonese Reckoning from the Death of the Buddha', J.R.A.S., (1909) 323-56; Hultzch, 'Contributions to Sinhalese Chronology', J.R.A.S., (1912), 517-31.} Fleet arrived at this result by reckoning from 544 B.C. as the initial year.

Recently Paranavitana has brought to light an inscription from Basavakkulama at Anuradhapura, on the basis of which he has tried to demonstrate that a Buddhist era reckoning from 544 B.C. was in use in Ceylon at a much earlier date, i.e. in the time of Upatissa I (368-410 A.D.), with whom the king mentioned in the epigraph has been identified.\footnote{Ep. Zeyl., V, No. 7, 80-111.} According to Paranavitana the 28th regnal year of this king fell in the year 941 after the Parinirvāṇa of the Buddha. Unfortunately on the published plate of this inscription, as well as on the original, the aksaras which refer to the Parinirvāṇa are not quite clear.\footnote{U.C.R., XVIII, text on p. 131, plate between pages 132-33.} But the reading 941 is beyond reasonable doubt, though it is less certain whether it refers to the Parinirvāṇa. One may, however, ask, to what could it refer if not to the Parinirvāṇa?
far we do not know of an era going back to the Buddha's birth or Bodhi. In view of these circumstances we are inclined to accept the conclusions of Paranavitana on the use of the Buddhist era in Ceylon. The possible question one might raise as to why a Buddhist era in use at such an early date went out of vogue until it re-appeared at the beginning of the 13th century would present no serious difficulty. For there were instances when a particular era in use went out of vogue for a time and re-emerged at a later date as is illustrated by the Śaka era which went out of use in the period between the last Satraps (c. 480 A.D.) and the Cālukyas. There is little doubt that the record to which Paranavitana has drawn attention would prove very useful in dealing with some difficult problems relating to the chronology of Ceylon.

So far as we are concerned it is fairly certain that the Buddhist era reckoned from 544 B.C. was current in Ceylon in the thirteenth century, whatever be its antiquity. On this basis the consecration of Parākramabāhu II which, as we have seen earlier, took place in the year 1779, falls in the year 1236 A.D. Consequently, the reign of Vijayabāhu III which lasted four years would fall between 1232 and 1236 A.D. This would of course not enable us to take into account the ten years' usurpation by Vathimi, which according to Codrington's view,
intervened between the death of Vijayabahu III and the accession of Parakramabahu II. While appreciating the arguments of Codrington, we are inclined to favour the view of Paranavitara partly also owing to the difficulties involved in accommodating this usurper into the chronology of this period.

Although Vijayabahu is assigned a reign of four years in our main sources their accounts of this ruler presuppose many years of struggle and hardship before he achieved the position of the acknowledged ruler of Mayarattha evidently in old age. By the end of his reign Vijayabahu had brought some degree of peace and order to the province of Mayarattha. Through determined effort he succeeded in organising his kingdom as a base of resistance to the invaders, who were in occupation of Rajarattha. He had taken steps to help the Samgha and the Sasana and had won their sympathy and support which, in turn, would have gone a long way to strengthen the position of his son and successors. Vijayabahu had thus cleared the background and built the foundations on which his son Parakramabahu could continue his good work and deal with the menace of foreign invasions, which took many years of his long reign.
Chapter IV

The Treatment of the Reign of Parakramabahu II and his Struggle with Māgha

The reconstruction of the Reign of Parakramabahu II is beset with certain difficulties, which may be borne in mind from the beginning. Some of these difficulties arise from the nature of the treatment of this monarch in our principal sources, the Čulavamsa and the Pūjavaliya. These works deal at length and with great emphasis with the services he rendered to promote Buddhism. Although they provide useful information on important political events such as the foreign invasions which took place during his reign and his struggle with these invaders, there are many gaps in the narrative. The treatment is often casual and less specific than one might desire, so that it becomes difficult to attempt adequate reconstructions to bridge the gaps and make the narrative intelligible.

This difficulty is not limited to the reign of Parakramabahu II compared with other rulers in the Chronicles but it applies in equal, if not greater measure, to this period. The inadequacy of information on some important political events of his reign is particularly striking, if one compares the Chronicle account of the reign of Parakramabahu II with that of some of his predecessors such as Parakramabahu I and Vijayabahu I. In the case of Vijayabahu, who successfully effected the expulsion of the Colas from Ceylon, it is possible to watch his early
career, his gradual emergence to the position of a powerful ruler and the strategy which ultimately led to the expulsion of the invaders and the unification of Ceylon.\(^1\) The treatment of that ruler in the Čulavamsa bears a strong annalistic character.\(^2\) Parākramabāhu I, who is the hero of the second part of the Pali Chronicle, is treated with very great detail, with entire chapters devoted to his childhood and early career, the campaigns for the unification of Ceylon, expeditions to foreign lands and the services rendered for the welfare of Buddhism. In the case of these two rulers for whom information is available with such considerable detail there is the additional advantage that the Chronicle account can be checked to a reasonable degree with quite a large number of epigraphic records, which enable us to discount the exaggerations in the Chronicle, fill the gaps and modify the picture where necessary.\(^3\)

The same cannot be said of the reign of Parākramabāhu II. On the one hand, as we have pointed out, the Chronicles give comparatively less information on vital political events, to which the student of history would attach greater importance than these authors have done. On the other hand, though there are a few epigraphic records, these are far less numerous and contain but limited data. Despite these

\(^1\) Cv., LVII-LX.

\(^2\) Note the statement that 'From the time that he was yuvarāja, the wise Prince (Vijayabāhu), that best of men had seventeen years chronicled in writing'. Cv., LIX, 7.

\(^3\) C.H.J., IV, 33-51, 169-81.
limitations, a careful examination of the data in the Chronicles and other sources may enable us to reconstruct the history of the reign of Parakramabahu II to a fair degree, even though the final picture which emerges may be blurred at some points.

It is clear from both our main sources, the Cūlavamsa and the Pūjavaliya, that these authors desired to glorify the reign of Parākramabahu II making him the hero of their accounts. His career and deeds as well as the services rendered to Buddhism are treated in such a manner as to contribute to that objective. As a result, the events are often varnished: heroism and bravery in battle exaggerated, and more often than not these authors were silent on the reverses which, in their opinion, detracted from the greatness of their hero. A study of Parākramabahu's reign would illustrate the validity of Geiger's observation that 'not what is said but what is left unsaid is the besetting difficulty of Sinhalese history'.¹ One redeeming feature, however, is that where such exaggeration has been made, it is often not too difficult to detect it, as may be shown in the sequel. The picture can thus be modified with the aid of internal evidence from the text and the limited data available in other sources.

The Cūlavamsa devotes eight chapters to the reign of Parākramabahu II, who is the principal hero in the third part of this Chronicle, just as Parakramabahu I occupies that position in the second part, with

¹ Cv. Tr., I, Introduction v.
eighteen chapters devoted to his career and achievements. In all Parākramabāhu I is given 2527 strophes and Parākramabāhu II 595 in the chapters devoted to them. In the older Mahāvamsa, out of its thirty seven chapters, eleven with 863 strophes in all are devoted to its central figure Duṭṭhagāmanī Abhaya. Thus, the space given to the reign of Parākramabāhu II compares not unfavourably with the treatment meted out to these two heroic counterparts, who were his predecessors. In fact, none of the kings who ruled in Ceylon after Parākramabāhu I has been treated in such a manner. Parakramabāhu VI (1412-67), whose reign was important both politically and culturally, is given the major part of a single chapter of 36 verses. Similarly, Kīrttisrī Rājasimha (1747-82), who took a keen interest in the restoration of Buddhism, is dealt with in two chapters of 483 strophes in all. Parākramabāhu II thus stands out in considerable prominence as far as the treatment in the Chronicle is concerned. Compa red with the information available on other important rulers of the period, in spite of the inadequacies concerning the treatment of political events, the Chronicle account of Parākramabāhu II provides a good basis for historical investigation.

1 Cv., LXII-LXXIX, LXXXII-LXXXIX.
2 Mv., XXII-XXXII.
3 Cv., XCI, 15-36.
4 Cv., XCIX-C.
Our sources provide little information on the early life of Parākramabāhu. This may appear somewhat strange, for in the case of Dutthagāmaṇī and Parākramabāhu I, whose reigns have been glorified in heroic fashion, their birth, childhood and early life are dealt with in some detail. There the account is garbed in literary embellishment, making reference to miraculous occurrences portending their future greatness. Even the name of Parākramabāhu's mother is not stated in the Chronicles or any other sources. The lack of information on his early life may be understood if one considers the stark realities of the time and the hardships which his father Vija-yabāhu III experienced before attaining the position of the ruler of Māyāraṭṭha. It is possible that Parākramabāhu in his childhood was compelled by circumstances to share the hardships which his father experienced when 'he had through fear of the foe withdrawn to diverse inaccessible forests and long dwelt there'. Perhaps the chroniclers felt that silence on these hardships and small beginnings of their hero was the wiser course.

If it was the desire of the chroniclers to cast Parākramabāhu II in the same heroic mould as the first king of that name, the result appears to pale before that of Parākramabāhu I. The author of these

---

1MV., XXII; CV., LXII.
2CV., LXXXI, 11.
chapters of the Cūlavamsa was evidently a man of considerable literary accomplishment and, if the image of his hero does not come up to that of Parākramabāhu I, it may be due partly to the limitations of his sources. None the less, he worked with his material with that objective and achieved partial success.

The greatness which Parākramabāhu was destined to achieve in the future is stated to have been forecast even before his accession to the throne. In old age Vijayabāhu appears to have taken up the question of settling the succession to the throne. In order to decide which of his two sons, Parākramabāhu and Bhuvanekabāhu, was the more capable prince to succeed him after his death, Vijayabāhu consulted the opinion of those proficient in the interpretation of bodily marks (lakhaṇavedī) and it was foretold that Parākramabāhu II was destined to achieve greatness. It was found that

'The signs of Parākramabāhu are such that he will in accordance therewith accomplish through the majesty of his power the destruction of the enemy and will unite all Laṅkā under one umbrella so that none shall be above him; and that he will further the spotless Order of the Omniscient One; will spread his fame over the chief and intermediate regions of the heavens; will receive from most diverse countries gifts as princesses for his women's apartments and the like, and will be for long a world ruler on the Island'.

Recourse to prophecy is a customary technique in dealing with kings who occupy the position of the hero - a feature not limited to the Pali

\[1\text{ Cv., LXXXI, 69-72.}\]
The birth of Dutthagamani was prophesied through the experiences of his mother Viharamahadevi during her pregnancy. Both parents of Parakramabahu I shared a similar experience, symbolising the birth of their great son. As in the case of Parakramabahu II, the bodily signs of Parakramabahu I are said to have been examined by the experts in that art who foretold that the prince would in the future unite not only the whole of Lanka, but even rule over the whole of Jambudipa. Here we see an element common in the treatment of heroes in the Chronicles. How far Parakramabahu II lives up to the achievements prophesied in this manner will be examined in the following pages.

In the course of time Parakramabahu was selected to succeed to the throne. Apart from considerations of capabilities, he was also the eldest son and was therefore the rightful heir to the throne according to the customary law of succession then prevalent in Ceylon. At this stage we are told that prince Parakramabahu was entrusted to the community of monks assembled there with Samgharakkhita Mahasami at the head. The Culavamsa goes on to add that the same therā was entrusted with the Tooth Relic and the Alms Bowl as well as the com-

1. E.g. the prophecies concerning Gautama Buddha.

2 Mv., XXII, 42 ff.

3 Cv., LXII, 12 ff.

4 Cv., LXII, 45 ff.
community of monks (mahāsamgha) and the people of the island. This passage can hardly be interpreted in a manner different from that given by Geiger. It clearly conveys the sense that Samgharakkhita Mahāsāmi was virtually appointed the head of the Buddhist Order, but the implication that he was entrusted with the protection of the people, a non-ecclesiastical mundane function, is somewhat unusual. It does not by any means imply that the therā was in fact charged with the royal function of protecting the people, but if the Cūlavamsa verses are taken to convey this idea it is perhaps no more than a symbolic act. Geiger commenting on this passage says,

'The meaning is that the King made Samgharakkhita Head of the Church and entrusted him with the education of the heir to the throne. As head of the Order Samgharakkhita had to look after the spiritual welfare of the people over whom the King exercised secular dominion'.

This is of course the most likely implication of this passage. However, the Pūjāvaliya refers to the same episode with all the details given in the Pali Chronicle, but the Sinhalese passage clearly lends itself to a somewhat different interpretation. There it is stated that having made him skilled in the various arts and sciences,

'having taken the elder prince (jyestha āpānan) named Parākramabāhu to the great community of monks consisting of the Grand Master Samgha-Rakkhita and the like, entrusted him to the community of monks

---

1Cv., LXXXI, 76-9.

2Cv.Tr., II, 142, note 1.
and having entrusted him with (the protection of) the great community of monks, the Tooth Relic and the Alms Bowl, and the people, advised him to be diligent in the future in the protection of the world and the Dispensation (sāsana), and having in this manner sowed the royal seed in the field of Lamkā, served the world and the Dispensation according to his power, ruled for four years and (passed away) leaving behind the aura of glory. 1

According to this reading it appears that the prince was entrusted to the Samgha and, in turn, the protection of the Samgha; Tooth Relic and Alms Bowl, and the people were entrusted to the prince. The word 'him. (literally: 'them' in the plural for respect, viz. gauravārtha-bahuvacana) stands for the Sinhalese ovun and ovunta both referring to Āpanāna (Parakramabāhu) also in the gauravārtha-bahuvacana, used in the accusative and dative cases respectively. If the Pūjāvaliya version is accepted, it brings out even more clearly the close relations between the king and the Buddhist order, which undoubtedly proved beneficial to both the parties concerned. This is in keeping with what Parakramabāhu II himself did when he entrusted the administration of the kingdom to his eldest son Vija-yabāhu: 'And further the King entrusted him with the five remaining

---

1. According to the Sinhalese text, the passage continues in a different manner than the English translation suggests. The text provides the complete Sinhalese version for clarity.

---

...noyek kalasilpayehi Daksa karava Parakramabahu nam jyeṣṭha Āpanāna Samgharakkhita nam mahimiyana adi vū mahasamghaya kara gena gos ovun samghayata pava di mahasamghaya hā dalada patra dhatu hā rajyavasin ovunta pava di matu lokasāsana raksayevah āpamādavana se kiya mese Lamkā nāmāti kethi raja biju pinituva loka sasanayaṣṭa taman balanurupayen vāda koṭa satara avuruddak rajya koṭa kirti-puṇjājāvaṣeṣa kalaha. Pjv., 111-112.
sons of the royal house, and the two sacred relics of the holy Sage, the Tooth and the Bowl, as also with the host of the ascetics, with the group of all the dignitaries and also the land of Lankā.\footnote{Cv., LXXXVII, 74.} Thus the Pūjāvaliya version of this act makes better sense and is more in keeping with what is likely to have taken place, but the discrepancy in the two sources on this detail is somewhat strange, for the two accounts agree generally almost word to word. The statement in the Pūjāvaliya that the king 'advised him to be diligent in the future in the protection of the world and the Dispensation', and the reference to 'having in this manner sowed the royal seed in the field of Lankā' would suggest that the prince was also entrusted with a responsibility, namely the protection of the Samgha, the Tooth Relic and the Alms Bowl and the people of Lankā.

At a critical time in the history of Ceylon, when it was threatened with foreign invasions, the co-operation of the Samgha with the king would have gone a long way in winning over the allegiance of the people to his side. We learn from the Nikāya Saṅgrahaya and the Daṃbadeni Katikavata that Saṃgharakkhita was a pupil of Sāriputta Mahāsami who flourished in the reign of Parākramabahu I, and he was evidently the 'Head of the Buddhist Church' at the time (tatkāla sāsanānuśasaka), and he belonged to the village dwelling (grāmavasi) community of monks.\footnote{Ktk. Sng., 8; Nks., 87-88.} He was an
erudite monk who is credited with the authorship of several Subha-commentaries (ṭīka) and other Pali works. He played a leading role in the Synod held in the Vijayasundararāma in Jambuddoni with the patronage of Vijayabahu III. The fact that the king had the confidence of such leading monks as the present one on his side is significant. In the past, too, Sinhalese kings had done their utmost to win the confidence of the Samgha resulting in 'an alliance of the Church and the State'; the integrity of which no ruler could dare to violate without having to face unpleasant consequences.

The young prince, we are told, was given training in all the arts and sciences (kalāsilpa). According to the Pujāvaliya, this training included dharma-nīti (moral precepts?), raja-nīti (state-craft?), the art of letters and so forth. The Dambadeni Asna elaborates on the branches of learning in which Parakramabahu attained proficiency and states that he learnt many languages including Demala, Sinhala, Sanskṛta and Magadga (Pali). Similarly, the Buddha Dhamma in its three Piṭakas, Vinaya, Sutta and Abhidhamma, grammar (vyākaraṇa) in the two systems namely Moggallāyana Vyākaraṇa and Kayisan Vyākaraṇa, the three Vedas, prosody (candolaksana), astrology (nakṣatraya) and so

---

1 Malalasekara, Pali Lit. Cey., 209, see also 186, 197.
2 Ktk. Sng., 8.
4 P.jv., 111-112; Cv., LXXXI, 75.
forth are mentioned in this list. He is also said to have mastered
sword-fighting (kaḍu-silpaya), archery (dhanu-silpaya), law (niti-
śāstraya), logic (tarkaya) and other branches of learning included
in the eighteen crafts (aṣṭādaśa-silpaya) as well as those of the
sixty-four arts (sūṣṭa kalā) some of which are named in this list.¹
Daṃbadena Asna should be regarded as reflecting the canons of learn­
ing and accomplishments expected of a prince according to the tradi­
tions rather than as an account of the actual attainments of the
young prince Parākramabāhu. There can, however, be little doubt that,
having been in the custody of a learned mahāthera such as Samgharakkhita
for his education, he gained a high degree of proficiency in languages
such as Sanskrit, Pali and Sinhalese, in the Buddha Dhamma and other
branches of traditional learning. That he reached remarkable heights
in this field is suggested by his upādhi 'Kalikāla Śāhica-sabbaññu-
pandita' (Skt. Kalikāla Šāhitya Sarvajña Pandita - 'the scholar who is
omniscient in the literature of the Kali Age'), which he received 'on
account of his learning'.² His scholarship and learning is brought out
by the Visuddhimagga mahā sannaya and the Vanavinisa Sannaya attributed
to Parākramabāhu. The former shows the profound knowledge of the author
in Buddhist philosophy and other schools of thought, inaccessible to
him unless he had mastered the Sanskrit language in addition to Pali,

¹Dmb.A., 30-31.

²Cv., LXXXII, 3. It is interesting to note that this title was in use
in India too in the twelfth century, see, J.B.O.R.I., XVI, 39.
while the latter speaks of his high attainments in the rules of the discipline of the Buddhist monks.¹ On the authorship of the *Kavsilumina* there is a difference of opinion, but the consensus of opinion is that it is a work of Parākramabāhu II.² If we accept this view Parākramabāhu's poetic gifts, his mastery of the canons of Sanskrit poetics and prosody gains confirmation. There are instances when the authenticity of the works credited to such scholar-kings are seriously disputed but, in the case of Parākramabāhu, there is no strong reason to doubt that he was indeed a man of great learning and the author of these works. Thus, while we concede his remarkable scholarship and learning, we cannot be so certain as to how far he mastered the canons of statecraft and the equally important science of warfare and how successfully he translated them into practice. These were, indeed, qualities called for in a prince who was to face up to the challenge of the times in which he was to take over the reins of government.

On the death of Vijayabāhu, Parākramabāhu ascended the throne and received his first consecration in Jambuddoni in 1236 as shown earlier. At the time of his accession Rājaraṭṭha was still occupied by Māgha who ruled from Poḷonnaruva. The latter is given a reign of 21 years in the


Cūlavamsa and the Pūjavaliya, which implies that his regnal years were counted up to the accession of Parākramabāhu, when the latter was regarded as the lawful ruler of the island.¹ But that Māgha continued to hold sway in Rājarattha is quite clear in the Chronicles, and indeed the first task before Parākramabāhu was to deal with this invader. Considering the fact that Māgha was well entrenched in power, supported by the Kerala mercenaries, who were garrisoned in several fortified stations, the task before Parākramabāhu was evidently not an easy one.

Military preparations and strategy involving efficient planning were required to deal with this powerful enemy. Parākramabāhu appointed his younger brother Bhuvanekabāhu to the position of yuvarāja, and possibly entrusted him with the administration of a part of his kingdom.² The Chronicles give hardly any information on what military preparations were made; instead, their authors took pains to have us believe that Parākramabāhu was a heroic and courageous prince determined to rid the country of foreign rule. To him are attributed the words 'I will make the maiden of Laṅkā my own'.³ The previous invasions of the country by the Damilas from the earliest times, and the manner they

¹Cv., LXXX, 79; Piỳ., 109; gives nineteen years (ekunvisi havuruddak) but a variant reading gives ekvisi havuruddak (twenty one years) agreeing with the length of the reign given in the Cūlavamsa; Piỳ., 109, note 1.

²Cv., LXXXII, 4; Piỳ., 112.

³Cv., LXXXII, 5.
were defeated are recalled to show that Parākramabāhu was destined to play a similar role. Reference is made to the defeat of the Damila invaders Sena and Guttika by Asela, and the defeat of Eliāra by Duṭṭhagāmāni. Similarly, other Sinhalese kings, namely Vaṭṭagāmāni, Dhatuseṇa and Vijayabāhu I, who were victorious in battle against Damila invaders, are mentioned.¹ We are told that Parākramabāhu was similarly determined 'to vanquish the insolent Damilas who have destroyed the vihāras and other buildings and also the Order of the Master and still have their abode in Patīṭṭhāraṭṭa'.²

The author of the Pūjavaliya, as shown by Paranavitana, has even gone a step further. An obvious attempt is made to model the hero on that of the celebrated Duṭṭhagāmāni. In the Mahāvamsa it is stated that at the ceremony of presenting the first rice (sitthappavesamaṅgala), Kakavaṇṇa Tissa requested of his two sons Tissa and Duṭṭha Gāmaṇī to take the pledges that the two brothers would not fight each other but live in amity, that they would not turn away from the doctrines of the Buddha, or from the Saṃgha, and that they would not fight the Damilas. Duṭṭhagāmāni acceded to all requests except the last, and, angered with his father on his cowardly behaviour, he is said to have fled to Malaya and, subsequently, went to war with the Damilas who occupied

¹CV., LXXXII, 22ff.
²CV., LXXXII, 26-27.
Rājarāṭṭha. The author of the Pujavaliya would have us believe that Vijayabāhu acted likewise in his last days and offered them the paternal advice that they should live in amity towards each other, that as the Damilas were very powerful they should not resort to a Dravida war nor cross Salgalkāndura, which was evidently a station on the frontier which separated the territories of Māgha and Parākramabāhu. In addition they are said to have been admonished not to be overcome by the lust for wealth, not to resort to killing and not to embark on conquest by anger (krodha) but by compassion (maitri). From the subsequent narrative in the Pujavaliya, it is implied that Parākramabāhu paid no heed to his father's admonitions but was determined to make war on the Damilas so that 'I will not spare the damsel of Lamkā to anyone else but make her the spouse of my own'.

All this is clearly a literary exercise on the part of these authors to bring out the heroism of Parākramabāhu and requires no comment. It may, however, be mentioned in passing that the over-enthusiasm of the Pujavaliya author in the passage cited above would undeservedly place Vijayabāhu in the position of a cowardly figure.


2Pjv., 111.

3Pjv., 112, Lamkā nāmāti aṅganāva anikakhāta noharim maya maṭama patini karavam maya' yi sitā.
Such an estimate would hardly do justice to this ruler who, indeed, carved out a kingdom for his son amidst great hardships. Vijayabahu, however, not the only ruler whose sons achieved a greater position than himself.

Prior to waging war with Māgha, one of the acts of Parākramabāhu was to bring the Tooth Relic to Beligala from Jambuddoni, where Vijayabahu had placed it for greater safety. A Tooth Relic Temple was erected near the royal palace, in order that he could worship the Relic 'in the three periods of the day', whenever he desired to do so. We are told that Parākramabāhu held a great festival in the city in honour of the Tooth Relic, and amidst the Samgha, who assembled there on that occasion, took the relic on his palm and resorted to an act of faith (Skt. satyakriyā). It is stated that the island of Lankā was sanctified by the visits of the Buddha on three occasions and that, therefore, it was not possible for kings of a 'false faith' to hold sway there. Each of the foreign invaders was defeated by successive Sinhalese kings.

Further, we are made to believe that Parākramabāhu was similarly determined to defeat the Damilas, who were in occupation by force. It

---

1Cv., LXXXII, 6-7; Piv., 112; Dal.S., 43-44.
2Piv., 112; Cv., LXXXII, 8-9; Dal.S., 44, Utulu rājāganayehi māṃgi daladā geyak karava.
3Cv., LXXXII, 11 ff.
is stated that Parākramabāhu claimed that if he had been chosen by the Buddha to be included among the heroic kings of old in Laṅkā, and was similarly destined to conquer the foreign enemies and establish order in Laṅkā and promote the welfare of the world and the Sāsana, the Tooth Relic should perform a miracle and demonstrate it. He claimed also that in the past when the Buddha was living many far-famed monarchs heard his sermons and saw the miracles, and so did other kings like Asoka, Devānampiya Tissa and Duṭṭhagāmanī, who lived when the Buddha had passed away, but had the fortune to see such miracles. Parākramabāhu wished the Tooth Relic to perform a similar miracle. We are told that the Tooth Relic instantly rose to the sky and appeared in the life-like form of the Buddha, radiating the six-coloured effulgence which lit the whole city. Having satisfied the wish of the king the Tooth Relic descended and rested on the palm of the king.

A whole chapter entitled 'The Exhibition of the Miracle of the Tooth Relic' in the Cūlavamsa is devoted to this description. The Pūjavaliya too contains essentially the same account. In these

---

1 Cv., LXXXII, 37-40; Pjv., 112-14.
2 Pjv., 114; Cv., LXXXII, 28-40; Hvy., 31.
3 Cv., LXXXII, 41-43; Pjv., 115; Hvy, 31.
4 Op. cit., LXXXII.
5 Pjv., 112-115.
accounts one can see little more than the attempt of the authors to highlight the merit and piety of the king. The statement that the Tooth Relic was brought to Dambadeniya from its previous repository in Beligala, and the construction of a Tooth Relic temple in that city may be accepted as a fact, for it is confirmed by several sources such as the Pūjāvaliya and the Daladasirita.¹ It is also possible to believe that a festival of the Tooth Relic was held soon after his accession to the throne as the symbol of sovereignty, the motive of which was perhaps not entirely religious. Considering the great veneration in which the Relic was held, popular festivals and celebrations in its honour are likely to have helped indirectly to strengthen the sympathy and allegiance of the people toward the king, particularly at a time when Buddhism had suffered considerably at the hands of foreign invaders in Rājarattha.

Before discussing the war between Parākramabāhu and Māgha, it would be appropriate to consider the basis of Māgha's power and the policy he followed. Nilakanta Sastri examined from what country he appears to have come and the nationality of the mercenary army with which he conquered Rājarattha. Māgha's army which consisted of Kerala Damilas according to the Čulavamsa, and Malalas according to the Pūjāvaliya, as shown elsewhere, has to be taken as the people of Kerala or Mala-maṇḍala (i.e. the Malabar) — names by which the

¹P.jv., 112; Daḷ.S., 44.
Malabar country is referred to in South Indian inscriptions.\footnote{1} It has also shown the difficulties in accepting the view that Māgha and his army were Malays. The strength of Māgha's invading army, given as 24,000 (Rjv. 20,000), could well be a round number, but there is little doubt that Māgha was assisted by a powerful army, without which he could not possibly have continued to be in power for so long a period.\footnote{2}

The fortifications of Māgha and his ally Jayabāhu were located in PulatthiPura (Polonnaruva), Koṭtasārakāma (Koṭasara), Gaṅgātalāka (Gaṅgatalā), Kākālayagāma (Kavudāvulū), Padīraṭṭha (Padī), Kurundi (Kurundu), Mānāmattā (Mānāmatu), Mahātīttha (Māvatu), Mambāra (Mambāra), Pulacceritīttha (Pulucceri), Vālikagāma (Vāligamu), Gonarattha (Gona), Gonusuraṭṭha (Govusu ?), Madhupādapatīttha (Mipātoṭa), Sūkaratīttha (Hūrātoṭa).\footnote{3} The Fūjāvaliya contains much the same list except for the addition of a place named Debarapatān.\footnote{4} Godrington and Nicholas have identified many of these places, some without any

\footnote{1}{Geiger renders Damilakeralā of Cv., LXXXIII, 20 as 'Damilas and Keralas', Cv. Tr., II, p.150; and Coliyadāmile of LXXXII, 25 as 'Coliyas and Damilas', Cv. Tr., II, p. 145. The Fūjāvaliya 113 in its narrative of the same events has the form Solī Demalun which means Cōla Damilas and not Damilas and Colas. The form Solī Demalun is also mentioned in medieval Sinhalese inscriptions, Ep. Zeyl., V, No. 1, p. 21, line 2. On this analogy, Damilakeralā should also be rendered as Kerala Damilas.}

\footnote{2}{Cv., LXXX, 58-59; Pjv., 108; Rjv., 44. The Sinhalese forms found in the Fūjāvaliya are given in brackets.}

\footnote{3}{Cv., LXXXIII, 15-18; Nks., 88 adds a place named Maṇḍali.}

difficulty. Of these fortifications practically all were coastal stations and others too were located not far from the north western and north eastern coasts, Mannāra (Mannar), Māvatu (Māntai), Mānāmatta and possibly Mīpātoṭa were ports in that area, while Gaṅga-talā (Kantalai), Koṭasara (Kottiyār) and Gona (Trincomalee) were located in the latter. Hūrātoṭa is identified with Kayts in the extreme north of Ceylon. All these fortifications where garrisons were maintained were located in Rājaraṭha.

The concentration of his forces in the region of the ports of Mahātittha in the north west, Trincomalee in the north east, and Kayts in the north may imply that he expected a threat to his authority from outside Ceylon, and from a consideration of the events which followed it would be clear that this fear was not unfounded. It is also significant that in this list of fortifications hardly any was located in what may be regarded as the frontier separating the realms of Māgha and Parākramabāhu. This list, however, may not cover all his strongholds, as the Gūlawamsa says that they were located 'at these and other places'. It is, however, fairly clear that great attention was paid to strengthen and fortify the coastal points where an invading army could land, as indeed they had done in the past. If

---

1 Nicholas, J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. Special Number, 33-35, 45-46, 85-87; 81, 75-79, 44, 84; C.A.L.R., X, 93ff; Medhanka Thera is inclined to locate Gona in the north-western sea coast, see his edition of the Pīv., Chapter 34, p.71; see, however, Ep. Zeyl, V, 171-72.
this list of fortifications is a fair indication, it may be sug-
gested that Māgha did not take a possible challenge to his authority
from the ruler of Māyārāṭṭha very seriously. The Pūjāvaliya states
that the forces of the two Damila kings Māgha and Jayabāhu were in
occupation of those regions for forty years. The Cūlavamsa states
that they were in occupation for a long time (cirakālmaiṃvāsinam).
Thus Māgha's rule in Rājaraṭṭha was evidently longer than the 21 year
reign assigned to him in the Cūlavamsa, and it certainly extended in-
to the reign of Parākramabāhu, although the reckoning of his regnal
years apparently ceased with the accession of Parākramabāhu. As we
have shown elsewhere, during this long period, there is no indication
that Māgha's authority was effectively challenged at any time, although
there were local rulers in Rohana and Māyārāṭṭha who succeeded in
maintaining their authority in limited areas. At least we have no
indication in any of our principal sources that Māgha was prepared for an
invasion from Māyāraṭṭha or Rohana. Māgha perhaps concentrated his
garrisons in the coastal areas of the north west and the north east
in view of the remoteness of an attack by the people of Māyāraṭṭa
and Rohana.

(cont.)

2UV., LXXXIII, 18.

3Mahātittha and Sūkaratittha in particular were ports where invaders

1UV., 116.
As soon as Māgha succeeded in occupying the northern parts
of Ceylon with his Kerala mercenaries he set himself up as the
ruler, with Polonnaruva as his capital. We are told that Māgha's
soldiers captured Parākrama Pāṇḍya, the king ruling in Polonnaruva
at the time of the invasion, put his eyes out and seized all his
treasure. Then the narrative goes on to state that 'the leaders
of the soldiers with Mānābharana at the head, consecrated the
Kālinga Māgha to the royal dignity of Lāṅkā'.

This Mānābharana, who appears to have been a chief general in the forces of Māgha,
is not mentioned in any other source. Even in the Cūlavamsa he
figures only in the account of the consecration of Māgha, but is
nowhere referred to again.

In the absence of any clue to his identification, we may
suggest one of two possibilities. Mānābharana was perhaps a Sin­
halese general, who was himself a party to the factional feuds
which were rampant in the politics of Polonnaruva during this period,
who took the side of the invader. There were precedents when cer­
tain Sinhalese nobles and army leaders took the side of the invader
or crossed over to the enemy camp during the course of the wars.

In favour of this possibility, it can also be added that if Mānā-

---

1 Cv., LXXX, 71-73.

2 Cv., LXXXVIII, 38-40; LVIII, 16-17, 33-37.
bharana was such a personage, Magha would probably have considered him a person suitable to be chiefly instrumental in his consecration, for, it would have brought in a semblance of approval in the eyes of the people. However, it has to be noted that in the political history of this period, where numerous generals who engaged in the factional disputes are mentioned, no military personage of consequence by the name of Manabharana figures in any of our sources. Another possibility is that he was a Damila himself, a leader of the mercenary army of Keralas, with which Magha invaded Ceylon. The name Manabharana is sometimes met with in South Indian inscriptions of this period. In an inscription of Rajadhiraja Cola, successor of Rajendra I, three Pandyya kings viz. Manabharana, Vira Kerala Pandyya and Sundara Pandyya are mentioned among his enemies.\(^1\) Similarly, in an inscription of Jatavarman Vira Pandyya (acc. c. 1253) a Manabharana Bhatar who was evidently some important official figures as a signatory in a transaction.\(^2\) In Ceylon, too, the princes who had the name Manabharana had Pandyya affiliations on their paternal side. Of these princes, the best known is the father of Parakramabahu I. The latter's father had a brother named Siri Vallabha, the ruler of Rohana, whose son was again a Manabharana. Both these princes were of Pandyyan stock on the father's side, for they were descendants

\(^1\) A.R.E., 1892, p.5; S.Ind. Ins., III, 56; see also 1898, pp.1-2.  
\(^2\) A.R.E., No. 339 Of 1916.
of a Pândya prince to whom Vijyabâhu I had given his sister in marriage. If this was more than a coincidence it may not be improbable that Mânabharaṇa, who consecrated Mâgha was himself a South Indian who belonged to the invading army. However, it would be unsafe to press this possibility too far, for a name is not always a safe indication of the territory and race to which a person belonged.

Apart from Mânabharaṇa, who was at the head of 'the leaders of the soldiers', a personage who is referred to as the Damila king Jayabâhu in the Gûlavamsa and the Pûjâvaliya ruled in Râjaraṭṭha contemporaneously with Mâgha. Jayabâhu, however, does not figure in the account of the actual invasion in which Mâgha is described as the head of the army of 24,000 men. Later in the narrative both these works mention Mâgha and Jayabâhu together as Damila kings ruling in Patittharatta, whom Parâkramabâhu wished to overthrow. Like Mâgha, Jayabâhu is also blamed in the Chronicles for repressive and impious acts such as the destruction of the vihâras. The fortifications referred to above

---

1 Cû., LIX, 40-45; LXIV, 18-19; Cû. Tr., I, 358, see Genealogical Table X.

2 Tato Kâlingamâghham tam Mânabharaṇapubbakâ yodhamukhyâ bhishinicaṁsu te lañkârañjälakâkhyam. Cû., LXXX, 73; Cû., LXXXIII, 18-19; Pûjû., 113-14.

3 Cû., LXXX, 54 ff., Pûjû., 108.

4 Pûjû., 113-14; Cû., LXXXII, 26-27; Pûjû., 113-14.

5 Cû., LXXXII, 26-27; Pûjû., 113-14.
are said to have been set up by Māgha and Jayabāhu.\(^1\) It is clear from the contexts in which Jayabāhu figures that he was working in collaboration with Māgha.

Codrington made the following comments on Jayabāhu, puzzled by the difficulty of attempting an identification:

'The question is who was Jayabāhu? Was he Māgha's sub-king and successor or was he an independent but allied prince? The definite mention of two Malala and Dravida wars points to his independence; possibly he was a Chola though the use of the word in the Attanagalu Vamsa as meaning anything more than "Tamil" should not be pressed'.\(^2\)

C. W. Nicholas has offered the suggestion that this Jayabāhu might be identified with the Codagaṅga who figures in a fragmentary Sanskrit inscription from Trincomalee.\(^3\) The latter was evidently an invader, and the date of that record fits into this period. Apart from that there is no strong reason to confirm this suggestion. The record is fragmentary, but the name Jayabāhu does not occur in the preserved portion.\(^4\) The possibilities indicated by these two scholars are interesting but unconvincing.

The Hatthavanagallavīravamsa and its Sinhalese versions

---

\(^1\) Pv., 114, 116; Cv., LXXXIII, 15-26; LXXXII, 26-27.

\(^2\) C.A.L.R., X, 47.


refer to 'the many thousands of enemy forces with their kings, the Colas, Keralas and the like, who had destroyed the world and the Sāsana and were living in Pulatthipura'.

This statement would hardly lend itself to the interpretation that Jayabahu was a Cola, for Jayabahu is nowhere mentioned by name. Secondly, we know that Māgha ruled at Polonnaruva and from the above statement it appears that there was a concentration of Keralas as well as Colas in Polonnaruva. As such, it would be difficult to infer that Māgha was the king of the Keralas or Malalas and that Jayabahu was the king of the Colas, thereby making a nice distinction. Codrington was partly led to hint at the possibility that Jayabahu could have been a Cola, on the statement in the Pūjavaliya that Parākramabahu fought a Malala war, a Dravīḍa war and a Jāvaka war, implying the latter's conflict with Māgha, Jayabahu and Candrabhānu respectively. It is true that this statement is virtually repeated in the Daṃbadeni Katikāvata, Nikāya Samgrahaya and the Saddharma Ratnākaraya.

In fact the Pūjavaliya states that Parākramabahu fought a Malala yuddha, a Dravīḍa yuddha, a Jāvaka yuddha and many

---

1Hyv., 32, Pulatthipuravāsīnaṁ kata lokasāsanavilopam sarājikam anekasahassāṅkham Cola-Keralavāhiniṁ ca. .

2Pjo., 117-18; Nks., 88; Sāh. Rtn., 314; Ktk. Sng., 8; Dravīḍa Kerala Yāvakādi saturuviyavul sanhinduvā.
other wars, so that the implication of the statement appears to be a reference to the varied character of the enemy forces who were occupying Rajaraththa, rather than to separate campaigns for the defeat of each of these categories. The Pujāvaliya states elsewhere that he subjugated the Simhala Vanni (Kings) and secondly (devāniva) embarked on a Dravidawar, in the account of which the list of fortifications built by Māgha and Jayabhāhu already cited appears. Then we are told that the forces of these two Damila kings, i.e. the Demala Malala maha senaga realized the prospect of imminent defeat and assembled in Polonnaruva in order to decide their future course of action. Thus we see that the forces of both Māgha and Jayabhāhu figure in the Dravidā war to which the Malalas were certainly a party. Therefore it would not be fair to draw such a strict distinction between the Malāla yuddha and the Dravidā yuddha as two different campaigns undertaken by Parakramabahu.

1 Codrington makes out that a second Dravidawar was fought (C.A.L.R., X, 46-47) but this passage would not lend itself to such an interpretation: piya rajahu sādhāgata nūhunu Simhala mahavannin taman hun pala ma hīnda sādhā noyek raṭaval gena Lakdvā Simhala balasen taman karēma rūs koṭa devāniva Dravidā yuddhayakata pātan gena, Pjav., 116; the word on which such a suggestion could be based is devānī (second), but the text gives devāniva, which means 'secondly'. It is clear from the context that firstly firstly fought the Vanni kings and secondly embarked on the Dravidā war. Note also the words Dravidā yuddhayata (the Dravidā war) but not yuddhayakata (a war).

2 Pjav., 116-17; Cv., LXXXIII, 15-26.
The precise identity of Jayabahu cannot be decided in the present state of our knowledge. There is, however, sufficient indication in the Gālavamsa and the Pujāvaliya that he was collaborating with Māgha. There they are mentioned together and so are their fortifications. Further, as stated earlier, in their hour of imminent defeat the forces of both these kings evidently acted together when they decided and assembled in Polonnaruva to consider the next course of action. Therefore it is sufficiently clear that they were in a common front. It can, of course, be argued that Māgha and Jayabahu were independent kings but that they resorted to concerted action in facing a common danger from the forces of Parākramabāhu. But the references cited above would indicate that the alliance was perhaps more than a temporary device.

It would be reasonable to hold that Māgha had precedence in rank over Jayabahu, whatever his relationship to the latter might have been. For, in the first place, the regnal years of Māgha are counted in all the principal Chronicles, but not those of Jayabahu. Secondly, the consecration of Māgha is specifically mentioned and his seat of authority was in Polonnaruva, the pre-eminent royal capital, to which even the Dambadeni kings yielded pride of place, as is evident from the desire of Parākramabāhu to hold his consecration there even towards the end of his reign. It may also be

1. Cv., LXXX, 79; Pjv., 109; Rjv., 44.
2. Cv., LXXX, 71-73; LXXXVII, 6; LXXX, 74; Polonnaruva is referred to as mūlarajadhāṇī in Cv., LXXXIX, 8 and Pjv., 131.
noted that the name of Jayabahu is preserved only in the Cūlavamsa and the Pūjāvāliya, whereas the Sinhalese Chronicles and the lesser works which refer to the activities of Māgha in detail or in brief as the case may be, do not mention Jayabahu at all. Therefore, there can be little doubt that Māgha was the chief figure and that Jayabahu occupied a secondary position possibly as his ally. Like Māgha, however, Jayabahu is mentioned as a 'Damila king' and, if the latter actually figured in the Kalinga invasion led by Māgha, it is surprising that Jayabahu is not mentioned in the account of the invasion. In these circumstances it may be suggested that Jayabahu was a Damila – possibly an invader who succeeded in establishing his authority in a part of Rājaratthā in the troubled period which preceded the invasion of Māgha. The Chronicles refer to several invasions of the island, which took place during this period and a few inscriptions, too, bear testimony to the insecurity in which the Pālānnuruva kings were placed partly on account of 'the Damila confusion' (Demala viyavul). If Jayabahu had been one such invader who achieved some success in the troubled waters, he appears to have yielded ground before the powerful army of Māgha and become his ally. Of this, however, we cannot be certain in view of the meagre data at our disposal.

\[^1\text{Nks., }87-88;\text{ Dal.S., }43;\text{ Rjr., }36\text{ ff., Rjv., }44.\]

\[^2\text{See above, }116\text{ ff.}\]
The policy which Māgha followed, as reflected in the Cūlavamsa and the Pūjāvaliya, and in the later Chronicles, was one of ruthless repression and tyranny, at least in the first part of his reign. If the principal Chronicles are to be trusted, his reign was one of terror, in which atrocities of the highest magnitude were committed on an unprecedented scale. The Cūlavamsa states:

'But since in consequence of the enormously accumulated various evil deeds of the dwellers in Lāṅkā, the devatās who were everywhere entrusted with the protection of Lāṅkā failed to carry out this protection, there landed a man who held to a false creed, whose heart rejoiced in bad statesmanship, who was a forest fire burning down the bushes in the forest of the good — that is generosity and the like — who was a sun whose actions closed the rows of night lotus flowers — that is the good doctrine — and a moon destroying the grace of the groups of the day lotuses — that is of peace — (a man) by name Māgha, an unjust king sprung from the Kālionga line, in whom reflection was fooled by his great delusion, landed as leader of four and twenty thousand warriors from the Kālionga country and conquered the Island of Lāṅkā. The great scorching fire — King Māgha — commanded his countless flames of fire — his warriors — to harass the great forest — the kingdom of Lāṅkā.'

In this passage Geiger has pointed out the influence of Indian poetics (alaṅkāra), but that would not minimise the scorn in which the author of the Cūlavamsa held the invader Māgha.²

¹Cv., LXXX, 54-59; see also Plj., 108; Ḫvy., 30-31.

²Cv.Tr., II, 132, note 3.
The narrative continues with an account of the cruelties inflicted on the laymen as well as the Samgha by 'the Damila warriors in imitation of the warriors of Mara'.

'While thus the great warriors oppressed the people, boasting cruelly everywhere, "We are Kerala warriors", they tore from people their garments, their ornaments and the like, corrupted the good morals of the family which had been observed for ages, cut off hands and feet and the like (of the people), destroyed many houses and tied up cows, oxen and other (cattle) which they made their own property. After they had put fetters on the wealthy and the rich people and had tortured them and taken away all their possessions, they made poor people of them. They wrecked the image houses, destroyed many cetiyas, ravaged the vihāras and maltreated the lay brethren. They flogged the children, tormented the five (groups of the) comrades of the Order, made the people carry burdens and forced them to do heavy labour. 1 Many books known and famous they tore from their cord and strewn them hither and thither. The beautiful vas, proud cetiyas like the Ratnāvalī (cetiya) and others which embodied as it were, the glory of the former pious kings, they destroyed by overthrowing them and alas! many of the bodily relics, their souls as it were, to disappear. 2

The ruling king Parākrama-Pāṇḍya was captured and his eyes were put out. Polonnaruva was sacked and Māgha was consecrated in the capital city. 3

1 Geiger's translation of this strophe conveys too strong a sense, see below, 229 ff.

2 Cv.,  LXXX, 61-69; Pjv., 108-109; see also Cv. Tr.II, 133, note 1; see below,

3 Cv.,  LXXX, 71-73.
The Cūlavamsa goes on further to describe the disruption of
the social order and the persecution of Buddhism.

'The monarch caused the people to adopt false views and
brought confusion into the four unmixed castes. The vil-
lages and fields, houses and gardens, slaves, cattle,
buffaloes and whatever else belonged to the Śīhalas he
had delivered to the Keralas. The vihāras, the par-
ivenas and many sanctuaries he made over to one or other
of his warriors as dwelling. The treasures which belonged
to the Buddha and were the property of the holy Order he
seized and thus committed a number of sins in order to go
to hell. In this fashion committing deeds of violence the
Ruler Māgha held sway in Lāṅkā for twenty one years.'

We quote at length from the Cūlavamsa, for it appears clearly
that the policy which Māgha followed, apart from being one of re-
pression, contains certain features which are in some respects al-
most unique. The destruction of the vihāras and image houses and
so forth are of course referred to in connection with the Tamil in-
vasions of earlier times. These Damila invaders too have been
blamed in the Chronicles and, in fact, the Colas who invaded and oc-
cupied Rājaratha are called blood-sucking yakkhas (devils). Even
so, the language used in the condemnation of Māgha can hardly find a
parallel in the accounts of the previous invasions. If Māgha's aim
was plunder and loot and the spoliation of vihāras and shrines, some

1Geiger's translation of this strophe as: 'The Monarch forced the
people to adopt a false faith and brought great confusion into the
four sharply divided castes' conveys too strong a sense; Cv., LXXX,
75; See below, 299 ff.


of which certainly possessed immense wealth, it is easily understandable. Even Sinhalese kings at times coveted this wealth and attempted the plunder of such institutions.\textsuperscript{1} It would, however, be difficult to explain all his activities in terms of plunder and loot alone.

Amongst other sections of society the Samgha in particular were the target of his merciless onslaught. In addition to bodily harm done to the members of the Buddhist Order, many vihārās and parivenas were converted into residences for his soldiers. The property of the Order, possibly the lands, fields and other endowments, were seized and it is stated that Parākamabāhu II restored to the Samgha the villages which had been confiscated in this manner.\textsuperscript{2} If we are to trust another passage occurring later in the Chronicle even the kinsmen of the Buddhist monks were deliberately subjected to harsh treatment. We are told that 'many kinsmen of the bhikkhu community who had become enslaved during the period of alien dominion and many other people he (i.e. Vijayabāhu IV) freed from their slavery by gifts to their masters of gold, precious stones and other valuables'.\textsuperscript{3} There is good reason to believe that the Samgha suffered during this period

\textsuperscript{1}\textit{Cv.}, LXI, 48 ff.

\textsuperscript{2}\textit{Cv.}, LXXX, 76-78; LXXXIV, 1-4; \textit{Rjv.}, 118. Note also the plunder of monastic property and cetiyas, and the conversion of some of the vihārās in Polonnaruwa into residences for foreign soldiers by the successors of Jayabāhu I, \textit{Cv.}, LXI, 48-62.

\textsuperscript{3}\textit{Cv.}, LXXXVII, 46-48; See Buddhadatta's Corrections to Geigers translation of the \textit{Gūlavamsa}, \textit{U.C.R.}, VIII, 175; ...arājītayehi gāti dasva (cont.)
not merely from lack of royal patronage, but apparently from deliberate persecution. Many Buddhist monks were compelled by circumstances to leave Ceylon and take shelter in South India. This is confirmed by the subsequent statement in the Pujavaliya that these Buddhist monks were invited to return to Ceylon during the time of Vijayabahu III. The Daladascurita specifically states that Vijayabahu recalled the great Mahatheras who migrated to foreign lands on account of the confusion caused by the Damilas. We have shown elsewhere that the Upasaka Janalankara confirms this further for, as stated in this work, its author Phandarata Ananda was a victim of the fire of confusion caused by the Damilas. As we have shown elsewhere, the Upasaka Janalankara confirms this further for, as stated in this work, its author Phandarata Ananda was a victim of the fire of confusion caused by the Damilas. The Daladascurita specifically states that these Buddhist monks were invited to return to Ceylon during the time of Vijayabahu III.
tween Ceylon and the Tamil country. It is in the light of this background that Māgha's conduct becomes even more strange.

The question is why did Māgha persecute the Buddhist Order in this manner? Was it motivated by political considerations? One possibility is that in order to establish his authority in Rājarattha through repressive measures Māgha considered it expedient to weaken the influence of the Samgha in the political affairs of the country, thereby insuring himself against a quarter from which opposition to his rule was likely to flare up. Undoubtedly the leading members of the Buddhist Order wielded great influence, certainly in the time of Vijayabāhu III and Parākramabāhu II, when their opinion was taken into consideration even in the matter of settling the succession to the throne. Was it a fear of this influential position of the Samgha, both at the court and with the Buddhist population, which angered Māgha and led him to a policy of persecution?

In favour of such a supposition is the fact that the other section of society which suffered heavily at the hands of Māgha were 'the wealthy and rich people', whose traditions of 'good morals of the family which had been observed for ages'. They suffered bodily harm by being fettered and mutilated in the limbs, and their wealth,
too, was seized. Paranavitana has rightly taken this class to have been the nobles or the upper class of society, referred to as the *kulīna*, who were undoubtedly influential in the politics of the time. It is therefore understandable that they became the victims of Māgha's repression.

Such an explanation is, however, unsatisfactory, if we accept the statement that children were flogged and people made to carry burdens and to do many kinds of work (*bahukāriyaṃ*). The five (groups of the) comrades of the Order, which included the female members of the Sāmaṃgha, such as the *bhikkhuni* and *sāmaneri*, were similarly maltreated. The lay brethren (*upāsaka*) were beaten. These acts, if the Chronicles can be trusted, show wanton cruelty, directed against members of the Buddhist Order. Some of these measures would hardly have been of any material benefit to an ad-

---

1 Bandhitvāna vadhitvāna jane addhe mahaddhane haritvāna dhanam sabbam daliddē ca karimsu te, Cv., LXXX, 64. Acchindimsu manussānam sātakābharaṇādikām vicchindimsu kulacāram cīfakālanurakkhitām, Cv., LXXX, 62.

2 U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 715-16; on the *kulīnas* see, Geiger, Cult. Cey. Med. Times, 29-30; women of this class (*kulīna itthiyō, kulitthiyō*) were treated with respect even by kings, Ibid., 30.

3 Talayum dārākeśaṇāca pīlayum sāhadhammikeṃkārayimsu jane bhāram kārayum bahukāriyām. Cv., LXXX, 66.

Geiger's translation of the second part of this strophe as 'made the people to carry burdens and forced them to do heavy labour' is too strong. Kārayum bahukāriyām would rather mean that they were made to do many duties' or services. The 'many duties' may include various types of compulsory labour for State services (*rājakāriya*).
venturer whose motives were no more than a desire for plunder and loot. On the other hand, even if we leave a reasonable margin for possible exaggeration in the Chronicle account, it immediately raises the question why such exaggeration was resorted to and why Māgha is condemned in a language almost unique in the treatment of foreign invaders in the Chronicles of Ceylon. In addition, the charges levelled against Māgha are also in some respects different from those attributed to, for example, the Colas in the Chronicles, in spite of the common accusations such as the plunder of vihāras and Buddhist shrines.¹

In fact the author of the Pūjavaliya begins his narrative in Chapter XXXIII by stressing the importance of Ceylon for the preservation of Buddhism. He adds:

'Therefore in this island of Laṅkā, the residence of those holding wrong views will not be permanent just as that of the yakshas could not be permanent. Even if kings who hold wrong views ruled the island of Laṅkā by forcible occupation at some time their families have not been established due to the power of the Buddha himself. Therefore, as this island is fitting for kings with the right views their families will certainly flourish. For this reason, kings who are the lords of Laṅkā should cultivate love and reverence to the Buddha, and should not delay in the reestablishment of the Dispensation. They should rule protecting the wheel of power and the wheel of

¹ Cv., LXXX, 61 ff., esp. 66-67, 75; LC, 19'ff.
the Dhammas, thereby protecting their families.¹

Though this passage may reflect the general resentment of foreign invaders which has grown in the course of centuries, it may as well suggest the persecution of Buddhism by Māgha. And we know that the author of this work was a contemporary of Māgha. It would, therefore be interesting to find out why Māgha has received this harsh treatment in the Cūlavamsa and the Pūjāvaliya.

In the account of Māgha, there are indeed a few indications which tend to suggest that political considerations alone were not the motivating factor. We are told that, 'The Monarch caused the people to adopt a false view; and he 'brought great confusion to the four unmixed castes'.² The recourse to compulsion in the conversion of people into religious faiths was not the practice in Ceylon or in the Indian subcontinent, although there is some evidence of religious persecution in a few notable exceptions.³ But this would not disturb the general picture of religious harmony which

¹ See below, 309-21.

² Cv., LXXX-75; Pjv., 108-109.

³ See below, 309-21.
prevailed among the followers of different faiths or different sects within the same faith. So the charge of forced conversion to a 'false view' levelled against Māgha is a strange statement, especially as previous invaders, who are also blamed for impious acts, are not accused of such deeds as compulsory conversion to their religious beliefs. It may be argued that the statement cited above should rather be treated as a general accusation against Māgha, who plundered their monasteries and harmed them in other ways. Such a view would receive some confirmation from the Pūjāvaliya, in which we are told that Parākramabāhu I resorted to foreign conquests because 'he was enraged by the kings of those countries who were of false faith, who on many occasions land in the island of Lankā and destroy the world and the Sāsana, and set out with the thought "I will conquer Jambudīpa and convert (it) into the true faith".'¹ There can be little doubt that Parakramabahu's foreign invasions were motivated by political considerations, but the author of the Pūjāvaliya and certain others recording the same tradition gave them a religious twist in order to impress upon the readers that their hero undertook these expeditions to promote the greater glory of the Sasana by converting Jambudīpa into the 'true faith'. Even if this is the true implication of the Pūjāvaliya statement,
one can still doubt whether the charge of forced conversion of the people to a 'false view' has to be taken in the same light.

Against such an interpretation there is the further accusation against Māgha that 'many books known and famous they tore from their cord and strewed them hither and thither'.¹ What the 'known and famous' books were is not stated here, but they were probably books concerning Buddhist doctrines which the Saṅgha professed. This is confirmed by a subsequent statement in the Cūlavamsa in the account of Vijaya’Bahu III, 'that on the Island of Laṅka so many books that dealt with the true doctrine had been destroyed by the alien foe', and that he arranged for the doctrines to be written down by men who were rewarded for their labour.² Similarly, Parākramabāhu II caused books on philosophy, logic and grammar and so forth to be brought from Jambudīpa for the instruction of bhikkhus.³ There is no strong reason to distrust the statement that books containing Buddhist doctrines suffered at the hands of Māgha, not so much as an indirect consequence of the sack of Rājaraṇṭha, but rather as part of a conscious effort. It is difficult to believe that Māgha destroyed these books out of mere vandalism. Māgha may have had strong religious convictions

¹ Cv., LXXX, 67.
² Cv., LXXXI, 40-45.
³ Cv., LXXXVII, 26-27; Pjv. 119.
which he tried to uphold at the expense of the Buddhist Faith which he thus persecuted.

The destruction of religious books would not have added to his material gains in any way; on the contrary, such a step would have enraged the Sangha as well as the lay Buddhists. In the few known instances, kings who tampered in this manner with books containing the religious doctrines were men who were moved by partisan religious sentiments. Perhaps the best known example is Mahāsena (278-302 A.D.) who became a convert to Vetullā doctrines and persecuted the Mahāvihāra whose inmates adhered to the Theravāda. From a fragmentary inscription from Jetavanārāma, belonging to the reign of this monarch, we learn that he caused to be deposited in 'the five great āvāsas' (paca maha avasa) of the Mahāvihāra books which evidently contained the doctrines of the Vetullavāda, to be read by the inmates of these residences of the orthodox church. In the sixteenth century Rājasimha I (1581-1593) of Sitavaka, who gave up Buddhism and became a convert to Saivism, is stated in the Culavamsa to have burned the sacred books and persecuted the Buddhist Order. It is stated that

"He annihilated the Order of the Victor, slew the community of the bhikkhus, burned the sacred books, destroyed the monasteries and thus barred his way to heaven. Become a (dead) tree-trunk in the cycle

---

1 MV., XXXVII.

of rebirths, he adopted a false faith. . . . In this way the impious fool as he did not know what he should accept, and accepted what he should not have accepted, brought evil upon himself. 1

His undisputed fame as a warrior has not spared him harsh condemnation in the Chronicle for his persecution of Buddhism. Thus the destruction of books by Māgha appears to have been a measure akin to that taken by Rājasimha as part of a policy of religious persecution.

Māgha is also accused of having brought confusion into the four castes. This is again a somewhat puzzling statement. Although the influence of the Indian caste system is reflected in the social developments in Ceylon, it never assumed the rigidity of the Indian divisions. 2 In fact, it is evident from certain statements in Nissanka Malla's inscriptions that members of the Govi-kula, belonging to the Vaiśya class according to Indian terminology, were a powerful community contending for the capture of royal power. 3 In fact Nissanka Malla holds out to his people that 'agriculture is the best occupation'. 4 Thus the reference to the four-fold division need

1 Cv., XCIII, 10-13.
not be taken literally; perhaps it is the use of a conventional phrase to describe the disruption of society. It may partly refer to excesses likely to have been committed by Māgha's mercenaries that upset 'the good morals of the family which had been observed for ages'. However, Māgha cannot be blamed entirely for this confusion in the social order, for we learn that in the reign of Queen Kālayānasvatī (1202-1208) general Ayasmanta 'separated the four castes, which had been mixed'.

The confusion in the social order appears to date back to an earlier time which saw many a foreign invasion and internal dissension, but was aggravated by the invasion of Māgha.

At this stage it is necessary to consider how far the account of Māgha in the Pali Chronicle and the Pujañaliya can be trusted. It may be conceded that the monks, authors of these works, exaggerated to some extent. But the lurid picture painted of him certainly suggests that many atrocities and excesses were committed, apart from religious persecution. The author of the Pujañaliya, who was almost no

1<sup>no</sup> eye-witness of these events, is less harsh in his condemnation of Māgha and his account agrees almost word to word with that of the Cūlavamsa. Paranavitana has contended that the kings who supplanted the Dāmbadenī dynasty were the Jāvaka descendants of Māgha and Candrabhānu. This claim is partly based on the equation with 'Jāvaka'
with 'Savulu', the lineage to which some of these kings traced their descent. \(^1\) Sastri discussed in detail elsewhere why Māgha cannot be treated as a Jāvaka. \(^1\) On the basis of this identification Paranavitana has expressed the view that the authors of the Nikāya Samgrahaya and the Saddharma Ratnakaraya, who wrote their works in the time of the Savulu or Jāvaka kings, have not used harsh language in the condemnation of Māgha and that the latter author has in fact exonerated him from such blame. In other words, these authors refrained from condemning a Jāvaka, namely Māgha, as the kings of the period were also Jāvaka descendants, who had extended their influence and come to power in the Sinhalese kingdom of the south of Ceylon.

The Nikāya Samgrahaya gives the names of the fifteen kings who ruled after Parakramabāhu I and states that on their demise Kāliṅga Vijayabāhu, who had the first name Māgha, became king. It goes on further to state that on account of the great confusion, which prevailed in the first part of his reign, the Samgha fled from the ancient places such as Pulasthipura to Māyārata in search of protection, leaving behind the books and other 'articles of use!' (pirikara) wherever they were. Then reference is made to the protection and generosity they received from Vijayabāhu and Parākramabāhu in Māyārata. \(^2\) Now the sequence of events given here agrees very well with that of the Cūlavamsa


\(^2\) Nks., 87-88.
and the PujaValiya, with the difference that the account is less de-
tailed, for it was limited in scope. The phrase '...Māgha nam lada
pūrvabhidhāna ati Kāliṅga Vijayabāhu nam maharajahugē pūrgabhāga
pravṛtta mahaviyavulin...¹' conveys clearly the sense that these
troubles prevailed in the first part of his reign. It is, therefore,
not quite correct to assume that Māgha has been exonerated from blame
or that its author consciously tried to do so. Daladasdrīta of 1325 A.D.
refers to 'Māgha who converted sīri Laṅkā to false views and destroyed
the world and the Sāsana'. It also mentions the hardships of the
members of the Samgha who fled to foreign lands on account of the con-
fusion caused by Māgha's invasion.² The Saddharma Ratnakaraya of
the fifteenth century, which follows the Nīkāya Samgrahaya closely re-
fers to these events with almost the same words, viz: '...Kāliṅga
Vijayabāhu nam maharajahugē avadhiyata pūrvabhāgayetī pūvati maha
saturu viyavulin...'; which, however, would imply that these troubles
prevailed before the time of Māgha.³ The Saddharma Ratnakaraya is in
the main a collection of Buddhist stories, not an attempt to set out
the history of these events connected with the Sāsana.⁴ Nevertheless

¹Nks., 87.
²Dal.S., 43, sīri laka mityādrstī ganvā, lōsasun nāsū Māgha raja.
³Sēh. Rtn., 313.
⁴For an account of this work see Godakumbura, Sinh. Lit., 94-97.
it gives a brief historical account, evidently following the Nikāya
Samgrahaya. It is not unlikely that the author of the Saddharma
Ratnakaraya, in paraphrasing the ‘maharajarāhugē pūrvabhāgapravṛta
mahaviyavulin’ of the earlier work misinterpreted the phrase by
having it in his work as maharajarāhugē avadhiyatā pūrvabhāgayehi pāvati
maha saturu viyavulin which conveys a somewhat different sense. Such
a possibility is enhanced by another discrepancy in a detail occurring
in the same paragraph. The Nikāyasamgrahaya states that when Polon-
naruva was sacked 'monks fled in search of protection to Māyāraṭṭha,
leaving behind their books, the articles of use and the like lying where
ever they were'. The Saddharma Ratnakaraya which follows the former
account almost word to word states that the fleeing monks collected
the books and other articles and evidently brought them to Māyāraṭṭha.\(^1\)

This discrepancy, however, is a matter of detail to which the latter
author probably gave little thought, but the statement conveys the oppo-
site sense when compared with the Nikāyasamgrahaya version. It is
difficult to believe that the author of the Saddharma Ratnakaraya deliberately
differed from the former concerning this detail. We would, therefore, be re-
luctant to concede that the author of the Saddharma Ratnakaraya had any in-
tention of exculpating Māgha from the charges of persecuting Buddhism.

\(^1\)Māgha nam lada pūrvabhīdāna yiti, Kālīṅga Vijayaṇāhu nam maharajarāhugē
pūrvabhāga pravṛta mahaviyavulin Pulastipurādi purātana sthanayen igīla
potpat ādi pirkara tubu tubu tena hāra, saraṇaveṣiva Māyārajayaṭa pāmini
maha Saṅghayaṭa, Nks., 87.
Māgha nam vi pūrvabhīdāna Kālīṅgavijayaṇāhu maharajarāhugē avadhiyatā
pūrvabhagayehi pāvati mahasaturuviyavulin Pulastipurādi vi purātana-
sthānavalini igīla pat pot ādi śramaṇa pariśkāra tubū tubū tānvalin
uguluvāyena avut Māyā rajayaṭa pāmini, Sdh. Rtn., 313.
The belief that the period covered by the brief reigns of the fifteen kings (twelve according to the Rājaratnākaraya) preceding Māgha was also one of confusion is easily understandable. That such confusion prevailed in this period is specifically stated in the Rājaratnākaraya which also belongs to the sixteenth century. It is significant to note that the latter which makes that statement also deals with the atrocities committed by Māgha in the manner of the authors of the Cūlavamsa and the Pūjāvaliya.¹ It would, therefore, be unsafe to attach too much importance to the statement in the Saddharma Ratnākaraya and arrive at the inference that its author desired to exculpate Māgha.

The Nikāya Sangrahaya and the Saddharma Ranākaraya however would be in favour of the view that much of the atrocities of Māgha took place in the first part of his reign. It may also be clear from our discussion of the political background of the period prior to the invasion of Māgha that it was one of confusion, as is specifically stated in the Rājaratnākaraya.² Once his authority was established in Rājarattha there was perhaps less need to enforce the rigour and repression with which he set out to wrest power. It is also unlikely that such a drastic policy of repression and persecution

¹Rjr., 36-37.
²See above, 113ff. Rjr., 37.
was followed through his period of rule, as we are told in the Pujāvaliya he continued to hold sway for 40 years.¹ In spite of the strength of his army, and however weak the position of the Sinhalese might have been, it would have been difficult for him to continue in power for so long unless he modified his repressive policies to some extent. All the more so, in view of the fact that unlike the case of the Colas there is also no indication that he had the active support of a South Indian power.

None of our sources refers to specific measures of improvement in the latter part of his reign. In fact the picture painted of the local chieftains in the Gūlavamsa such as Ādipāda Bhuvanekabāhu and Senāpati Sankha who ruled in different parts of the island, would not indicate that any appreciable change in the policies of Māgha had taken place.² But then we have to remember that the Pali Chronicle has the highest condemnation for Māgha and we cannot expect its author to have a good word for Māgha even if he deserved any. The persecution and repression which he pursued in the first part of his reign would have left such bitter memories that the chroniclers would have remained silent on any improvement in the latter part of his reign.

It is very likely that the Damīlas, who were a considerable

¹Pjv. 116.
²See above, 194-97.
part of the population of Rājaraṭṭha extended their support to Māgha. They had at times supported the invading armies from South India in the past and possibly Māgha could count on their sympathies. Such a possibility is indicated by a subsequent reference in the Cūlavamsa and the Pūjāvaliya where the strength of the forces of Māgha and Jayabāhu is placed at 44,000 and 40,000 respectively, as against the 24,000 strong army with Māgga which Māgha invaded Ceylon. These figures in themselves need not be taken as trustworthy, but it is reasonable to hold that some increase of the forces had taken place subsequent to the invasion. The Damilas who were already in Rājaraṭṭha would have joined the ranks of Māgha: for it is clear from the Cūlavamsa that they were given a very generous share of the loot, as part of the reward for their loyalty and services. It may be a reasonable inference that the sack of Rājaraṭṭha by Māgha and his repressive policies, though not necessarily followed throughout his rule, was a shattering blow to the Sinhalese kingdom which was already on the decline.

A question that would naturally arise from the foregoing discussion of the policies followed by Māgha is why he resorted to a re-

---

1 S.H.C., 57.
2 Cv., LXXIII, 20; Pjv., 116.
3 Cv., LXX, 76-78.
pression and persecution of Buddhism, which is in a clear con-
trast to the policies of his Kāliṅga predecessors. The Kāliṅga
kings generally and the Nissaṅka Malla in particular, extended their
patronage to Buddhism with great enthusiasm and tried to win over
the confidence of the Buddhists through benevolent measures, in
order to secure the throne of Ceylon for the Kāliṅga family.¹

Our sources do not give a positive answer to this question, but
from the accounts of Māgha we have so far considered it appears that
Māgha was a man of a different temperament with tendencies towards
religious fanaticism. It is possible to concede that in view of
the insecurity of the time and the quick termination of the reigns
of his Kāliṅga predecessors, he thought it more expedient to suppress
all quarters of opposition to the rule of the Kāliṅga line by violent
methods. But such a view would not sufficiently explain his perse-
cution of Buddhism effected in so ruthless a manner.

The Cūlavamsa uses the word micchāditthi ('wrong views') to
denote 'the false views' to which Māgha is said to have converted
the people of Rājarattha. Geiger translated this part of this impor-
ant strophe as: 'The Monarch forced the people to adopt a false faith'.²
The word micchāditthi literally means 'wrong views'.³ This term need

¹See above, 120-22.
²Micchāditthim sa bhūpālo ganhāpetvā mahājanaṁ, Cv., LXXX-75.
not necessarily connote a 'false faith'. For, in the Dīghanikāya 'wrong views' held by members of the Buddhist Order are also called micchādīthi. But, in later times, however, this term may have acquired a stronger connotation as is suggested by the Pujāvaliya passage cited above. Similarly, the translation of the ganhāpetvā as 'forced' would convey a sense somewhat stronger than the context demands. This part of the strophe may be accordingly rendered as: 'The Monarch caused the people to adopt wrong views'. In order to achieve this objective whether Māgha offered any inducements to those whom he wanted to be converted to his 'wrong views' is not stated in any of our sources. Though the word ganhāpetvā does not necessarily suggest the use of force, by implication it contains an element of compulsion involved in the alleged conversion. The plunder of the monasteries, the illtreatment of the Samgha as well as of the lay devotees (upāsaka), the confiscation of the belongings of 'the wealthy and rich people' and the harsh treatment meted out to them would point towards conversion by compulsion rather than by peaceful methods of persuasion.

Here a further point calls for clarification. Who really were the mahājana ('the people') who were compelled to adopt micchādīthi?

1 Dīghanikāya, Saṅgīti Suttānta, III, 246. cf. account of Eḷāra in Mv., XXI, 13-34, and Pjv., 85-87; Rjv., 18.
The word mahājana stands for 'a great crowd, collectively "the people" or a multitude'.\(^1\) Apart from this sense it also means in Sanskrit 'a great or eminent man, great persons; the chief of a trade or caste, a merchant, banker, tradesman'.\(^2\) Though the first is the best known meaning of this word, the second should not be ruled out. In fact there is some reason to prefer the latter sense as more suitable to the context, and to render it as 'notables' or 'eminent men'. We have already referred to the confiscation of the property of wealthy men in addition to causing them bodily injury.\(^3\) The reference to 'the good morals of the family which had been observed for ages', which the mercenaries 'corrupted' would call to mind the upper class in society denoted by terms like kulīna and kulaputto.\(^4\) It is even more significant to note that the strophe immediately following the reference to the mahājana refers to the confiscation of the possessions of the Sīhalas. These included 'villages and fields, houses and gardens, slaves, cattle and buffaloes'.\(^5\) The nature of these possessions which are characteristic of the higher sections of the society may imply that they were not the common people.

\(^1\) See, The Pali-English Dictionary, P.T.S., p.150.

\(^2\) See, A Sanskrit-English Dictionary, Monier Williams, 755.

\(^3\) Cv., LXXX-64.


\(^5\) Cv., LXXX-76.
One may therefore take note of the possibility that महाजन may refer to persons of the upper strata in society and not necessarily to 'the people' in the ordinary sense of the word. If this was the case, then an attempt seems to have been made to compel them to adopt his 'wrong views' after confiscating their wealth.

However, reasonable objections can be raised against interpreting the term महाजन as 'notables' or 'eminent men'. For, although the term conveys this sense also in Sanskrit usage, in Pali the term occurs more often in the sense of 'the people'. In fact, in the Pali Chronicle as well as in the Sinhalese literary works the term is used in the latter sense. In the account of the First Buddhist Council the Mahāvamsa refers to the theras 'who had made their pilgrimage over Jambudīpa, consoling here and there the sorrowing people'.

The term महाजन here refers to people in various parts of Jambudīpa, who bemoaned the death of the Buddha, and it does not convey the sense of 'notables' or 'eminent men'. In the account of Parākramabāhu's military operations to bring the island under his rule we are told: 'Then he sent his train of hunters and robbers and the like, who were skilled in wandering by night in the wilderness of the forest and mountain and had many people (महाजन) slain by them night and day'.

The Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa states that when king Sirisaṅgabodhi

1Ny., III 13-14.
2Cv., LXXII, 208-209.
was considering abdication, he was moved by the prospect of great suffering which may fall on the people because of him, in the event of a war between the two opposing armies.\(^1\) Similarly in the account of the restoration of Poḷonnaruva during the reign of Parākramabāhu II, the Pūjāvaliya states that irrigation works were restored making that region prosperous and that that area was resettled with lacs of people.\(^2\) Parākramabāhu II gathered 'a great multitude of the inhabitants of Laṅkā (Laṅkāvāsīmahājanam) and had the great highway from the town of Jambudonī to splendid Pulatthinagara' improved and decorated for the Tooth Relic and the Alms Bowl Relics to be taken to the latter city.\(^3\) A Pali stanza at the end of the Dalada Pūjāvaliya calls upon kings to rule with justice without violating the canons of statecraft and pleasing their subjects (mahājanam).\(^4\) Other clear examples of the use of this term in this sense can be cited.\(^5\) In all these contexts, the term mahājana is mentioned quite clearly in the sense of 'people'. This would militate against taking the mahājana whom Māgha is said to have caused to adopt 'wrong views' as 'notables'.

---

\(^1\) evam sat mām nissāya ubhayapakkthagatassa mahājanassa vipulam dukkham bhavissati, Ḥvy., 20, para.13; see also Eli Av., 51.

\(^2\) lakṣa gann manusyayangen mahajana gahana karava, Pjv., 138.

\(^3\) Cv., LXXXIX, 13-15.

\(^4\) Rājadhamma mako pento - raṭṭhayanta mahājanam rāja no pi ciraṃ samma - pālayantu vasundhara, Dal. Pjv., 65.

\(^5\) Jkm., 21, 81, 88; Ep. Zeyl., IV, No.33, p. 258, line 21.
or 'eminent men'. Even leaving allowance for exaggerations, that this term in the account of Māgha refers to people in a general sense is consistent with the Pūjavaliya statement which refers to Māgha's 'having caused Śrī Lanka to adopt wrong views'. In spite of the considerations given earlier, therefore, we may take the mahaīana to have meant the people rather than the notables or eminent men.

Whichever connotation is given to the word micchādīthi, here we have the implication of compulsory conversion to certain religious beliefs. As stated earlier, micchādīthi is a general term which cannot be of much assistance in determining the religious faith to which Māgha belonged. But from the account of his persecution of Buddhism one gets the impression that he was not a Buddhist. Geiger has equated his 'false faith' with Hinduism. If he was a Hindu, as indeed he appears to have been, the particular sect - such as Śaiva or Vaiśnava - to which he belonged cannot be determined in the absence of data bearing on the subject. Archaeological exploration in Rājarāṭha has so far brought to light no religious monuments erected by him or datable in his reign. The Śaiva and Vaiśnava dēvālas in

---

1 siri laka mītyādṛṣṭi ganvā, Pjv., 108-9; same in Dal. S., 43.
2 Cv.Tr., II, see note to LXXX-75.
3 Paranavitana gives an account of the remains of a Śiva Dēvālaya to the north of the Northern Gate of Polonnaruva. This shrine, which measures 39 feet east to west and 18 feet north to south, has the usual features of a Hindu dēvālaya. Stone images of Siva, (cont.)
Polonnaruva are generally regarded as monuments erected during the Cola occupation of Rājarattha (c.1017-70). In many cases this view is confirmed by the Tamil inscriptions of the time of the Cola kings like Rājarāja I and Rājendra I found at the sites of these monuments. It is unfortunate that so far no epigraphic records or monuments datable in the reign of Māgha have come to light.

Considering the spirit of religious tolerance which led Indian kings throughout the ages not merely to permit the free exercise of religious worship, but often to encourage and patronise religions and religious sects other than their own, the persecutionist policies and religious intolerance shown by Māgha appear almost unique. It may, however, be pointed out that, though this religious tolerance on the whole remained unchanged, a few striking exceptions took place about this time. Harṣa of Kashmir (1089-1101 A.D.) carried out measures

(cont.) Nandin, Ganeśa, and a liṅgam of polished stone placed on a pedestal in the shape of a yoni were found. A pillar with an inscription of Jayabahu I (1110-11) was discovered; it has been suggested that this pillar and some other stones had been taken from an earlier building to build this shrine. A coin of Sāhassamalla (1200-02) was found in the debris. It has been suggested that this shrine may belong to the reign of Māgha, but there is no epigraphic or other evidence which would confirm this date. A.S.C.A.R., 1934, 16-17, see also plate IX.

2 A.S.C.A.R., 1908, 3-11; 1907, 37-38; 1960, 72-76.
which clearly display a violation of the characteristic Indian tradition of religious tolerance. These activities, which are vividly described in the Raêjatarângini, bear a strong analogy to the conduct of Mâgha. Like Mâgha he, too, plundered the enormous wealth of the temples for extravagant expenditure upon various corpses of his army. But that was only one reason. A certain Udayaraja was appointed for the purpose of destroying the images of gods (devotpâtanâ-pâyaka). Members of the local purohita Corporation, who were evidently Brâhmanas, were forced to carry loads (rudhabhârodhi) a measure to which Mâgha also had recourse. The acts of desecration by Harsa are vividly described:

'In order to defile the statues of gods he had excrements and urine poured over their faces by naked mendicants whose noses, feet and hands had rotted away. Divine images made of gold, silver and other (materials) rolled about even on the roads which were covered with night soil, (as if they were) logs of wood. Crippled naked mendicants and the like covered the images of gods, which were dragged along by ropes round their ankles with spitting instead of flowers. There was not one temple in a village, town or in the city which was not despoiled of its images by that Turuska, king Harsa. Only two chief divine images were respected by him, the illustrious Rasâsvâmin in the city, and Martânda (among the images) in townships'.

Two Buddha images, one at Parihâsapura and the other in the city, are said to have been saved due to requests made by the singer Kanaka

1Raêjatarângini, I, (VII), 1087 ff, see also A. L. Basham, B.S.O.A.S., x, 188-91.
2Raêjatarângini, I, (VII), 1089, 1091.
3Raêjatarângini, VII, 1088; Cf. Cv., LXXX, 66.
4Raêjatarângini, VII, 1092-96.
and the Śramaṇa Kusalasrī 'at a time when he was free with his favours'. Even if we leave a margin for exaggerations, there is little doubt that the above account clearly reflects an attitude of religious intolerance and positive persecution rarely met with in Indian history. It may also be noted that Harṣa is referred to as a 'Turuska' — a term by which the Muslims, known for their iconoclastic zeal, are denoted. Kalhana calls him a 'Bhairava of a king'.

The inhuman cruelties which Harṣa is stated to have inflicted on the Dāmaras and the Lavanyas are also reminiscent of the excesses committed by Māgha to some extent. We are told that 'Since he impaled even travellers, taking them for Lavanyas, the country became terrible to look at, (just as if it had been) Bhairava's kitchen'.

'The governor sent to the Bhairava of a king whole strings and rows of Lavanya heads (just as if they were) a great offering. At the gate of the king's palace there were seen everywhere rows of triumphal arches (torana) covered with Dāmara skulls, which appeared like cups (ghati).'

'Vultures, herons and (others) frequented king's gateway and occupied the spreading arches to feast on the heads of the Dāmaras.'

'In this land, which was filled with corpses, just as (if it had been) a burning ground, the nose was tormented by impure smells and the ear by the howls of the jackals'.

1 Rājatarāṅgini, VII, 1097-98.
2 Rājatarāṅgini, VII, 1095, 1233.
3 Rājatarāṅgini, VII, 1230.
4 Rājatarāṅgini, VII, 1233-34.
5 Rājatarāṅgini, VII, 1236

(cont.)
This description is clothed in poetic language, but that would not minimise the significance of the merciless cruelties inflicted on god and man alike. The parallel in the religious persecution and the cruelties practised by Harṣa and Māgha, both being near contemporaries, ruling two different kingdoms situated in the northern and southern extremes of the subcontinent is both striking and interesting. It at least illustrates that Māgha's religious intolerance and atrocities are not necessarily so unique as they appear at first sight.

Some evidence of religious unrest if not intolerance is forthcoming from the Karnataka country in Southern India during this period, when the Kalacuri kings ruled there with their capital at Kalyāṇī. Religious unrest showing signs of persecution prevailed there in the relations between the Jainas and the Śaivas who came to prominence there at this time. This 'new sect of Sivabhaktas' as Fleet calls them, rose to prominence in the 12th century and are generally known as 'Virasaivas' meaning 'brave, fierce or strict Śaivas - Śaiva champions' and popularly called Lingāyats or Lingavants meaning 'those who have the linga or phallic emblem'. To this day the followers of this Śaiva sect constitute about 35 per cent of the population in the

6 Rājatarangini, VII, 1238.

1 J. F. Fleet, Ep. Ind., V, 239, 237-60; Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts, 477-84.
Belgaum and Dhārwār districts of the Kanarese country. In Mysore
and Kōlhāpur state, as well as in Poona, Sholāpur and Sātārā, they
are a considerable element in the population.\footnote{\text{Fleet, Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts, 477-78.}}

Fleet gives an account of the Vīrasaiva sect. Among their
chief characteristics are noted the adoration of the linga which
they carry about 'usually in a silver box suspended from the neck
and hanging about the waist', adoration of Siva's bull Nandin, hosti-
licity to Brāhmaṇas, disbelief in the transmigration of the soul, dis-
like of child marriage, and the approval and practice of the re-
marriage of widows. Some of these tenets are a clear departure from
orthodox Hinduism.\footnote{\text{Dr. S. C. Nandimath attempted to refer Vīra-
śaivism to the more ancient past as against Fleet, who dated its
emergence in the 12th century A.D.\textsuperscript{3} Nilakanta Sastri defended the
stand taken by Fleet, but preferred to regard Basava who figures in
the Purāṇas, which treat of the history of this movement, as its founder.\textsuperscript{4}}
Fleet was strongly of opinion that the founder of this movement was
Ekāntada Rāmayya who figures in the Ablur Inscription.\footnote{\text{Fleet, Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts, 477; \textit{Ep. Ind.}, V, 239;
\textit{A Handbook of Vīrasaivism}, Dharwar (1942) Ch. IV, 50.\textsuperscript{2}
\text{S. C. Nandimath, \textit{A Handbook of Vīrasaivism}, 3 ff.\textsuperscript{3}
\textit{A note on Vīrasaivism - its History and Doctrines', \textit{18th All In. Or. Conf.},
(1958), 389-91.\textsuperscript{4}\textit{Ep. Ind.}, V, 239-45.\textsuperscript{5}}}}
The story of the foundation of the Vīraśaivism and the relations of this sect with the Jainas are contained in the Basava Purāṇa and the Channabasava Purāṇa written in Kannāda, and in the Jaina version in the Bijjalarayacarita. Fleet expressed strong distrust of these purāṇas which contain differences within the story as told by them, in addition to other differences when compared with the Jaina version. According to these works the Kalacuri king Bijjala even lost his life in a conspiracy arising from the disputes and uneasy relations between the two sects. Basava and his nephew Channabasava figure as having propagated the new faith 'which included persecution and extermination of all persons - especially the Jainas whose creed differed from that of the Liṅgāyats'. In the Jaina version of these legends, namely the Bijjalarayacarita, it is stated that Bijjala died of poisoning by a Jangama dressed in the guise of a Jaina, sent by Basava. Before his death, Bijjala is stated to have instructed his son Immadi Bijjala to put Basava to death. We are told that Immadi Bijjala ordered the execution of the Jangams wherever they were seized. On hearing the news Basava is

1Basava Purāṇa, Ed. Appaji Appannappannavar, (Rājesvarī Press), 1914; for a summary of the contents of these Śaiva Purāṇas see J.R.A.S. Bombay Br., VIII, 65-97, 98-221.
2Ep. Ind., V, 242 ff.; Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts, 477-84.
3Ep. Ind., V, 240.
said to have jumped into a well and died.\(^1\) Whatever may be the truth of these claims and counter-claims by these two parties, these accounts reflect the uneasiness and conflict which embittered the relations between the Jainas and this extreme Saivite sect. This is of considerable significance in the light of the strong traditions of religious tolerance in India, occurring as it did at a time when similar but rare instances are known from other parts of India.

Among the tenets of Vīrasaivism their anti-Brahmanical attitude is of some interest to us. Basava is stated to have refused to be invested with the Brāhmanical thread, claiming that he had come to destroy the distinctions of caste.\(^2\) Nandimath, however, tried to explain that this was merely a revolt from within the Brahmanical fold as much as Buddhism and Jainism were from without.\(^3\) But Nila-kanta Sastri admits rightly that 'the career of Basava was a definite and conscious break from Brahmanism and even according to the Purāṇas the Brāhmaṇas were as much the opponents of Basava as the Jainas'.\(^4\) Although this was evidently not a movement of universal opposition to distinctions of caste, the initiates into Līṅgāyatism appear to have been free of disabilities arising from considerations of caste.

---

\(^1\) Ep. Ind., V, 242.

\(^2\) Ep. Ind., V, 240; A Handbook of Vīrasaivism, 87 ff.

\(^3\) A Hand Book of Vīrasaivism, 53.

\(^4\) Eighteenth All Ind. Or. Conf., 388.
In this connection we are reminded of the charge levelled against Māgha that in addition to converting the people to a 'false view', he 'mixed the four castes which were (previously) unmixed'.

Before any significance can be attached to this statement we must take note of another statement in the same text that in the reign of queen Kalyānāvatī 'the four castes which had become mixed' were separated. The two statements are made almost in identical words. Taken along with the latter, it may seem that the reference is to the general confusion in the social order which may have been caused in this period of foreign invasions and political unheavels. But it would be interesting to find out whether this statement conveys a sense beyond this general implication.

The same text informs us in its account of Māgha that the Kerala warriors 'corrupted the good morals of the family which had been observed for ages'. This may be regarded as a reference to the excesses committed in the sack of Rājarattha, in the course of which violation

---

1 samkinnam catubbannam samkinnam akarī bhusam, Cv., LXXX-75. Geiger's translation that 'he brought great confusion into the four sharply divided castes' is too strong. Cv.Tr., LXXX-75.

2 samkinnam ca catubbannam asamkinnam vidhāya so, Cv. LXXX-41. Here too Geiger's translation as 'having scrupulously separated the four castes which had become impure through mixture' forces too strong a sense; see, Cv.Tr., LXXX-41.

3 vicchindimsu kulacaram cirakālānurakkhitam, Cv., LXXX-62.
of women by the mercenaries might have taken place. But reading
the Pūjāvaliya version one suspects it was a calculated measure and
not merely an allusion to the excesses commonplace in the conduct of
mercenary soldiers in times of war. The Pūjāvaliya states: '...lakdiya
kulastrīṅge jātisambheda koṭa kuladaruvan sīvasi karava...' Kula-
daruvan and kulastrīṅ generally refer to men and women of respectable
families in the upper strata of society. The first part of the Pūjā-
valiya statement may be rendered as 'having (caused breach in the
families of, or) brought confusion into the families of the respectable
women'. If the statement ends here it can be explained as the excesses
of the soldiers at the hands of whom these women suffered molestation.
But there is the additional statement viz. kuladaruvan sīvasi karava,
which presents some difficulty. The word sīvasi occurs in Sinhalese
literature as 'one who practises agriculture'. In this sense the phrase
would mean 'having made the nobles to take to agriculture'. In that
case we have to believe that the nobles were degraded to the position
of those engaged in agriculture. One may, however, raise the question
whether such a step would have led to the social degradation of these
men. Whatever be the occupational and caste divisions in ancient Ceylon,

1 Pūj., 108.
2 See Sumangala Sabdakosaya, 263-64; Geiger, Cult.Cey.Med.Times, see
   kulaputta, 205, kulāna itthiyo, kulatthiyo, pp. 29-30.
3 Sorata Thera, Sumangala Sabdakosaya, 1059; Saddharma Ratnāvaliya, 712.
agriculture was not looked down upon as a low occupation. In the twelfth century they were certainly an important community. Nissanka Malla warned them not to aspire to kingship. This statement itself is suggestive of the influence they wielded at the time. However, this monarch refers to agriculture as 'the best occupation' in one of his inscriptions. It is extremely unlikely that a social stigma was attached to the practice of agriculture, which to this day continues to be the main occupation of the people of Ceylon.

As a possible alternative it may be suggested that the word sivāsi is a derivation from the Pali sahavāsa which conveys the sense of 'living together'. Thus the entire statement appears to mean that confusion was brought by causing co-habitation in contravention of the morals accepted at the time. But the implication of the statement is not yet clear. It can be asked that since marital relations between kuladaruva and kulastrin were usual, what social confusion could have arisen in such a situation. As this is a valid objection to this interpretation, the earlier explanation based on the best known meaning of the word sivāsi appears more satisfactory.

---


2Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 17, p.113-14, lines 14-18, tr. 122.

3See Sanskrit-English Dictionary, Monier Williams, p. 1100, 'one who lives with another, a fellow lodger, dwelling together'; Pali-English Dictionary, p. T. S., 'living together, associating'.
It is true, as we have pointed out, that agriculture was not looked down upon as a low occupation, but if the nobles were compelled to take to cultivation of the land instead of their normal duties, it would not have been locked upon with favour by this class. In fact it would have led to a diminution of their influence. Māgha is also stated to have made the people carry burdens and do 'many duties' (bahu kāriyaṃ) which probably was a form of rājakāriya.\(^1\) Similarly the nobles appear to have been made to till the land. The exact implication of the statement, however, remains uncertain, but it seems to reflect a conscious effort on the part of Māgha to tamper with the social order with some motive or other.

Our suspicion is increased by the Rājāvaliya which goes even a step further. We are told that he 'wrought confusion in castes by reducing to servitude people of high birth in Lānka, raising people of low birth and holding them in esteem, (he) spread (his) fame (and) reduced to poverty respectable people'.\(^2\) According to this text Māgha appears to have interfered in the social order by upsetting the traditional scales which determined their relative positions. We may not, however, ignore the fact that the Rājāvaliya is much later in date than both the principal sources cited above.

\(^1\)hārayimsu jane bhāram kārayum bahu kāriyaṃ. Cv., LXXX, 66.

\(^2\)lakdiya kulavāsīn atavāsikaravā hīnayan utum karavā kīrti pavatvā jātibhedā karavā kuladaruvan dilindu karavā. Rjv. 44; Rjv.Tr. 53.

See, however, Cv., LXI, 50 where an earlier Sinhalese king had taken a similar measure.
In spite of the confused nature of these accounts, we are inclined to suggest that they contain a reflection of a conscious attempt by *Magha* to reduce the influence which the *kuladaruvan* wielded in society. It is difficult to detect his motive, but in all probability it appears to have been a political measure calculated to reduce the influence of the nobility - at any rate the more influential section in society. One cannot, therefore, venture to suggest that *Magha* shared a tenet of the *Virasaivas* in his attitude to caste. As shown by Geiger the 'four castes' (*catubbanna*) has to be taken as conventional phraseology denoting the social order generally.\(^1\)

For, though the four-fold division was known in Ceylon, it never assumed the rigidity of the Indian system.\(^2\) It may, however, be noted that *Karnātas* who were probably not unfamiliar with the teachings of this extremist *Saiva* sect, which had risen to prominence in their country, served in the armies of the *Sinhalese* kings in the twelfth century, along with the *Keralas* - their neighbours in the south.

We may also draw attention to a few more indications in other parts of South India, where a feeling of uneasiness and strain coloured the relations between the *Saiva* and *Vaisnava* sects, as well as their attitude to the *Jainas* and the *Buddhists*, side by side with glowing

---

\(^1\) *Cult. Cey. Med. Times*, 25; see also above,

examples of the spirit of religious tolerance which, it must be emphasised, remained on the whole unchanged. A well known instance of religious intolerance in the Col country was the persecution of Rāmānuja, though the kings never followed an anti-Vaiṣṇava attitude as a part of their policy.¹ Kulottuṅga II in his ardent attachment to Saivism removed the statue of Viṣṇu from its position in the celebrated temple of Chidambaram.² There are also other examples of disputes between Saiva and Vaiṣṇava temples which needed the intervention of royal authority for settlement.³ Attention has been drawn to a recorded case, when the mahāsabha of Tirukkadaiyūr 'resolved that any Māhesvaras who, contrary to their tenets as custodians of the Śiva temple and its observances, mixed freely with Vaiṣṇavas, would forfeit their property to the temple'.⁴ These are rare instances, but they are none the less significant in the history of the relations between Indian religions.

Some of the Tamil literary works also contain hints of mutual suspicion and animosity in the relations between different sects and creeds in South India. Attention has been drawn to a story in the

¹The Colas, 644.
²A.R.E., 363 of 1907; The Colas, 645, 362, note 49.
³A.R.E., 387 of 1906; see also A.R.E., 1907, p.69, para 26; this inscription is assigned to Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya II (1239-51 A.D.).
⁴A.R.E., 257 of 1925; The Colas, 645.
Tiruvilaiyādar Purāṇam which speaks of the śramaṇas (Buddhist or Jaina) who were unhappy about the flourishing condition of Saivism in the Pāṇḍya capital and sent three supernatural agents in the form of an elephant, a cobra and a cow for the destruction of Madhura. On these occasions the tutelary deity of Madhura - Sandaresa - is said to have come to the rescue by petrifying these destructive agents into the hills of Anamalai, Nāgamalai and Pasumalai in the neighbourhood of Madhura.¹ Vaiṣṇava legends contain a story of Tirumaṅgai Alvār in which he is said to have despoiled the Buddhist Vihāra at Negapatam of a golden image of the Buddha in order to secure the wealth required to build the Raṅganātha Temple at Sriraṅgam.²

These stories, however, cannot reveal anything more than the underlying uneasiness and suspicion in the relations between the different sects and creeds. Nilakanta Sastri has rightly issued 'a warning against a wholesale acceptance of the stories of the persecution and extirpation of Jainism and Buddhism, so freely retained in the hagiology of the Hindu sects'.³ To cite but one example in justification of the position taken by this scholar we refer to the Tiruvendipuram Inscription of the time of Rājarāja III and the Hoysala Narasimha II, which mentions the rescue of this Cola king by the latter, when

3 The Colas, 656.
the rebel Kopperunjīṅga raised a revolt against the Cola king and took him captive. In this record we are told that Nārāśimha heard that Kopperunjīṅga had taken the Cola emperor captive at Śendamāṅgalam, that he had destroyed the kingdom with his army and that the temples of god (Śiva) and the places (sacred to) Viśnu were destroyed. Now this allegation of the destruction of temples by Kopperunjīṅga made by the latter's opponent can hardly be accepted, for we have epigraphic records of Kopperunjīṅga recording endowments to temples, one of which is the Sanskrit Inscription at Drākṣarāma wherein he is called a worshipper Kaṇakasabhādhinātha. In these circumstances, these examples would hardly lead to a conclusion that the spirit of religious tolerance was no more, especially in view of the numerous examples pointing to the contrary.

But it would be reasonable to infer that in about the 12th century there was certainly an underlying element of mutual suspicion and animosity, which on rare occasions found open expression in religious intolerance and even persecution. We were compelled to enter in to a digression on the question of religious tolerance in the Indian subcontinent in order to understand the persecutionist activities and intolerance reflected in the conduct of Māgha, which otherwise would remain a puzzle. Māgha in all probability appears to have been in-

---

1 Ep. Ind., VII, No. 29, 160 ff; see line 1 of the text.
fluenced by, if not a follower of, an extremist sect, possibly of the Saivite faith such as that of Virasaivas. It is, however, not possible to arrive at a conclusion on the precise religious affiliations of Māgha in the present state of our knowledge.

As regards the struggle of Parākramabāhu against Māgha, the available information on the course of the war is limited and, as we have shown earlier, the account is given in very general terms. There is no way to track down the military strategy or the plan followed in this campaign for overthrowing Māgha. One of the things to which the king directed his attention before this war with Māgha referred to as the Dravida war in the Pūjavaliya, was to bring the vanni kings under his control. But it is not stated the vanni kings of which region were thus brought under control, if the reference is to those of Rājaraṭṭha it would have been difficult to interfere with their domains without coming into a direct conflict with Māgha. These vanni chieftains are known to have exercised their authority in different parts of the country such as Rājaraṭṭha and Rohaṇa. In this connection we are told that Parākramabāhu displayed leniency by reducing the sentence of those committed to the death penalty to be put in the dungeon under fetters and were to be later set free. The punishment

1Cv., LXXXIII, 8-10; Pju., 116.
2Cv., LXXIX, 51; Pjv., 136, 139.
of a prison sentence was commuted to a lighter punishment along with a reprimand. Those who were to be banished from the country were allowed to pay a fine of thousand (kahāpanas). 'But on all those who deserved a fine, he looked with indignation and with all sorts words of rebuke he made of them honest men.' We know from the Mahāvamsa that the pious king Saṅghabodhi (247-249 A.D.) showed similar compassion, which led him to mete out lighter punishments and the two accounts are very similar.

It is stated that the vanni kings were equipped with 'army and train' (senavāhānsampānna). It may also be noted that they are referred to as Simhala maha-vannin indicating that they were Sinhalese. It is quite probable that these Sinhalese chieftains in Rājarattha who must have suffered under Māgha's rule, looked upon Parākramabāhu with some respect when the latter became the protector of the Buddhist faith, having taken custody of the sacred objects like the Tooth Relic. But this allegiance of the vanni kings would not have been a matter of course, for there is evidence that they at times proved refractory.

We are told that they were 'brought completely under his influence, sitting merely on his lion's throne' having been subjugated by the

---

1 Cv., LXXXIII, 4-7; Pjv., 116.
2 Mv., XXXVI, 80-81; Hvy., 20, para.13.
3 Cv., LXXXIII, 8-10; Pjv., 116.
4 Pjv., 136 refers to the wives and children of vanni kings previously captured by the Sinhalese king, but returned to them by Vijayabāhu IV.
It is difficult to believe that the task was as simple as that. The Pujāvaliya adds a significant detail not found in the Gūlavamsa that, apart from the king's merit, the 'diplomacy' of his younger brother Bhuvanekabāhu, who held the position of yuvarāja, contributed to bring his enemies under control.² Like his nephew Virabāhu who fought bravely against the Jāvakas, Bhuvanekabāhu appears to have assisted his brother in his efforts to extend his influence into Rājarattha. What appears to have taken place is not so much a conquest leading to a complete subjugation of the vanni kings, which was difficult and inconceivable in those circumstances, but rather an attempt to win them over to his side through diplomacy and persuasion, a step which is likely to have been of advantage in the ensuing war against the forces of Māgha.

The Pujāvaliya goes on to state that, having brought the vanni kings under control Parākramabāhu embarked on a Dravida war, namely the campaign against Māgha and Jayabāhu whose forces were garrisoned in the stations referred to earlier.³ One difficulty that arises at this stage is the date of this war and the defeat of Māgha. In both our principal sources, the Gūlavamsa and the Pujāvaliya, the

¹ Cv., LXXXIII, 9-10.
² ...ekala tamangē ājāhā pin balen hā mal yuvarajahuge mantri belen Lamkēvehi parasaturan sādhannāhu, Pīv., 116.
³ Pīv., 116; Cv., LXXXIII, 15 ff.
war with and the defeat of Magha are dealt with before the account of the first invasion of Candrabhanu which took place in the eleventh year of the reign of Parakramabahu (1247). Thus, if the sequence of the narrative reflects a chronological sequence, the defeat of Magha took place before 1247 A.D. The narratives in the Pujāvaliya and the Cūlavamsa lend some support to this view for, apart from the fact that the account of Magha's defeat precedes that of Candrabhanu's invasion, it is specifically stated that Magha had been defeated and that Parākramabahu was engaged in developing the country at the time of the Jāvaka invasion in his eleventh year.

"After thus accomplishing by his power the crushing of the alien foe, he set himself to bring about the prosperity of all Lāṅkā. When the eleventh year of the reign of the king had arrived, a king of the Jāvakas known by the name of Gandrabhānu landed...."  

The Pujāvaliya contains the same version.

Paranavitana, on the other hand, would place the defeat of Magha about the year 1255 A.D. This view is partly based on a subsequent statement occurring in the Pujāvaliya that the forces of Magha and Jayabahu had been in occupation of the strongholds in Rāja-

---

1Pjv., 115-18; Cv., LXXXIII, 15-52.
2Codrington placed the defeat of Magha before 1247, C.A.L.R., X, 47.
3Cv., LXXXIII, 35-37.
4Mesē Lakdiva parasaturan sādhā raṭa samṛddha karavamin siṭi kalhi nāvata tamaṇṭa ekolos vāmnehi......Lakdiva nāvata nasannatā patangat Candrabhanu nam rajahu ha Javaka mahaseṅga, Pjv. 117.
rattha including Polonnaruva for 40 years before they were finally defeated.¹ This would bring us to the date proposed by Paranavítana. A further argument given by him against placing the event in 1247 is that one cannot understand why Parākramabāhu did not effect his consecration in Polonnaruva or restore that city and place the Tooth Relic in the ancient temple there - the cherished desires of this monarch which were achieved towards the end of his reign only. If Māgha had been defeated as early as 1247 why did Parākramabāhu have to take so long to achieve these objectives when he had a respite of several years before the Pāndya invasions and the second invasion of Candrabhānu. In this intervening period, he has pointed out, Parākramabāhu engaged himself in religious activities in Māyārattha but did not proceed to Rājaraṭṭha.²

These arguments are sufficiently plausible and we are inclined to accept the year 1255 as the approximate date of the defeat of Māgha. But it is necessary to bear in mind certain other considerations, which do not establish this date beyond all doubt. First, it is necessary to grant that the chroniclers disregarded the actual chronological sequence in their narrative, though as shown earlier, it is reasonably clear that Māgha's defeat took place before Candrabhānu's invasion.

It is rather difficult to allow such a lapse to pass in the case of the *Pāḷi* account which is an almost contemporary account. Even then this would not be an overwhelming difficulty if we assume that strict chronological considerations were not observed, and that the present discrepancy is a result of placing these political events in a narrative largely devoted to the services rendered to Buddhism.

Second, one may explain that Parākramabāhu was unable to perform his consecration in Polonnaruva and attend to activities in that royal capital, because of the possibility that even after the defeat of Māgha, conditions of insecurity continued and that all opposition to his rule had not been completely overcome in Rājarāṭṭha, which resulted in the concentration of his activities in Māyārattha. These are, however, not major difficulties. The reference to the occupation of Rājarāṭṭha by Māgha for forty years, though the figure is a round number as pointed out by Codrington, and a further statement that these forces had occupied these strongholds for long (*katvā katvā balakkāraṁ cirakālaṁ nivāsinam*) has to be taken as a favourable argument for Paranavitana's view.¹ The date 1255 in addition fits in well with the sequence of events which will be discussed in the next chapter.

Coming to the account of the campaign against Māgha, we are given

¹*C.A.L.R.*, X, 47; *Cv.*, LXXXIII, 19; *Pjv.*, 116.
no information on the generals who led it or the military strategy they followed. The Gūlavamsa states that the Kerala soldiers who were 44,000 in number, 'hard pressed by the spear-armed Sīhala warriors, were unable to resist, came terror-stricken to Pulaththinagara and held counsel there as to their future conduct'. The Pujāvaliya, which gives almost the same version, states that they resolved:

'King Parākramabāhu is of great majesty and meritorious power. Even the kings of foreign lands have come under his influence. All the Sinhalese have rallied round him. A half of us even Draviḍas have come under his influence. (We have all become) dim like the fire flies before the (rising) sun, from his abhiseka onwards. In the future it is not possible to remain in Simhala. Let us not remain, let us go away to (another) country'.

We are told that thereafter they took all their belongings such as horses and elephants, beauties of the harem, precious stones and pearls, royal diadems and other paraphernalia and abandoned the capital. In doing so we are told:

'They thought it was the eastern gate and marched out through the western gate and came to Kālavāpi, where the army of the Sīhalas had set up an entrenched camp. With all their goods they had alas! also to sacrifice their life by each giving his to the Sīhala warriors, thus carrying out themselves, what the king had only thought.'

---

1CV., LXXXIII, 20-21; Pujāvaliya, 116 gives the strength of the army as 40,000.

2Pjv., 116-17

And all the Sīhalas taking from their accumulated treasures became from that time onwards rich people, as in ancient times all the dwellers in Mithilā who gained the wealth which the kings, a hundred in number had through fear flung away'.

Here, we have only one side of the story. There can be little doubt that the soldiers of Māgha who had remained in occupation of these areas for many years naturally offered resistance to the bitter end. The narrative in all our principal sources gives no indication where such fighting took place, except for the engagement in ambush at Kālavāpi referred to above. It is sufficiently clear that this deficiency is partly due to the desire of the chroniclers to glorify their hero. They were evidently not enthusiastic about any reverses suffered by their hero, or of any bravery and audacity shown by his opponents in battle in this confrontation of the forces of Māgha and Parākramabāhu. The Dambadeṇi Asna, as noted by Paranavitana, takes splendid liberties in its account of these events, when it tries to uphold the personal valour of Parākramabāhu in battle by stating that the Kāliṅga king suffered death at the hands of the forces of the former. The ultimate end which overtook Māgha is nowhere stated in the more authentic sources. We have a reference to a king of 'Silan' in the Chu-Phu-Chi of Chau Ju Kua written about the year 1225 A.D.

1 Cv., LXXXIII, 29-34; Piv; 117.
It states that Si-lan (Ceylon) was under Malabar, a statement which would make sense if we take into account the fact that Māgha was mainly supported by the mercenaries from Malabar in occupation of Rājaraṭṭha. If this is the case the identification of the King of 'Silan' with Māgha would gain some confirmation. Unfortunately the king is not mentioned by name. This account hardly adds anything towards solving the present problems, except for a glimpse of life at the court and the impression that the king was in old age.  

In any case the authenticity of Chau Ju Kua's account is doubtful for the reasons shown elsewhere, and with regard to the final outcome, it is fairly clear that it did not lead to the achievement of any of his major objectives, namely the restoration of the old capital and the shrines in the sacred cities or the performance of his consecration in Pulatthinagara and the restoration of the Tooth Relic to its temple in that city. In other words, it did not lead to any extension into Rājaraṭṭha of his active authority. The final defeat of Māgha appears to be linked up with the Pāṇḍya invasions of Ceylon during this period as well as the Jāvaka invasions. These events will be considered in the next chapter.

1 Op.cit., p. 72, 87-89. The editors of this text have pointed out the occupation of Rājaraṭṭha by the Kerala mercenaries of Māgha.

2 See also Nilakanta Sastri, J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., VIII, 130 where he points out the unreliability of this work.
Chapter V

The Javaka and the Pandyya Invasions

Before we consider the events connected with the final defeat of Māgha it is necessary to draw attention to the invasions of Ceylon by a ruler from the Malay Peninsula - a region with which Ceylon had had no political conflict in the past. The first invasion took place in the eleventh year of the reign of Parākramabāhu. It was led by a king named Candrabhānu who is stated to have invaded the Island with a Javaka army. This indeed is the first recorded instance of Ceylon being invaded by a ruler from South East Asia. It is therefore necessary to consider the nature of this invasion in some detail.

The Culavamsa refers to the first of these invasions in these words:

1When the eleventh year of the reign of this King had arrived, a king of the Javakas known by the name of Candrabhānu landed with a terrible Javaka army under the treacherous pretext that they were also followers of the Buddha. All these wicked Javaka soldiers who invaded every landing place, and who with their poisoned arrows, like to terrible snakes, without ceasing harassed the people whomever they caught sight of, laid waste, raging in their fury all Lanka. Just as flashes of lightning with floods of water (visit) a place destroyed by lightning with flames of fire, so Lanka which had been harassed by Māgha and others was ravaged anew by the Javakas".  

These and other passages in the Chronicle relating to Candrabhānu's

1Cy. LXXXII, 36-39; Pjv., 117.
invasions of Ceylon attracted the attention of scholars from an early
date. It was clear to them even at the time they began these in-
vestigations that Candrabhanu was a ruler from a part of South East
Asia, but opinion differed in regard to the precise land from which
he hailed.

After some earlier attempts by several scholars, notably Kern,
Bosch, Ferrand and Krom, at the identification of Candrabhanu and
the repercussions of his invasions of Ceylon on the developments in
South East Asia, the publication of the text of a Sanskrit inscription
from Vat Hva Vian in Jaiya by Coedès in 1918 paved the way for the
identification of this ruler.¹

Coedès reassessed the entire problem in 1927 in the light of
a further study of this important inscription. This record, dated
Kaliyuga 4332 (1230 A.D.), mentions a ruler named Candrabhanu, who
is described as Tambralingesvara belonging to the Padmavamsa or Kamala-
kula, and as lord of the Pancandavamsa.² Coedès pointed out that,

¹ For a summary of the views of these scholars see T.B.G., LXXVII, 251-
54; 8th All. Ind. Or. Conf., 509, note 1. G. Ferrand, 'L'empire
Sumatranais de Çrîvijaya', J.A., XX (1922), 1-104, 161-246, esp. 115,
van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, Deel 62, series B, No. 5, pp. 151-71;
Coedès, 'Le royaume de Çrîvijaya', B.E.F.E.O., XVIII, No. 6 (1918),
1-36, text and translations, 32-33.

² 'A propos de la chute du royaume de Çrîvijaya', B.K.I., LXXXIII, (1927),
459-472.

³ (1) svasti
srimatrighnasasanagrasubhadam yas tambralini (2) gesvarah ....
svanivesam vamsapravah vamsaprdipotbhavanah

(cont.)
apart from these data which give no indication of Sumatran affiliations, neither Śrīvijaya nor Sailendravamsa – the family to which that line of rulers belonged – is mentioned. In addition, he also expressed the view that Tambralinga, identified with the region of Ligor in the Malay Peninsula, was no longer a dependency of Śrīvijaya and that this ruler was virtually independent of imperial control.

Coedés observed:

'Mais l'inscription de Jaiya remet tout en question. En effet si Candrabhanu était souverain du grand royaume sumatranais, il est probable que, suivant l'exemple de celui qui fit graver la stèle Vat Mường en 775, il aurait mentionné son titre de "Seigneur de Śrīvijaya (Śrīvījēśvara)" au lieu de s'intituler simplement "Seigneur de Tambralinga". D'autre part, le titre de Śrī Dharmarāja qui ne figure dans aucun document relatif aux rois de Śrīvijaya, semble particulier aux princes régnant sur la région de Ligor. Enfin la dynastie à laquelle se rattache Candrabhanu, la Padma-vamsa, n'est pas celle des rois de Śrīvijaya qui était, comme l'on sait, le Sailendravamsa. Tout concourt à donner l'impression que Candrabhanu était, non le Mahārāja du Zābag, mais un roi gouvernant un état particulier de la Péninsule Malaise, sous la suzeraineté plus ou moins effective de Sumatra'.

(continuation)

samru (3) pena hi candrabhamumadanaḥ śrīdharmarājā sa yah dharmmasaṣokasamaṇani (4) tīnipunah pāṇcaḥ avamsadhipān svasti śrī kamalakulasamutbhr(t)tām (5) braṅgesvarabhujabala- bhimasenaḥkyāyenāḥ sakalamamasyapunya (6) nubhāvam baḥhuva candrasuryaḥubhavah iha lakoprasiddhirīti (7) dharacandrabhānu śrīśrīdharmarāja kalyugabārṣāṇi dvārtriṃśadnikas triṇī (8) satādhiḥcatvārasahasrayaḥ atikrānte selalekham īva bhaktyamrta varadam, Recueil des Inscriptions du Siam, II, 27, tr. 24.

---

Coedés thus identified Candrabhanu of the Ceylon Chronicles with the ruler of that name in the Jaiya inscription. In support of this identification he also added that the term Javaka could well apply to all Indonesians. The people of Tambraliṅga would well have come under this ethnic denomination, as they differed little from those of Sumatraprior to the influx of the Thais. A further point which strengthened his arguments was the indications in the two sources that both these Candrabhāṇus were Buddhists. Coedés' identification is now generally accepted.

Paranavitana, who is in agreement with this identification, has, however, recently argued in favour of the earlier view that Candrabhāṇu was a ruler of Srīvijaya. We have already considered the difficulties in accepting this view, for Coedés has shown the clear indications for the decline of Srīvijaya during this period, for which he suggested a date as early as 1178 A.D. These views on the decline of Srīvijaya are now accepted by most scholars. It is therefore difficult to believe that Candrabhāṇu in 1247 and again circa 1262-63 was conquering territories for Srīvijaya; it would rather lend support to the view that he was doing so on his own account. This would indeed

3 B.K.I., LXXXIII, 459 ff.
be taken as a clear indication of the decline of Srīvijaya, as it was no longer able to exercise effective control on the outlying dependencies.

The dating of Candrabhānu's invasions of Ceylon has given rise to a difference of opinion. Coedes initially dated the two invasions in 1236 and 1256 A.D. respectively, partly on the basis of the Jina-kālamālī, a Pali Chronicle of Siam which belongs to the early sixteenth century.¹ Nilakanta Sastri is not inclined to give much credit to this work in dating these events and has shown that Geiger's chronology is in agreement with South Indian chronology.² As far as dating the Jāvaka invasions is concerned, Jina-kālamālī is not likely to be a reliable guide. This Chronicle informs us that after the lapse of 1800 years from the Parinibbāna of the Buddha, or in the Saka year 718, there reigned in the city of Sukhodaya in Siam a king named Rocarāja. This king, who was keen to see the sea, we are told, worked his way down the river Nān, accompanied by his retinue, and arrived at the city of Siridhamma. There he heard from king Siridhamma the stories of the miraculous image called the Sihala-pātimā of the Island of Laṅkā. Rocarāja questioned Siridhamma whether it was possible for others to go there. In reply he was told that the island was protected by the

¹B.K.I., LXXXIII, 462 ff.
²8th All Ind. Conf. 517-19.
deities with miraculous power, namely Sumana, Rāma, Lakkhaṇa (Lakṣaṇa) and Khattagāma (Kataragama). The two kings sent an envoy to Ceylon to secure the image and Rocarāja returned to his kingdom. After paying homage to this image the Sinhalese king is stated to have handed over the image to the envoy. The ship in which the envoy sailed on his return journey dashed itself on a rock on account of a severe storm, but the image was, however, saved miraculously through divine intervention and was taken to the city of Siridhamma. On hearing the news Rocarāja arrived in that city and took the image away to Sukhodaya where great homage was paid to it.\footnote{\textit{Ikm.} ed. A. P. Buddhadatta, P.T.S., 86-91.}

This in brief is the episode relating to the \textit{Sīhala paṭimā} in the \textit{Jinakālamālī}. Now this account undoubtedly bears a reflection of religious relations between the two countries, and that we will take into consideration later. Nilakanta Sastri's distrust of this Siamese Chronicle for purposes of chronology is justified. Firstly, it is clear that the date of Rocarāja given in the Buddha era and the Saka era yield two different results (544 B.C. as initial year: 1800 B.E. = 1256 A.D.; 718 Saka = 796 A.D.). Secondly there is no reason to believe that the second invasion of Candrabhānu took place in that year of Rocarāja, namely 1800 B.E. (1256 A.D.), for it may well have taken place a few years after this date, which is more in line with the possible date that can be assigned to this event based on Ceylon sources,
supported also by South Indian (Pāṇḍya) inscriptions as shown by Nilakanta Sastri.1

There are other difficulties in accepting the Jinakālamālī version. King Rocarāja cannot be identified in any other sources. According to the story given in this text, when a handsome young man (unnamed) of Gogāma was wandering in a forest, a divine damsel who was taken up by his physical charm desired cohabitation with him, which eventually took place. As a result of this a son was born, who grew up to become a powerful and handsome young man. People who were taken up by these qualities consecrated him as their king and he came to be known as Rocarāja. It is clear from this story that Rocarāja does not figure as a convincing historical figure. Sukhodaya (Sukhotai) arose as a centre of power only after the middle of the century and, before that, it was under Khmer dominion. The story in the Jinakālamālī may be taken as a mere legend explaining the establishment of Theravāda in Thailand, together with local stories about a Sīhala paṭimā.

So far as the first invasion is concerned it is certainly impossible to place it in the year 1236 A.D., for we have shown that this was the date of Parākramabāhu's accession to the throne. The Čulavamsa and the Pūjāvaliya are unanimous that Candrabhānu's first invasion took place in the eleventh year of the reign of Parākrama-

---

18th All. Ind. Or. Conf., 508-20; T.B.G., LXXVII, 256-57.
bāhu, and this would bring us to 1247 A.D., the year in which both Nilakanta Sastrī and Paranavitana have placed this event.¹ Coedés arrived at those dates partly by a correction of 15 years applied to Wijesinghe's chronology by accepting a suggestion from Jouveau Dubreuil. Coedés, however, revised these dates and placed the two invasions in 1247 and 1270. It will be shown in the sequel that the second invasion took place a few years earlier than 1270.² The main arguments of Coedés in regard to the identification of Candrabhānu and his dating of the decline of Śrīvijaya are generally accepted.

On the whole, Ceylon's relations with Indonesian territories appear to have been peaceful. Paranavitana has collected and examined data from Pali and Sinhalese literature bearing on this subject.³ From about the 12th century onwards the Śrīla-Samgha played a prominent role in the religious developments of Siam and Čamboja, apart from Burma.⁴

An important fragmentary inscription from the Ratubaka Plateau in Central Java would take Ceylon's religious relations with that island to at least the end of the eighth century A.D.⁵ De Casparis has

drawn attention to this interesting record, in the light of which he has suggested rightly that Ceylon too played a part in the 'Indianisation' of South East Asia. This inscription states that 'This Abhayagiri Vihāra here of the Sinhalese ascetics (?) trained in the sayings of discipline of the Best of the Jinas was established'.

Commenting on this record he 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 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 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'.

It is interesting to note in the light of this epigraph that Ceylon's relations with South East Asia go back to an early date. It is also significant that the more 'liberal' monastery - the Abhayagiri Vihāra - which was receptive to external influences, touching at times even matters of doctrine, had become a source of inspiration to their co-religionists in that part of Asia.

Such evidence as is forthcoming from the present record would indicate the possibility that Ceylon had similar relations with the

---

1 J. G. de Casparis, 'New Evidence on the Cultural relations between Java and Ceylon in ancient times', *Artibus Asiae*, XXIV, 245.

2 J. G. de Casparis, 'New Evidence on the Cultural relations between Java and Ceylon in ancient times', *Artibus Asiae*, XXIV, 245.
neighbouring lands like the Malay Peninsula and Sumatra, too. As far as the Malay Peninsula is concerned, if Paranavitana's identification of Tambarattha with Tambralinga is accepted, it has to be conceded that the two countries had similar cultural relations in the 12th and 13th centuries. We have shown some difficulties in endorsing this identification but it must be admitted that both the Pujāvaliya and the Daladāsirita state that Dhammakitti therā, who was invited to Ceylon by Parākramabāhu II, came from Tamalimgamu, in place of Tambarattha of the Culavamsa which refers to this episode. Tamalimgamu has a strong resemblance to Tambaliṅga-visaya of the Hatthanagallavihāravamsa, from where Candrabhānu invaded Ceylon, according to this text. This would point in favour of Paranavitana's identification, as we have shown elsewhere, but in the light of the difficulties pointed out by us this must remain an open question in the present state of our knowledge.

In the account of the first invasion of Candrabhānu no reason is given why he invaded Ceylon. In connection with the second, however, we are told that he demanded from Parākramabāhu the Tooth Relic and the Alms Bowl as well as his kingdom. We may also take note of

1 Cv., LXXXIV, 11 ff; Pjv., 118; Dal.S. 44,
3 Cv., LXXXIII, 36 ff.
4 Cv., LXXXVIII, 62 ff.
the story of the Śīhala-pātimā in the Jinakālamālī though, as shown above, it is very doubtful whether it has any direct bearing on these events.\(^1\) In addition, the Culavamsa states that Candrabhānu and his Jāvaka army landed 'under the pretext that they were also followers of the Buddha'.\(^2\) Though the chronicler had been reluctant to grant that he was a Buddhist for understandable reasons, these accounts and the Jaiyā Inscription would leave no doubt that Candrabhānu was a Buddhist. The story of the Śīhala-pātimā and the reference to the Tooth Relic and the Bowl Relic in the account of the second invasion may indicate that the desire to gain possession of these sacred objects was at least one important consideration, which motivated him to undertake this hazardous expedition. This, however, would not rule out the possibility of Candrabhānu's territorial ambitions in Ceylon for which there is some indication in the account of the second invasion.\(^3\) But that religious considerations were involved in these invasions appears almost beyond doubt. From the discussion which follows it would appear that, if he was moved by the desire to gain possession of sacred objects at first, later he saw the chances of territorial success in Ceylon and ventured to achieve that objective.

If Candrabhānu had merely planned to carve out for himself a

---

\(^1\) Jkm., 86-91.

\(^2\) 'mayam pi sogata eva iti māyam vidhaya so', Cv., LXXXIII, 37.

\(^3\) Hvv., 32; Cv., LXXXVIII, 62 ff.
kingdom in Ceylon by this expedition across the seas to an island
where he had no previous political experience, it is difficult to
understand why he should not have diverted his energy and resources
to more rewarding ventures closer home. The fact that he could find
the men and resources for these costly expeditions shows that he dis­
posed of considerable power, though not comparable with that of
Srivijaya in earlier times. In fact Candrabhanu could try his fortune
closer home in view of the weakening of the authority of Srivijaya on
the out-lying dependencies. The first expedition thus appears to have
been partly motivated by religious considerations, though we cannot
be certain of this. However, it is probable that the experience he
 gained in his trial of strength with the forces of Parākramabāhu on
this occasion, in which, however, the chroniclers would have us believe
that Candrabhanu was defeated, kindled in him hopes of success in the
future. And this he undertook some years later.

Owing to lack of information, however, it is impossible to be
certain of Candrabhānu's motives. It is possible to suggest that Can­
drabhanu had heard of Ceylon, especially of the time of Parākramabāhu I
when he invaded South India and also chastised the ruler of Burma. Can­
drabhanu may have associated the fame of Parākramabāhu with the possess­
ion of certain sacred relics. He may have tried to obtain these relics
by negotiations but was unsuccessful. When he heard of the difficulties
in Ceylon, possibly arising from the occupation of Rājarattha by Māgha,
perhaps he ventured on this expedition. An inscription from Siam, which
however belongs to a later date than that of these events, mentions a Siamese prince who went to the kingdoms of Kaliṅga, Paṭaliputra, Goḷaṃḍala, the kingdom of the Mallas and to the Island of Lāṅkā in search of precious relics. It is not impossible that Candrabhānu, being a Buddhist himself, similarly had ideas of possessing the coveted relics such as the Tooth Relic and the Alms Bowl, which were now in the possession of Parākramabāhu II. It appears that religious motives were at least partly responsible for this venture, whatever course it may have taken later.

Prince Viśrabāhu, sister's son of Parākramabāhu, was sent out to fight the Jāvaka invader when he landed in Ceylon for the first time. The Jāvaka soldiers are described as having been equipped with poisoned arrows 'which were shot one after the other by the Jāvaka soldiers from a machine'. Geiger has pointed out that such mechanical devices from which stones were hurled were known in medieal warfare. Poisoned arrows, however, do not appear to have been used as a weapon in warfare in Ceylon at any time, but the Pali Chronicle mentions that they were in use among the Rāmacchāyas apart from the Jāvakas.

---

1 Recueil des Inscriptions du Siam, I, 145-49.
2 Cv., LXXXIII, 42-43; Pjv. does not mention the role of Viśrabāhu in this battle, see 117-18; Rjv., 45, mentions Parākramabāhu's brother (Bhuvanekabāhu) in place of Viśrabāhu.
3 'yuddhe Jāvakayodhehi yantamutte lahum lahum visadiddhamukhe bāne bahdhā'bhimukhagate', Cv., LXXXIII, 44.
4 Cv. Tr. II, 152, note 1.
ever, was certainly a highly specialised art practised in families where its skill remained a hereditary speciality. The archers formed an important element in the Sinhalese army.\(^1\) Unfortunately, the \textit{Cūlavamsa} does not state where the fighting took place but only says that the Jāvakas landed 'in every landing place'. Generally invaders in the past landed in the port of Mahātittha (Mantai) in the north western coast. There were occasions when they landed in the port of Sūkaratittha (Kayts) in the extreme north of Ceylon, and at Gona (Trincomalee) on the north eastern coast.\(^2\) This does not exclude the possibility that he landed in a southern or south western port.

It has indeed been concluded that he would have landed on the south western coast of Ceylon and that the fighting might have taken place in that region. This suggestion is based on the statement in the \textit{Cūlavamsa} that when Vīrabāhu was victorious in battle in this war he went to Devanagara to worship the 'lotus-hued' god there before he returned to Jambuddoni.\(^3\) This, however, need not necessarily be a correct inference for, as this god and his shrine were held in such veneration as to deserve thanksgiving after victory, Vīrabāhu could have done so even if the fighting had taken place far from this southern shrine.

Although there is no conclusive evidence in favour of the above suggestion, it must be noted that Candrabhānu's invasion was from a new quarter, namely South East Asia. It is therefore not necessary to assume that he would have landed in a northern port as South Indian invaders had done. Besides, Rajarāṭha was at this time under Māgha's occupation, and he may have had to enter into a conflict with him, too, in case he landed in a northern port. And if Candrabhānu's desire at this time was to obtain the sacred relics, which evidently were in the possession of Parakramabahu who ruled in South Western Ceylon, there was no need to come into conflict with Māgha, who ruled in Rajarāṭha. Thus, though there is the possibility that Candrabhānu might have landed in the southern or south western coast of the island, it cannot be established beyond doubt.

The Cūlavamsa and the Pūjavaliya clearly state that Candrabhānu and his Jāvakas were defeated.\(^1\) The heroism of Vīrabhū is brought out in language couched in poetic flourishes: 'Going forth to combat like Rāma, Prince Vīrabhū slew numbers of Jāvakas as Rāma (slew) Rakkhasas. The Veramba wind namely Vīrabhū possessed of great vehemence shattered again and again the forest wilderness namely the Jāvaka foes'.\(^2\) There can be little doubt that Candrabhānu and the Jāvakas suffered defeat at the hands of Vīrabhū. We are told that 'After thus putting to flight the Jāvakas in combat he freed the whole region of

---

\(^1\) Cv., LXXXIII, 42-48; Pjv., 117-18.

\(^2\) Cv., LXXXIII, 46-47. Here Geiger has pointed out the influence of Sanskrit poetics, Cv. Tr., II, 151, note 4.
Lanka from the foe'.

We can raise an interesting question at this stage. After the defeat did Candrabhānu return to his own kingdom with his Jāvakas? The Chronicles do not make such a statement but we are told that the Jāvakas were put to flight. There is a possibility that the defeated Jāvakas did not abandon the island but remained behind in the north of Ceylon towards the Jaffna Peninsula forming a Jāvaka settlement, which later became the nucleus of a 'Jāvaka kingdom'. Codrington and, afterwards, Paranavitana, have called attention to some place names still current in that region, such as Chāvākachchēri ('the Jāvaka quarter'), Chāvankōṭṭai ('Jāvaka fort') at Nāvatkuli in the Jaffna Peninsula, and Jāvaka-kōṭṭai ('Jāvaka fort') on the mainland remind us of the association of this region with the Jāvakas. It may be argued that these place names could date from a period posterior to these events with which we are presently concerned. But the word 'kōṭṭai' 'kōtte' associated with these place names is significant and provides the indication that they were places of military occupation. That these place names are not of recent origin and

1Cv., LXXXIII, 48.

2Codrington, SHC., 78; Paranavitana, J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. VII, 194-95;

3The Dutch and the British imported Javanese labour, but the occurrence of some of these names in the Kadaimpot (Boundary Books) which belong to about the fourteenth century may further suggest that they were of not recent origin, Paranavitana, op.cit., 194-5.
that at least some of them were places of military occupation is confirmed by the fifteenth century Sinhalese poem *Kōkilasandesaya*. An interesting verse in this poem cited by Medhaṅkara Thera refers to Sapumal Kumāraya who occupied the Jaffna Peninsula (Yāpāpaṭuna) for Parākramabāhu VI. The author calls upon his messenger – the Kōkila – to have a look at the Jāvaka-Kōṭṭaya where Sapumal Kumāraya defeated the Kanarese forces (Kannādi-sen). Therefore, it is clear that Jāvaka-kōṭte, like several other place names cited here, is not of recent origin.

These data obtain a particular significance in the light of the information contained in a few Pāṇḍya inscriptions of this period from South India to be considered in the sequel. In the light of these important records from South India, it appears to be a certainty that the Jāvakas ruled over a part of northern Ceylon for some time. The accounts of Candrabhānu's invasions in the Chronicles establish that he was defeated on both occasions, and the impression created is that they were merely sporadic invasions which were repulsed successfully. They do not refer to or imply a Jāvaka occupation of part of the island during a period. This is an important and interesting difference.

---

1. sēvaka samaṅga Pārakum niriṅduge vipula
evaka pūmini Sapumal kumariṅdu pabala
nevaka gunaṭi Kannādi sen bīndi tumula
Jāvaka-kōṭṭaya ḍāka yan maṅga asala

emerging from a comparative study of the Ceylon Chronicles and
the South Indian inscriptions, which we propose to take up presently.

A number of inscriptions dated in the reigns of Jatārāman Sundara
Pāṇḍya (accession 1251 A.D.) and Jatēvarman Vīra Pāṇḍya (accession
1253 A.D.) have brought to light interesting data on an aspect of
Ceylon history during this period, where Ceylon sources have main­
tained an understandable silence. They refer to the invasion of Cey­
lon by these Pāṇḍya kings during the reign of Parākramabāhu II. In
order to understand these events in their perspective it is necessary
to note briefly the political developments in South India during this
period.

Throughout the first half of the thirteenth century the power
of the Colas was declining and their place came gradually to be taken
by the Pāṇḍyas. Kulottunga III made a desperate attempt to hold to­
gether a crumbling empire amidst great odds, but the forces of dis­
integration moved on.¹ The disintegration had virtually reached the
point of no return when the Kādava chieftain Kopperunāḍiga succeeded
in taking the Cola 'emperor' prisoner, about the year 1230 A.D. The
situation was temporarily saved by the intervention of the Hoysala
king Vīranarasimha, who released the Cola king, claiming for himself
the title 'The Defender of the Cola Monarchy' (Colarājya (mandala)
pratisthācārya).² Thus the Colas were practically reduced to insig­

¹The Colas, 365 ff;  The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom, 118-37.
²The Colas, 422-23; Ep. Ind., VII, 162.
nificance in South India.

In this situation the Pāṇḍyas who, for centuries, had felt the impact of Cola imperialism through the repeated invasions of their country, emerged the predominant power in South India. With Sundara Pāṇḍya we see the reverse of the process when he successfully carried the war into the heart of the Cola country.¹ It was, however, with the accession of Jatāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya about the year 1251 A.D. that the second Pāṇḍya empire reached its high watermark and remained in that position throughout the thirteenth century, as testified to by numerous inscriptions and the accounts of Muslim writers.² Sundara Pāṇḍya was ably assisted by Jatāvarman Vīra Pāṇḍya, who ascended the throne about the year 1253-54 A.D. and ruled contemporaneously with him. During their rule Pāṇḍya supremacy was established over a considerable part of South India. The Kērala kingdom was invaded and made tributary while the power of the Hoysalas was confined to their home territory. The Koṅgu country became subject to Pāṇḍya supremacy. Nilakanta Sastri has discussed the more important inscriptions of these rulers in The Pāṇḍya Kingdom and has shown the extent of the territory in which their supremacy held sway.³

¹The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom, 138-46.
²The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom, 156-73, Ch. XII, 174 ff.
³The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom, 174-87.
It is but natural that these developments in South India were to have an impact on the course of events in Ceylon. In the past dynasties which gained supremacy in South India included Ceylon in their orbit of territorial expansion, as shown by the Colas who invaded Ceylon towards the end of the tenth century and ruled over Rājaraṭṭha for a period of about half a century.\(^1\) The Pāṇḍyas of the second empire seem to have attempted to extend their influence into Ceylon. Several records belonging to the reign of Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya and Jaṭāvarman Vīra Pāṇḍya refer to victories over Ceylon, showing clearly that these rulers attempted the extension of their influence to the neighbouring island. These records are important for the course of Ceylon history during this period, as they throw light on an aspect not dealt with in the Pali Chronicles.

These records pose important problems. In the reconstruction of Pāṇḍya history, Nilakanta Sastri referred to many such obstacles, such as the interpretation of astronomical data in the inscriptions for purposes of chronology.\(^2\) Although the records give both the regnal years of the kings and astronomical data their dates cannot often be established satisfactorily. This led Nilakanta Sastri to remark that:

> These astronomical details yield different results in the hands of different scholars and often in the hands of the same scholar at different times. New kings have

---


\(^2\) The *Pāṇḍyan Kingdom*, 139-41; *A.R.E.*, 1926-27, p. 92, para. 45.
been postulated and given up in a manner that has tended to make the chronology a game of nine pins. As one wades through the results of Kielhorn, Jacobi, Swami Kannu Pillai and Sewell one almost gets the feeling that ignorance, at least of astronomy is bliss..."1

Fortunately, the records concerning the events in Ceylon contain dates which yield results which appear beyond doubt. This holds true so far as the dates are concerned, but that would not relieve us of the problems of chronology arising from our attempts to understand the events referred to therein, as may appear from the present discussion.

The prasasti of Sundara Pāṇḍya from his seventh regnal year (1258 A.D.) onwards state that he levied a tribute of elephants and precious jewels from the king of Ceylon.2 In an inscription of this ruler at the Jambukesvara temple at Śrīraṅgam, Trichinopoly, which recounts his numerous victories, Sundara Pāṇḍya is referred to as 'a second Rama in plundering the Island of Lāṅkā' (Lāṅkadvīpa-luntana-dvītya-Rāma).3

There are records dated in the reign of Vīra Pāṇḍya which contain more data on an expedition to Ceylon. In an inscription of the tenth regnal year (A.D. 1263), we are told that 'in the tenth year

1 The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom, 140.

2 'Tulangoli maniyuñ-jūli vēlamum Ilāngai kāvalanai-yērai kondanu', 8th All Ind. Or. Conf., 508; T.B.G., LXXVII, 254; K. N. Sastrī, The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom, 162 note 3 pointed out that K. V. S. Aiyar was wrong in his view that Sundara Pāṇḍya refused to accept the tribute and seized him. Ancient Dekhan 166.

3 Ind. Ant. XXI. E. Hultsch. 121-22.
of king Jatāvarman alias Tribhuvanacakravarti Śrī Vīra Pāṇḍya-deva who was pleased to take Sonādu, Ilam and Sāvagan's crown together with the crowned head'. 1 More information is forthcoming from a long prāṣasti the full text of which is available in one copy from Kudumiyamalai. 2 Inscriptions of Vīra Pāṇḍya are known to cover almost every regnal year up to this point but, in the notes on their contents published in the Annual Report on Epigraphy and in other relevant publications, no reference is made to those details concerning Ceylon until his tenth year. 3 It may be noted that a record of his ninth year from Sendamangalam, too, does not contain these data pertaining to the Ceylon expedition. 4 Vīra Pāṇḍya's inscriptions after this date also make repeated mention of victories over Ceylon, but they provide us with no new information on these events. 5 The Kudumiyāmalai text is corrupt and it is sometimes difficult to make out implications of its contents at several points as shown by Nilakanta Sastri, who has drawn attention to its salient features in his edition of the text. 6


2 A.R.E., No. 356 of 1906; K. N. Sastri gives the text and an abstract of its contents in T.B.G., LXXVII, 265-68, 8th All Ind. Or. Conf. 523-26, and in his History of Śrīvijaya, 133-34; see also Inscriptions of the Pudukottah State, No. 366, 238-39.

3 A.R.E., No. 432 of 1917, 3rd year. See also A.R.E., 1918, p. 155, para. 48; 299 of 1919, 8 and 9 of 1928-29, 4th year; 468 of 1907, 25 of 1928- (cont.)
A minister (mandiri) of Ceylon is mentioned who appears to have sought the aid of the Pāṇḍya king (.....tirunda mandiri saramai etc.), which in the context has to be taken as a step to settle a dispute between two kings of Ceylon. It is also stated that the (Pāṇḍya) King's aim was 'to uphold in proper form the ancient practice of royalty' (arasiyal valakkam nerippadu nāttuṅgurippinul).

Then we are told that among the (two) kings of Ceylon one was killed in the battle field\(^1\) and all his troops, treasures and royal paraphernalia were seized, the double carp (the Pāṇḍya crest) was put upon the fine flags which were waving on the Koṇamalai and the Trikūṭa-giri and that another king (ēnai vēndan) of Ceylon was compelled to surrender his elephants as tribute.\(^2\)

And the son of the Śāvakan, who formerly disregarded the commands and showed hostility, came and prostrated himself before Vīra Pāṇḍya and was duly rewarded. In the difficult portion of the text at this point, Nilakanta Sastri makes out that the son of the Śāvakan (Śāvakan maindan) was presented with the

\(^{(\text{cont.})}\) 29, 5th year; 1928-29, p.70, para. 15.

\(^4\) A.R.E., 480 of 1930.

\(^5\) For example, A.R.E. 437 of 1917, 544 of 1911 of the 14th, 15th and 16th years respectively, 1912, p.71, para. 37, 197 of 1932-33, p. 69, para 34.

\(^6\) 8th All Ind. Or. Conf., 511-12.

\(^1\) 8th All Ind. Or. Conf., 511; T.B.G., LXXVII, 267, strophes 7-8.

\(^2\) T.B.G., LXXVII, 267, strophes 9-11.
anklet of heroes (vîrakkâla), taken round in procession on an
elephant and was at once permitted to proceed to Anurâpurî, because
it was thought by Vîra Pândya that it was only proper that the son
should rule the vast land of Ceylon (formerly) ruled by his father.¹

As early as 1922 Ferrand stressed the importance of a compara­
tive study of South Indian inscriptions in relation to the problem of
Candrabhânu.² Later on it became clear that the Savaka of the South
Indian inscriptions had a bearing on the Jâvaka invasions referred to
in the Ceylon Chronicles. In 1929 Nilakanta Sastri took note of these
records in The Pândya Kingdom and referred to the Pândya invasions of
Ceylon during this period.³ A few years later he attempted a more
detailed treatment of these events in two important papers,⁴ in which
he tried to understand the course of events by placing them in a chrono­
logical sequence. He suggested certain modifications, but accepted
the main arguments of Coedès on the identification of Candrabhânu and
the dating of the decline of Srîvijaya. While these articles marked
a great advance in our understanding of these confused events, the
nature of the South Indian records, with their great difficulties, left

¹T.B.G., 267f.; strophes 11-12; 8th All Ind. Or. Conf., 511-12.
²J.A. (1922), p. 163; Coedès referred to Vîra Pândya's inscriptions
in which the Savakan figures, B.K.I., LXXXIII (1927) 465.
⁴' The Ceylon Expedition of Jatâvarman Vîra Pândya', 8th All Ind. Or. Conf.
1935, 508-26; 'Srivijaya, Candrabhânu and Vîra Pândya', T.B.G., LXXVII,
(1937) 251-68.
some of the problems open.

Several interesting questions can be raised in the light of the data from the Pāṇḍya inscriptions. Do the inscriptions of Sundara Pāṇḍya and those of Vira Pāṇḍya refer to one or to two different expeditions against Ceylon? Who was the minister who sought the aid of the Pāṇḍya king? Did Parākramabahu II strike an alliance with the Pāṇḍya rulers in order to expel the invaders who were in occupation of Rājārattha? Who were the (two) kings, one of whom was killed in the battle field and forfeited his possessions? And who was the 'other king' forced to surrender his elephants as tribute? Who was 'the son of Sāvakan' restored to his father's kingdom? It would be difficult to answer many of these questions with the desirable degree of precision but an attempt will be made to explain them as far as possible subject, however, to the limitations arising from the very nature of these records.

One observation that can be safely made is that the records of Vira Pāṇḍya refer to the expedition not only in greater detail but with much greater emphasis. Sundara Pāṇḍya's inscriptions merely refer to the exaction of elephants and precious jewels as tribute from the king of Ceylon, apart from the stylised phrase stating that he was 'a second Rāma in plundering the island of Lāṅkā'. These claims are made in the inscriptions beginning from the seventh year of the reign of Sundara Pāṇḍya (1250), while the first mention of the victories of Vira Pāṇḍya over Ceylon occurs in the tenth year, i.e. 1263, elaborated in greater detail
in the \textit{Kudumiyamalai prasasti} of the eleventh year, i.e. 1264. It may also be noted that the Sāvaka does not figure at all in the inscriptions of Sundara Pāṇḍya. A further point to bear in mind is that there is a gap of at least five years which separates the earliest records of the two Pāṇḍya kings in their references to victories over Ceylon. In the light of these circumstances it is reasonable to hold that some time before, or about, the year 1258 Sundara Pāṇḍya succeeded in chastising the king of Ceylon. He was perhaps satisfied with the exaction of tribute and an acknowledgment of his supremacy. As it is generally believed that Vīra Pāṇḍya assisted Sundara Pāṇḍya in his conquests it is not unlikely that Vīra Pāṇḍya was associated in some way in this expedition. But Sundara Pāṇḍya rather than the latter, appears to have figured prominently in this invasion of Ceylon.

The more detailed information on Vīra Pāṇḍya's expedition in the Kudumiyamalai prasasti as well as the differences in the two accounts create the impression that this ruler played a more prominent role in a subsequent expedition, which appears to have taken place between 1258 and 1263. It may be inferred that the latter resulted in a more active intervention of the Pāṇḍyas in the affairs of Ceylon, and was perhaps a continuation of what Sundara Pāṇḍya initiated some time before his seventh year. If the inscriptions of the two kings refer to one and the same expedition organised jointly, which Nilakanta Sastri has ruled out on good reasons, it is difficult to explain why Sundara Pāṇḍya makes
only a passing mention of it in contrast to Vīra Pāṇḍya. Besides, as stated earlier, the nature of the claims by the two rulers in regard to their victories over Ceylon are different. At any rate we may not be far from the truth if we infer that it was really the expedition of Vīra Pāṇḍya that led to a more active intervention in its affairs. It need not be imagined that Vīra Pāṇḍya was conducting expeditions on his own as against Sundara Pāṇḍya. Rather, the latter's sympathies were on his side in these ventures which were after all an extension of the supremacy of the Pāṇḍyas. There cannot be much doubt that Vīra Pāṇḍya was the principal figure in this expedition, for it is extremely unlikely that he would have detailed the victories in this manner and claimed the credit for himself in one of his records if it was really a joint enterprise. We may now proceed to analyse the contents of Vīra Pāṇḍya's prasasti and see how far they could be reconciled with the events in Ceylon as known from the Ceylon sources.

The record begins with high-sounding claims to numerous victories over far flung territories both within and outside the Indian subcontinent. The passage quoted below would show that Nilakanta Sastri had ample justification for regarding most of these high sounding claims as 'court poetry, not history':

'Gaṅgam, Gaūdām, Kadāram, Kāśipam, Kongam, Kudiram, Kōśalam, Māluvam, Aruṇaṅgam, Sonagam, Cinam, Avanti, Karuṇadām, Ikam, Kalingam, Telīṅgam, Papanam(?), Dandakam (or Dandanam), and Pandaram - the kings of

---

1 8th All Ind. Or. Conf., 508-12.
2 8th All Ind. Or. Conf., 511.
all these and other lands and the strong mandalīkas, having entered the victorious gate of the palace in the jewelled mansion, in which the three drums reverberated, awaited the convenience (of Vīra Pāṇḍya), made obeisance at his feet and presented before him the dark elephants and the treasure they had brought as a tribute.¹

According to these claims Vīra Pāṇḍya would have overrun practically the entire subcontinent of India and even such distant foreign lands like China (Cīnām), Kadāram in the Malay Peninsula and Burma (Arūmanām). Much of this is stylised prāṣasti and apparently rests on no historical foundation.

But the same cannot be said of his claims of victories over Ceylon. Here too the narrative is garbed in the characteristic prāṣasti language, but the description of the victories clearly indicates that it was more than a boastful claim. The reference to the death of one of the kings of Ceylon and the capture of his royal paraphernalia and the restoration of the son of the Sāvakan to his kingdom have to be taken as claims based on some foundation, and therefore deserve careful investigation.

At this stage it is necessary to consider the view expressed by Paranavitana that Parākramabāhu II sought the aid of the Pāṇḍyas in his struggle against his enemies who occupied Rājaraṭṭha, namely Māgha and his Kerala mercenaries.² In other words he has opined that Pāra-

¹T.B.C., LXXVII, 265-66, strophes 1-4; 8th All Ind. Or. Conf., see translation of this passage, 510-11.
kramabahu and the Pandyas were in alliance and that the latter's invasions of the north of Ceylon, coupled with the simultaneous attacks by Parakramabahu from the south resulted in the final defeat of Magha. Circumstantial evidence seems to point in favour of this view, though it lacks direct evidence for confirmation.

We have already noted the unconvincing tone of the account in the Culavamsa when it deals with the campaign of Parakramabahu against Magha. This account, as pointed out by Paranavitana, is conspicuous by the absence of any reference to the generals who planned and led it or the military strategy followed by them. The efforts at eulogy on the part of the chronicler only bring this weakness into more prominent relief. The passage cited by Paranavitana is by far the best illustration of this point:

'King Parakramabahu is of high majesty and is of miraculous power. Who in the world is strong enough to neglect his commands? Even the monarchs of foreign lands have now come under his influence, also all the Sihalas. Even some of us Damilas are his followers. What is the use of words about others? But what, what shall we people do? Now we have all become dim like glow-worms at the rising of the radiant sun. Therefore in the future, it is impossible for us to take up our abode on the Sihala Island, we will go to another country.'

We are told that these Damila and Keralas were unable to resist 'the spear-armed Sihala warriors' and therefore withdrew to Pulatthinagara

---

and gave vent to the sentiments referred to above. Paranavitana raises the question why these men who had their strongholds in the coastal regions of Northern Ceylon flocked to Pulatthinagara in the hour of imminent defeat, instead of leaving Ceylon from those ports if they wanted to do so. Further he adds that it is unlikely that Parakramabahu could attack these northern coastal strongholds without a fleet, for the existence of which there is no evidence.

In the continuation of the narrative we are told that the Damilas took their elephants and horses, pearls and precious stones and other royal paraphernalia and made their escape, in the course of which they mistakenly marched out through the western gate thinking that it was the eastern gate and, consequently, at Kālavāpi they were attacked and routed by the Sīhalas who had pitched their camp there. Paranavitana thinks that the implication of this statement is that they escaped through the western gate because of the approach of an enemy both from the north and the east, but were taken unawares by the Sīhala soldiers who remained at Kālavāpi for their turn, to attack the fleeing forces of Māgha. The enemy from the north and the east, whose advance is said to have led to this retreat of the forces of Māgha is identified with the Pāndyas, who invaded Ceylon some time before 1258, as known from

1 Cv, LXXXIII, 20-21; Pjv., 116-17.
3 Cv., LXXXIII, 27-35; Pjv., 117.
Sundara Pāṇḍya's inscriptions.¹

Now, with regard to the withdrawal of Māgha's forces finally to Pulatthinagara from their northern strongholds it is possible that the threat of the Pāṇḍya invasion made it necessary for them to take this course of action. On the other hand, it is also understandable if the pressure of Parākramabāhu's forces from the south, which had advanced at least up to Kālavāpi to the west of Polonnaruva, made it necessary for their garrisons to be released for the defence of the capital city in which Māgha himself was resident.² The possibility that the threat of a foreign invasion, which indeed Māgha was prepared to meet if the location of his strongholds mainly in the northern coastal positions is in indication, led to their abandonment, can be conceded. Further as the defeat of Māgha took place about the year 1255 there is some reason to believe that it was in some way connected with the Pāṇḍya invasion dated some time before 1258. This invasion, organised by a powerful sovereign such as Sundara Pāṇḍya, is likely to have weakened the position of Māgha, and Parākramabāhu possibly took advantage of it, whether the Pāṇḍya invasion was undertaken in collaboration with the Sinhalese king or not.

According to the Gūlavamsa and the Pūjavaliya Māgha was decisively defeated and all his treasures and all the inmates of the harem were


²Cv., LXXX, 73-74. Note the Riy. statement: 'Polonnaruva udaviyaṭa Urātōti udavvaṭa avut un Demala senaga'; 'the Tamils who had come from Urātōta (Kayts) to assist (their) men in Polonnaru'; Riy., 45.
The plunder of the defeated forces brought such enormous booty that we are told: 'And all the Siha\l as taking from them their accumulated treasures, became from this time onward rich people, as in ancient times all the dwellers in Mithil\a who gained the wealth, which the kings a hundred in number, had through fear flung away'.

This is undoubtedly exaggerated, but there is no doubt that M\a\ha suffered a defeat. It is difficult to imagine that Par\\a\kramab\a\hu should have sufficient resources at this stage to undertake a successful campaign against M\a\ha who was powerfully entrenched in a number of strongholds. This would point strongly in favour of the view that the Sinhalese king had some kind of understanding with the P\\a\ndy\a during this period. This does not necessarily imply that Par\\a\kramab\a\hu should have refused to acknowledge the supremacy of the P\\a\ndy\a king. In fact the king of Ceylon (\l\a\ngai K\a\valan), who paid a tribute of elephants and precious jewels to Sundara P\\a\ndy\a, was in all probability Par\\a\kramab\a\hu himself. These relations between the Sinhalese and the P\\a\ndy\a kings would have inevitably led to the exchange of envoys and courtesies between the two countries. The Pali Chronicles, which eulogise the reign of Par\\a\kramab\a\hu, could state with some justification that 'Even the monarchs of foreign lands have now come under

---

1 Cv., LXXXIII, 30-34; Pjv., 117.
2 Cv., LXXXIII, 33-34.
3 A.R.E., 166 of 1894; 8th All Ind. Or. Conf. 508.
his influence* and 'the heroes of the Pandus and the Colas, the kings sprung from the dynasties of the Sun and Moon, have sent me diadems and ornaments'. These statements may be taken for what they are worth, for we have at least a partial indication of the actual course of events from the few South Indian inscriptions.

Parākramabāhu entered Polonnaruva in his 26th year (1262), several years after the defeat of Māgha. This he did after the defeat of another enemy, namely Candrabhanānu, who invaded his kingdom a second time. It is an interesting coincidence that it is approximately about this time, viz. the tenth year of Vīra Pāṇḍya (c. 1263), that the latter claims to have taken 'the crown and the crowned head of the Sāvakan'. This is perhaps more than a coincidence, and points in favour of Paranavitana's view that Parākramabāhu and the Pāṇḍyas were acting together on some kind of understanding. He adds in conclusion:

'This Jāvaka /i.e. the Jāvaka referred to in the Pāṇḍya inscription/can be no other than Candrabhanānu. As the same cannot be slain more than once, we may conclude that the Jāvaka king lost his life in a battle in which the Sinhalese and the Pāṇḍyas fought as allies. Eulogists on either side would have given the full credit for the Jāvaka's defeat to their own hero, allowing no diminution of his glory by stating that the achievement was facilitated by an ally.'

---

1 Cv., LXXXIII, 23; LXXXVII, 29.
2 The variant reading satvisivana havuru (twenty seventh year) is also given, but savisi (twenty sixth) may be preferred, Piv., 137, note 16.
3 Cv., LXXXVIII, 62 ff; Piv., 135 ff.
4 A.R.E., No. 588 of 1916.
While we are inclined to accept this conclusion, as it offers the most plausible interpretation of these events as reflected in the confused and conflicting accounts, it is none the less necessary to give further consideration to the arguments adduced in support of this view.

In the first place, the argument that a Pāṇḍya-Sinhalese alliance would be consistent with the alignment of the powers contending for the mastery of South India during this period is not a very strong one. It has been suggested that Māgha must have ranged on the side of the Colas while the Sinhalese allied with the Pāṇḍyas. Reference has been made to a Parākramabāhu 'king of Ceylon' (Ilattu rāja), who lost his life while fighting on the side of Kopperunjiṅga - the Kāḍava chieftain who rebelled and took the Cola 'emperor' Rājarāja III captive. This record is dated in the 16th year of a Cola king Rājarāja (1231/2 A.D.). It has been suggested that this Parākramabāhu could be identified with Tennilanilaṅkaikon Parākramabāhu Nic-Caṅka Mallar of the Tamil inscription from Paṇḍuvasuvarā. It is consequently argued that the Sinhalese kings ranged themselves on the side of the opponents of the Colas as they did in the past.

In our discussion of that inscription, we have shown that it should be referred to the Kāţiṅga king Nīsanka Mallā, and it would

---

2 Hultzch, Ep. Ind., VII, 167, lines 5-6, tr. 168.
therefore be difficult to identify these two rulers.\textsuperscript{1} Besides, we have seen that the ruler mentioned in the Paṇḍuvasnuvara Inscription flourished in the last decade of the 12th century and the date of the present record is 123l/2, so that the time gap between the two rulers is also considerable (though this may not be a decisive objection). We are inclined to believe that the ally of the Kādava chief was some local ruler who styled himself 'king of Ceylon'. Anyhow the point that has been made is that like this Parākramabāhu, who had joined an enemy of the Colas, the Daṁbadeṇiya kings of a later date would have followed the same policy and ranged themselves on the side of the Pāṇḍyas - the traditional enemies of the Colas.

Such an alignment, however, would not have been particularly useful during this period, for by the middle of the 13th century the Colas had almost been reduced to insignificance, and they could no longer prove a threat to Pāṇḍya supremacy. It is true that in about the tenth century A.D. the Sinhalese and Pāṇḍya kings were in an alliance in their efforts to withstand the expansion of Cola power under Parāntaka I and his successors. At that time the Sinhalese kings tried in fact to bolster up the dwindling fortunes of the Pāṇḍyas against the rising tide of Cola imperialism, to which both parties were in the end forced to succumb. But by the time of Parākramabāhu II the situation in South India had changed completely, and the reverse process was at work when the Pāṇḍyas had established their supremacy

\textsuperscript{1} See above, 197-204.
and brought the Colas to virtual subjection. In this context, an alliance with the Sinhalese kings would have been of very little use to the Pandyas. But it must however be remembered that in spite of these changes in the power politics of Southern India, the Sinhalese would have continued to look upon the Colas as their traditional enemies. The Sinhalese kings, therefore, might have been led to throw in their lot with the Pandyas.

Similarly the presence of certain members of a Ceylon trading corporation, the Valahjiyar of South (?) Ceylon, in the Pandy country during the time of Vira Pandy, amongst the pious donees to sacred shrines there, is no argument for the existence of a political alliance between the two countries. Political conflicts were hardly an obstacle to commercial and cultural relations between these countries. And we know of the presence of the members of this trading corporation in South India at an earlier date, as referred to in the epigraphic records of Kulottunga III (1178-1216) and Maravarman Sundara Pandy (c. 1216) so that their presence in the Pandy country in the time of Vira Pandy is not of great consequence so far as the question of a political alliance between Parakramabahu and the Pandyas is concerned.

There are, however, other considerations which, taken together,

---

1 The Colas, 417-38; Anuradhapura Yugaya, 275-78; The Pandyyan Kingdom, 157 ff.
3 A.R.E., 505 of 1922-23. See also A.R.E., 406-407 of 1914; 1915, p.102, para. 32.
would point to some kind of political understanding between the Sinhalese king and the Pândyas. We have already mentioned the marriage links which connected the two royal families from early times. There is also some indication that Parâkramabâhu II himself belonged to Pândya stock. Further, as Paranavitana has pointed out, the author of the Gûlavamsa makes complimentary references to the Pândya kings even when they appeared as invaders. The Pândivamsa was held in high esteem in this period, as for example, the author of the Pûjavaliya refers with pride to the Sumaṅgala Thera of Mahanet-pā-mula (Mahānetra-prasāda-mūla), who was of the same pupillary succession as himself and who belonged to that family.

In the light of these circumstances and, particularly, in view of the memories of friendly relations between the two royal families in the past it is not unlikely that the Pândya kings showed some favour to the Sinhalese king, even if it was of little benefit to them politically.

There are some indications in the Muḍumiyāmalai Prasasti which lend some support to this view. Some difficulties in the text render their precise implication uncertain. But it is reasonably clear that

1 See above, 124.
2 See above, 93 ff., 124.
3 Cv., LXXX, 51-53; XC, 43-47.
reference is made to a minister (se..............tirunda mandiri), who appears to have sought the aid of the Pândya king (saranamai tigalindindu etc.). Paranavitana believes that the minister in question would have been an officer of Parâkramabâhu II, who sought the intervention of the Pândya king in order to secure his help in dealing with the enemies in Râjaraṭṭha. Although there is no conclusive proof it may be pointed out that in the reign of Parâkramabâhu there is an officer by the name of Devapatirâja, who occupied a very influential position. He was one of the most trusted men Parâkramabâhu had, whose services, particularly connected with the promotion of Buddhism, are recounted in detail in the Gûlavamsa. The grammatical work Sidatsângarâva composed in the reign of Parâkramabâhu II states that it was written at the request of the minister Patirâjadeva (Patirajadêva amâtya), who is described as having fought the Keralas with great audacity. We are told that the waters of the Mahâvâli were reddened by the blood of the Keralas when Patirâja took to battle. Though this is clearly a

1 T.B.G., LXXVII, 266, strophes 7-8, lines 6-8.
3 Cv., LXXXVI, 3 ff; Piv., 125 ff.
4 Sañda vana siñdu kiya kuñbuyona nama satara kivi seveta toda Vâlini yala togora arunu kiheni vi Keralan lâbâ hurirâ pativanedesa yuda Patiraja diya isura', Sidat Sangara Vistara Sannaya, Ed. Ratmalâne Dharmarâma (1931), p. 216, v. 11, p. 231, v. 24; It is stated that the Piv. was written at the request of the minister named Devapatirâja; this text refers to him also as Prime Minister (Devapatirâja nam agamâtiyân), Piv., ed. Bentara Šraddhâtisya, (1930), Ch. I, 12; see also the Alutnuvara Dévalaya Karavîma, Dunuketuvamśabhijäta Delgas (gamuve) Devapatirâja nam agra amâtyayân, Sinh. Sa. 11pi, 67-68.
poetic description of Devapatirāja or Patirājadeva it appears that he was an important minister, whose activities were not confined to his services to Buddhism, as he played an active role in the wars of Parākramabāhu against the Keralas. It is therefore not altogether impossible to identify this Devapatirāja with the minister who sought the aid of the Pāṇḍya king.

Another important, but somewhat vague, phrase in the Kuṭumiyāmalai Praśasti suggests that the expedition was undertaken in order to uphold in proper form the ancient practice of royalty (araiśīyal valakkam nerippada nāttum kuripinul). If any significance can be attached to this statement, there is some reason to believe that Vīra Pāṇḍya invaded Ceylon, at least on the pretext of assisting Parākramabāhu in his campaigns against his enemies. Parākramabāhu II was certainly the lawful and acknowledged ruler of the island at this time and had a right to his kingdom according to 'the ancient practice of royalty'. It may be argued that the minister in question could have been in the service of a ruler in the north of Ceylon on whose behalf Vīra Pāṇḍya intervened. But according to a statement elsewhere in the text of this inscription 'the son of the Sāvaka' is blamed for his previous recalcitrance. This ruler of a part of Northern Ceylon could therefore not have been the king for whom Pāṇḍya aid was sought. On the other hand, if Vīra Pāṇḍya interfered on behalf of an invader who had occupied a part of the kingdom which legally belonged to Parākrama-

1 T.B.G., LXXVII, 266, strophe 7, lines 4-5. See also K. N. Sastri, 8th All Ind. Or. Conf., 511.
2 T.B.G., LXXVII, 267, strophe 11.
bāhu, he could hardly have claimed with any degree of justification that his purpose was 'to uphold in proper form the ancient practice of royalty'. If Vīra Pāṇḍya did so at least with the pretext of assisting Parākramabāhu, the claim made by the former would become meaningful, for the latter was the lawful ruler of the island, though his effective authority did not extend much beyond Māyāratṭha. On these considerations, there is reason to believe that Vīra Pāṇḍya invaded Ceylon claiming to render assistance to Parākramabāhu. But it remains for us to see whether the Sinhalese ruler achieved his ultimate objective in seeking Pāṇḍyan aid.

Now it would be relevant to take into account the information on the 'Jāvaka' or 'Jāvakan' from the Ceylon sources. We have already considered the first Jāvaka invasion which took place in 1247. There it was shown that Candrabhānu who came at the head of the Jāvakas was defeated but that he was likely to have held his own in a limited part of Northern Ceylon.¹ Our main sources refer to a second invasion by this Jāvaka ruler. On this occasion he invaded with apparently greater preparation and strength than on his first invasion:

'After that time the Lord of men Candrabhānu, formerly beaten after hard fighting, having collected from the countries of the Pāṇḍus and the Colas and elsewhere many Damila soldiers, representing a greater force, landed with his Jāvaka army in Mahātittha. After the king had brought over to his side the Siḥalas dwelling in Padi, Kurundī and other districts he marched to

¹See above. 361 ff.
Subhagiri. He set up there an armed camp and sent forth messengers with the message, "I shall take Tisihala. I shall not leave it to thee. Yield up to me therefore together with the Tooth Relic of the Sage, the Bowl Relic and the royal dominion. If thou wilt not then fight".¹

Our main sources indicate that prince Vijayabahu and Virabahu rose to the occasion, inflicted a crushing defeat upon the 'Lord of men Candrabhanu flying defenceless'. The women of his harem, the elephants and horses, swords and weapons, the treasures, trumpets of victory, the umbrella of victory, the drum of victory, the banner of victory and all the other royal paraphernalia were seized and sent to Parākramabahu who resided in Jambuddoni.² According to some contemporary sources Candrabhanu lost his life in this battle.³

Before we can compare the data in the Kudumiyāmalai Prasasti with the version given in the Ceylon Chronicles cited above, it is necessary to fix the possible date of the second Javaka invasion. This event is not dated in any of our sources, but from the narrative in the Pūjavaliyya and the Gūlavamsa it is clear that this event took place after prince Vijayabahu had been entrusted with the administration of the kingdom.⁴ From a document entitled the Alutnuvara Devālaya Karavīma we learn that Parākramabahu was afflicted with an incurable ailment in his twenty-second year (1258).⁵ Though this tradition is not mentioned in the

¹Cv., LXXXVIII, 62-66; Pjv., 135; Hvv., 32.
²Cv., LXXXVIII, 67-75; Pjv., 136.
³Pjv., 136; Hvv., 32.
⁴Cv., LXXXVII, 73; LXXXVIII, 62 ff.
⁵Devisivana avuruddhehi kisiyam käyikābādhayak mūlikavā madak basa vikkavā
principal sources it seems to rest on some foundation. It also explains the necessity for having to entrust his son with the administration of the kingdom. Thus Vijayabahu must have taken over this responsibility in the year his father came to be afflicted with this disease, i.e. 1258, or a few years later. Besides, the filial affection shown by his sons towards Parakramabahu in the last stages, and the latter's virtual inactivity while his sons and prince Virabahu took over the defence preparations in the face of the threats of foreign invasions confirms further the tradition of the incurable ailment which overtook this monarch. On this basis it is reasonable to hold that the second invasion of Candrabhanu took place after the twenty second year of Parakramabahu (1258). It is possible to define the approximate date of this invasion more precisely. We learn from the Pujavaliya that prince Vijayabahu after defeating Candrabhanu entered Polonnaruva in the 26th year of the reign of Parakramabahu. This brings us to 1262. We can now confidently hold that the second invasion of the Javakas took place between 1258 and 1262.

The restoration of the religious shrines in Polonnaruva and Anuradhapura and the desire of Parakramabahu to be consecrated in the former capital were urgent. It is therefore very likely that Vijayabahu took the first


1'Thought the Ruler: my royal father shall have no grief arising from the separation from his sons and made his two younger brothers Parākramabahu and Jayabahu dwell continually near their father', Cv., LXXXVIII, 18-19; see also 29-30.

2Pjv., 137.
opportunity of performing this task to bring satisfaction to his ail­
ing father. It is, therefore, reasonable to hold that Vijayabāhu
entered Polonnaruva soon after the defeat of Candrabhānu and busied
himself with the tasks referred to above. As Vijayabāhu entered Polon­
naruva in 1262/3 the defeat of Candrabhānu is most likely to have taken
place in the same or the preceding year (1261). This date would very
closely approximate the year of Candrabhānu's defeat.

In the light of the chronology of the events discussed above it
is significant to note the claim made by Vira Pāndya in an inscription
of his tenth year (1263) that he 'took the crown and the crowned head
of the Śāvakan'. In the next year (1264) the Kuḍumiyāmalai Prasasti
refers to the surrender of the son of the Śāvakan and the reinstatement
of the latter to the kingdom ruled by his father. Thus the synchronism
as well as other details would establish beyond doubt that the South
Indian records and the Ceylon Chronicles refer to the same events. Our
difficulties, however, are not over. A comparative study of the two
accounts would still leave some conflicting elements to which we should
now call attention.

The accounts of Candrabhānu in the Gūlavamsa and the Pūjāvaliya
contain a few significant details. Paranavitana is right in suggesting

1 A.R.E., 588 of 1916.

2 'pandēval seyyādigal seydirunda Śāva(ka)n maindan tali(? ) rundirinīja',
strophe 11, lines 1-2; 'tandai yanda tadangadal-llam maindan per...gum',
strophe 12, lines 1-2; the latter portion is omitted in the Pudukottah
text, see Inscriptions of the Pudukottah State, No. 366, pp. 238-39;
T.B.G., LXXVII, 267.
that Candrabhānu was in a much stronger position in the second invasion. In the Gūlavamsa it is stated that 'he had brought over to his side the Sīhalas dwelling in Padī Kurundi and other districts' before he marched to Subhagiri. The Pujāvaliya adds to this list of areas brought under his influence Mānāmatu, Gona and Debarapātan, which are located in the north western and north eastern coastal regions of Ceylon. An interesting observation that can be made here is that the areas where Candrabhānu is stated to have won the Sīhalas to his side correspond to a remarkable degree with the regions in which the Māgha's strongholds were located. It therefore appears that Candrabhānu had extended his influence into the regions formerly occupied by Māgha.

We are told that he had 'deluded the whole world by a show of service to the world and the Sasana'. As stated earlier, it is beyond doubt that Candrabhānu was a Buddhist. This factor must have helped him to bring the people of those regions to his side. Other benevolent measures calculated to enlist the support of the people would have made him acceptable to the Buddhists, irrespective of the fact that he was an invader. Candrabhānu as a Buddhist could have

---


2Cv., LXXXVIII, 64; Pijv., 135. The variant reading Mānāmatu should be preferred to Mānavatu, Pijv., 135, note 12.


4Hvv., 32; Elu Av., 71, 'Lokasāsana samgraha kirīm vasayen ṛāccā karana lada siyalu lōkaya āti'.
successfully appealed to the sentiments of the people, precisely because these were the regions that undoubtedly suffered heavily under Māgha's rule of persecution and oppression. To the Sinhalese of these regions Candrabhānu is likely to have appeared as a devout Buddhist rather than as a hostile invader. It seems certain that Parākramabāhu's writ did not include the regions in which Candrabhānu enlisted popular support. Such a development could not, however, have taken place immediately after the invasion. It must have taken time before Candrabhānu could have succeeded in winning over the people. The fact that he ruled over these regions for a considerable period is confirmed by the Kuḍumiyāmalai Prasasti in which the Pāṇḍya king claims to have reinstated the son of the Savakan (Sāvakan maindan) to the kingdom ruled by his father (tandai Yānda tadaṅgadal Īlam). This would give further confirmation to the possibility indicated earlier that, though Candrabhānu was defeated on his first invasion, he continued to rule over part of Northern Ceylon and probably did not return to his kingdom of Tambraliṅga. There he gradually won over the sympathy and support of the Sinhalese until he became powerful enough to challenge Parākramabāhu from a position of strength. In fact, none of our sources specifically state that he was forced to flee from the island. The Gūlavamsa refers to 'putting to flight the Jāvakas in combat'. The Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa which gives the correct name

1 T.B.G., LXXVII, 267, strophes 11-12.

2 Cv., LXXXIII, 48. However, not much credit can be given to the statement that 'he freed the whole region of Lankā from the foe', Cv., LXXXVIII, 62; 'Ekkala peravaka piya rajahūgē yuddhayehi pūḍa Candrabhānu raja', Pjv., 135; see also p. 117 which contains a statement with the implication that he was killed in the first expedition.
of the country from which he hailed does not distinguish between the two invasions but, as his death in battle is referred to, the second rather than the first appears to have been taken into account. There is thus good reason to believe that Candrabhanu succeeded in establishing his rule over a part of Northern Ceylon, probably after his first invasion of Ceylon.

If thus Candrabhanu succeeded in securing the support of a substantial section of the people of those areas in Rājarattha it is quite understandable if he entertained ambitions of extending his sphere of influence southwards, thereby coming into conflict with Parākramabāhu. He thus made this attempt when he was powerful enough to do so. His army was supplemented with recruits from the countries of the Pāṇḍyas and the Cōlas and was certainly more powerful than the army with which he led the first expedition. It is difficult to infer from the statement in the Gūlavamsa that the recruits were collected from the countries of the Pāṇḍyas and the Cōlas, with the Pāṇḍya king's connivance, as suggested by Paranavitana. Rather, they may be regarded as ordinary mercenaries from the Tamil country, as Nilakanta Sastri has done.

There are very clear indications both in the Gūlavamsa and the Pūjāvaliya that Parākramabāhu had sensed a serious threat to his authority

1 Hvv., 32.
2 Cv., LXXXVIII, 62-63 ff.
by an imminent invasion of his kingdom. Vijayabāhu, who was in charge of the administration of the kingdom at this time, devoted his attention to military preparations. His younger brother Tilokamalla was given the necessary garrisons and was stationed at Mahāvattalagāma (Vattala on the sea coast near Colombo). He was entrusted with the defence of the region from Jambuddoni up to the southern sea against an enemy who would land in the south-western and southern parts of the island. Protection of the kingdom on the northern front was looked upon as a particularly difficult task on account of 'foes coming from the opposite coast' and 'since it is here that fighting is wont to begin'. This task was entrusted to his brother Bhuvaneka-bāhu, who was considered suited to take over this responsibility. He was stationed at Sundarapabbata (Yāpahu) with the requisite troops. Vijayabāhu and Virabāhu, who had shown great fighting ability and courage in the first encounter with Candrabhanu, took over the general supervision of the overall defence strategy, at the same time crushing any elements of opposition to their rule. As Paranavitana has shown, these preparations were evidently made to meet the threat of an invasion by Candrabhānu.

1 Cv., LXXXVIII, 20-22; Pjv., 133.
2 Cv., LXXXVIII, 23-26; Pjv., 133.
The Cūlavamsa gives an account of some of the religious activities in which Vijayabāhu engaged when he set out for the restoration of Pulatthinagara. These activities included the repair of old vihāras and shrines and the foundation of new ones. Most of the places he visited at this time were located in the Hill country (Malaya). This account precedes that of the second invasion of Candrabhānu but it is clear that Vijayabāhu's activities were not entirely confined to those connected with religion. He devoted his time to strengthening the military defences where necessary. Perhaps he realised the importance of a place like the rock-fortress of Vātagiri (Vākirigala in the Kāgalla District), which formed an important link in the military strategy followed by Vijayabāhu I in his campaigns against the Colas.

We are told:

"Then he betook himself with the four-membered army in the desired strength to the great and loftily situated fortress of Vātagiri. After building a splendid royal palace on the summit of this mountain, surrounded by an extraordinarily high wall, he stored there in case of need, the whole of the great treasure given over to him by his royal father."²

Similarly at Hatthigiripura (Kurunāgala, in the Kurunāgala District) which some time later became a royal capital for a brief period, the defences were strengthened by encircling the city with a wall and a moat.³ He also visited Gaṅgasiripura (Gampola) on the banks of the

---

¹Cv., LXXXVIII, 29-61; Piv., 134-35.
³Cv., LXXXVIII, 60; J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS, VI, 105-106.
Mahavilai, which also later became a royal capital, and restored the 
Nigamaggamapasada Vihara (Niyamgampaya).\(^1\) Prior to this, Parakramabahu 
II had devoted attention to this region when his minister Devapatiraja 
founded Viharas and improved the lines of communications by the con­
struction of bridges across the streams, on behalf of the pilgrims 
to Samantakūta.\(^2\) Vijayabahu therefore appears to have taken into ac­
count also the military importance of some of the places he visited 
and possibly desired to win the support and sympathy of the people in 
this region in his efforts to deal with the invaders.

It is now possible to consider the data in the Kudumiyamalai 
Prasasti and determine how far they can be reconciled with the accounts 
given in the Chronicles. We have already referred to the appeal by a 
minister to Vīra Pāṇḍya. According to the interpretation by Nilakanta 
Sastri of this record, the implication of the statement is that there 
was a dispute between two kings of Ceylon in which one of the parties 
appealed to the Pāṇḍya king for intervention.\(^3\) There is, however, no 
definite reference to a dispute in the record. This possibility is 
evidently based on the reference to the defeat and death in the battle­ 
field of one of the kings of Ceylon. Then the record goes on to detail 
his defeat and the capture of his troops and royal paraphernalia.\(^4\) The

---

\(^1\) Cv., LXXXVIII, 48-50; Codrington, S.H.C., 82-87; J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXXII, 260-309.

\(^2\) Cv., LXXXVI, 1 ff.; Rjv., 126.

\(^3\) 8th All Ind. Or. Conf., 511.

\(^4\) T.B.G., LXXVII, 266-67, strophes 8-10.
phrase Ilamannar ilaguvaril oru vanai vilapporodu vinmisi-yerri would literally convey the sense: 'Of the kings of Ceylon, having defeated one and raised him to the other world' (viz. killed him). If the word ilaguvaril is derived from the Tamil word ilaṅguvaril as it appears to be, its meaning, according to the Tamil Lexicon is 'luminary' and would not convey the sense of 'two' according to that authority. If this is the case there would be no direct textual reference to two kings or to a dispute between them. But the reference to an appeal to Vīra Pāṇḍya by a minister from Ceylon and 'the defeat and death of one of the (luminary ?) kings of Ceylon' which immediately follows, would make it possible to render the interpretation given by Nilakanta Sastri that there was a dispute between two kings of Ceylon, and that Vīra Pāṇḍya intervened on an appeal made by one of the parties to it, for the Pāṇḍya king's aid.

Then the record goes on to detail the possessions of the defeated king which were captured. These included the regiments of forces (padaippuraviyam), chariots (kanammanitter), silk garments (sinavadam), ear-ornaments (nāgattōdu), a heap of the nine gems (navamanikkuvai), the throne of the enemy (ariāsānam), crown (mudi), armoury (kaṭagam), long pearl necklace (mulumaniyāra), the flag (kodi), the umbrella

1Tamil Lexicon, I, 340.
28th All Ind. Or. Conf., 511.
(kudai), the drum (murasu), conch (jangam), staff (tandu), the seven elements of royalty (arairu keludaym) and so forth. After this it is stated that the (Pandy) flag with the double carp was hoisted on Komamalai and Tirik"tagiri, and that the elephant corps of (another) king was captured (enai vendanai anai tirai kondu).  

We then come to a very important part of the record which mentions the Sava(ka)n maidan (the son of the Sava(ka)n) 'who was formerly recalcitrant' (pandeval seyyatikal seydirunda). At this point the text is difficult, but Nilakanta Sastri makes out that after his (of the son of the Javaka) submission to Vira Pandy the Savakan maidan was presented with the anklet of heroes (virakkalal) and was restored to 'the kingdom of Ulam formerly ruled by his father (urvalañje) vittu tandai yanda tadangadal Ulam maidan pe...gum). The phrase yanda to pe...gum is omitted in the published text of this record in the Inscriptions of the Pudukottah State. The statement which follows, that the son of the Javaka was taken round in procession and was permitted to go to Anurapuri (Anuradhapura ?) is based on an emendation of the text by Nilakanta Sastri and is therefore less certain.

1 T.B.G., LXXVII, 267, strophe 8, lines 5-6; strophes 9-10.
2 T.B.G., LXXVII, 267, strophe 11, lines 1-2.
3 T.B.G., LXXVII, 267, Strophes 11-12; 8th All Ind. Or. Conf., 511-12.
5 8th All Ind. Or. Conf., 511-12.
We have already indicated the probability that the minister who sought Pāṇḍya aid was an officer of Parākramabāhu II. If that is accepted it follows that the latter was a party to the implied dispute between the (two) kings of Ceylon in which Vīra Pāṇḍya appears to have intervened. Now who were the kings with whom Parākramabāhu was in conflict? We know that he waged a long struggle with Māgha, but it has been shown that the latter had been defeated several years before the probable date of these events. Besides we have seen that Candrabhānu had extended his influence into areas which had once been Māgha's strongholds, suggesting that the latter had quit the scene by this time.

According to the Pujāvaliya account Māgha's defeat appears to have taken place about the year 1255. In fact, if the Cūlvamsa is relied on, his defeat may be placed sometime before 1247. We have preferred the view of Paranavitana based on the Pujāvaliya version that Māgha's defeat could be dated about 1255. Vīra Pāṇḍya's expedition to Ceylon, as shown above, appears to have taken place some years after this event. Therefore there is some reason to believe that Māgha was not the victim who suffered death at the hands of Vīra Pāṇḍya. Further, we learn from the Prasasti that the son of the Sāvaka was reinstated in the kingdom ruled by his father, which bears the implication that the latter had been killed in battle. K.N. Sastri has shown the difficulties in accepting the view that Māgha was a Jāvaka. Apart from this, considerations

---

1 See above, 323-25.

of age also make it improbable that Māgha was yet alive for he would have been far advanced in age and would hardly have survived these hard times. This, however, is a difficulty which applies in some measure even in the case of Candrabhānu, for the time gap which separates the Jaiyā Inscription of 1230 from these events is quite considerable. But this is not necessarily a serious difficulty and, if we are to accept a statement from the Kuṇumiyāmalai Prasasti, Candrabhānu's son was already associated in the administration, or was at least of sufficient age and ability to shoulder that responsibility. ¹ Who then was this king who was in conflict with Parākramabāhu, and who eventually suffered death at the hands of Vīra Pāṇḍya when the latter intervened in the affairs of Ceylon to set things right?

There is very strong reason to endorse the view of Paranavitana that the king who suffered death in battle, in the momentous events which led to the intervention of Vīra Pāṇḍya in the affairs of Ceylon, was no other but Candrabhānu himself. ² Paranavitana soon changed this view and came to regard the Jāvaka and the son of the Jāvaka in Vīra Pāṇḍya's inscriptions as referring to Māgha and a son of the latter, based on his identification of Kalinga in the Malay Peninsula and taking Māgha to have been a Jāvaka.³ We have referred to these difficulties

¹ T.B.G., LXXVII, 267, strophe 12, 'tandai yānda tādaṃgadal Tlam maindan per...gum etc.
in accepting this view.\textsuperscript{1} Candrabhānu quite clearly was the formidable enemy to meet the threat of whom Parākramabāhu was forced to set up the elaborate defences.

We have already noted the synchronism between Vīra Pāṇḍya's intervention and Candrabhānu's second invasion, as given in the Ceylon Chronicles. Vīra Pāṇḍya claims in an inscription of his tenth year (1263) referred to earlier that he 'took the crown and the crowned head of the Sāvakan'.\textsuperscript{2} In the prasasti of his eleventh year (1264) now under consideration, he elaborates the defeat and death in the battle field of one king of Ceylon, whose entire royal paraphernalia was seized. We are inclined to believe that both these records refer to the defeat and death of one and the same king - the Jāvaka, namely Candrabhānu. In the former it is referred to in brief, while the account was elaborated in the prasasti issued in the very next year. Nilakanta Sastri, however, expressed the view that the statement that Vīra Pāṇḍya 'took the crown and the crowned head of the Sāvakan' implies that the vanquished ruler paid obeisance to Vīra Pāṇḍya in open assembly, and not that he was killed.\textsuperscript{3} In the present case, however, the statement could well be taken in its literal sense. This interpretation is also in keeping with the re-instatement of the Jāvaka's son to the kingdom 'formerly ruled by his

\textsuperscript{1}J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. VIII, 125-46.

\textsuperscript{2}A.R.E., 588 of 1916.

\textsuperscript{3}T.B.G., LXXVII, 255.
father', who evidently met his death in his encounter with the forces of Vīra Pāṇḍya and Parākramabāhu. Let us now see the ultimate fate which befell Candrabhānu according to the Ceylon sources to determine how far it agrees with the version given in the inscriptions of Vīra Pāṇḍya.

Candrabhānu and his Jávaka army strengthened by mercenary levies from the countries of the Pāṇḍyas and the Colas marched up to Subhagiri and demanded from Parākramabāhu the Tooth Relic and the Bowl Relic and threatened to take Tissīhala. Vijayabāhu and Vīrabāhu went out to battle and we are told that Candrabhānu and his forces were decisively defeated and all his royal paraphernalia, the women of his harem, horses and elephants, royal treasure, trumpets of victory, the umbrella of victory, the drum of victory, the banner of victory were seized and sent to Parākramabāhu. 'Having in this way fought the fiery battle, conquered the province and won the victory he united Laṅkā under the umbrella of his dominion'.

Now the synchronism of the invasion of Vīra Pāṇḍya and that of Candrabhānu is particularly significant. The account of the defeat and death of the king of Ceylon referred to in the inscription of Vīra Pāṇḍya would at once call to one's mind the Cūlavamsa account of the defeat of Candrabhānu cited above. The Pali Chronicle does not specifically state that Candrabhānu was killed, but the Hatthavanagallavihāra

1 C. LXXXVIII, 62-76; compare this account of the defeat of Candrabhānu with that of the ruler who was killed by Vīra Pāṇḍya, and whose royal paraphernalia was seized, T.B.G., LXXVII, 266-67, strophes 8-9.
vamsa would have us believe that he met with his death in this war.¹ The province (mandalam) referred to in the Cūlavamsa passage is probably Rājarattha. This may lend some support to the view that Candrabhānu had already been in control of a part of Rājarattha before invading Parākramabāhu's territory - a point which is also confirmed by the Kuḍumiyāmalai Prasasti.² The ignominious defeat suffered by Candrabhānu is understandable if he was thus attacked simultaneously by the forces of Parākramabāhu and those of Vīra Pāṇḍya and, as shown by Paranavitana, both parties evidently claimed the credit of this victory for themselves, making no acknowledgment of the assistance one received from the other.³

If Vīra Pāṇḍya came to the assistance of Parākramabāhu it may appear strange that once the major enemy had been defeated he should have chosen to reinstate Candrabhānu's son to rule over the kingdom. It may have been a concession to expediency, though it was a measure which detracted from honest diplomacy on the part of Vīra Pāṇḍya. Paranavitana explains that, 'Instead of a strong Sinhalese state in a unified Ceylon, the Pāṇḍyas no doubt wanted both the contending parties in the Island to be subordinate allies of theirs'.⁴ Such action was also commonplace in India. Even so one may doubt whether Ceylon could

¹ Hvū., 32.
² 'tandai yānda taḍaṅgadal Ilam', T.B.G., LXXVII, 267, strophe 12, line 2.
have become a serious threat to the Pāṇḍyas at this time even if the island was united under Parākramabāhu.

The Kuḍumiyāmalai Prasasti refers to the elephant corps of the 'other king' (ēnai vendan) from whom Vīra Pāṇḍya claims to have taken it as tribute. The possession of an elephant corps may indicate that he was of a higher rank than that of a feudatory or forest chief (vanniarāja). Thus if 'one of the kings of Ilam' (Ilamannar ilaguvairil oruvanai) put to death by Vīra Pāṇḍya had been Candrabhānu, 'the other king (ēnai vendan) may well be identified with Parākramabāhu, as suggested by Paranavitana. Candrabhānu and Parākramabāhu being the two parties to the dispute which led to the intervention of the Pāṇḍya king. Although this would be a plausible explanation, the identification of the ēnai vendanai has to be left open. It is not impossible that this form of tribute and acknowledgment of Pāṇḍyan supremacy was the price which Parākramabāhu had to pay for the assistance he received in dealing with his enemies.

In the foregoing discussion we have attempted to analyse and interpret these events as far as possible, within the limits set by the conflicting and confused accounts, of important events in the troubled history of this period. From the above survey it is indeed quite clear that the Ceylonese sources are silent on these momentous events. Once again we are reminded of Geiger's apt observation that

1 T.B.G., LXXVII, 267, strophe 10, line 6.
'Not what is said but what is left unsaid is the besetting difficulty of Sinhalese history'.¹ In this connection we have also to bear in mind that but for the aid of these few South Indian inscriptions an inaccurate picture of the times would have emerged in our minds. For example it is said:

'Even the monarchs of foreign lands have now come under his influence'

and further,

'Having spread my fame everywhere also in foreign lands, I have for long held sway in just fashion. I have brought hither king's daughters from Jambudīpa with gifts and thereby made the nobles in foreign land your kinsmen. The heroes of the Pāṇḍus and Coḷas, the kings sprung from the dynasties of the Sun and Moon have sent me diadems and ornaments. Also I have gathered together without ceasing a mass of jewels which can be enjoyed not only by you all here, but even in future time by seven generations of my descendants, even as the (god) Kubera (gathered together) his nine treasures, the shell and the rest'.²

Here we have in the Ceylon Chronicles the counterpart of the vain and unfounded claims made by court poets on behalf of Viṇa Pāṇḍya, which Nilakanta Sastri rightly described as 'court poetry; not history'.³ At best these accounts can reflect little more than the customary exchanges of envoys and courtesies, which must have formed part of the relations between these dynasties, particularly appropriate in view of the relations between Ceylon and South India in this period.

² Cv., LXXXIII, 23; LXXXVII, 27-31; Pjv., 116-17, 129.
³ 8th All Ind. Or. Conf., 511.
Chapter VI

The Importance of the Reign of Parākramabāhu II

Once the defeat of Candrabhānu was achieved a great task before Parākramabāhu was the restoration of the ancient capitals, especially Polonnaruva. The Gūlavamsa devotes an entire chapter to a description of the manner in which Vijayabāhu attempted to accomplish this task. In fact the account of the restoration of the sacred cities gives the impression that it was looked upon as a kind of holy mission. Vijayabāhu, who is depicted as a particularly pious personage, appears to have been the chief architect of this movement. On the occasion of his being selected to take over the responsibility of administration, the Sangha espoused his cause with great enthusiasm, on account of his great piety, generosity and popularity. Vijayabāhu undoubtedly possessed not only such virtues as the Chronicles attribute to him but was indeed a man of considerable ability, who successfully organized the defence of the kingdom when it was faced with the invasion of Candrabhānu - a determined and powerful enemy. Having defeated the Jāvakas, no doubt with the assistance of Vīrabāhu and his brothers, as well as the Pāṇḍyas, he now undertook the restoration of the sacred cities.

We are told that when Vijayabāhu set out on this mission even women and children displayed great enthusiasm and were keen to join him.

---

1 Gv., LXXXVIII, 'The Rebuilding of Pulatthinagara'.

'When a certain number of dignitaries, soldiers and others out of laziness were not minded to go their wives said to them: "Ye, our lords may come with us or not, at any rate we are going with the king who seeks the best and we shall dwell with him in the newly restored splendid town". And they set forth therewith on their way before them. Even children deserted their fathers, if they would not go with them and followed the king. When the king beheld the great crowd of people setting forth, each deserting his village his house and his comfortable possessions, he persuaded them again and again in his great anxiety and induced all those whom it was right to induce to return.'

The Pūjāvaliya gives a similar account. On the one hand it reflects the great enthusiasm with which the people looked upon the attempts of the king to restore the sacred shrines in these ancient cities which earned their unstinted veneration through the ages. On the other it appears to bring out how difficult it was to attract people back to Rajarattha. The obvious reason would have been that conditions conducive to living were no longer present there. For the irrigation system had obviously suffered and fallen into such neglect that agriculture could no longer be practised with the assurance of the harvests to which they were accustomed in the past. Foreign invasion and the repeated sacking of Rājarattha had divested this once prosperous seat of royal authority of its ancient splendour and attraction. Naturally the people showed a reluctance to return there to live under conditions

---

1Cv., LXXXVIII, 37-42.

2Piv., 134.
perhaps more trying than in Māyārāttha, to which many had come in search of protection and security, which the chronicler has described as 'laziness'. The progressive neglect of Rajarattha and its ultimate abandonment in the century that followed shows that its restoration and resettlement was difficult and ineffective.

When Vijayabāhu undertook this task conditions of uncertainty and insecurity seem to have prevailed, although the major opponent, Candrabhānu, had been eliminated. For, even after the defeat of Candrabhānu, it was considered necessary to strengthen the defences of Subhagiri by the erection of a 'high rampart' and a trench. A royal palace was built there and Bhuvanekabāhu was made to continue his residence in Subhagiri as before.

Vijayabāhu entered Polonnaruva in the 26th year of Parākramabāhu's reign according to the PūjaVALiya. He made his way to the ancient royal city of Amurādhapura and initiated the restoration of the sacred shrines and other important edifices. Here one may raise the question why the son of the Savakan, who had been reinstated in his kingdom, did not interfere when Parākramabāhu started restoration work in Amurādhapura. The reason probably is that he could not start another conflict with Parākramabāhu so soon after his defeat. This would have been

1 Cv., LXXXVIII, 77-79.

2 The reading satvisivana (twenty seventh) is found in two printed texts of the PūjaVALiya, Pjv., 137, note 16.

3 Cv., LXXXVIII, 80 ff; Pjv., 136; Dal. S. makes no reference to restoration work done at Amurādhapura, 43-45.
even more difficult if Parākramabāhu had the Pāṇḍyas on his side. There is a vague phrase in the Kuṭumīyāmalai Inscription, in its reference to the son of the Savakan as 'having made him not wander' (tirukkōlam alaivāppadān kalittu).¹ What is really meant by this phrase is not clear, but if it conveys the above sense as is likely there is reason to believe that the aggressive mood of the Jāvaka received a setback after his defeat by Vīra Pāṇḍya and Parākramabāhu. The Sinhalese king appears to have taken advantage of this respite to effect repairs to the more important shrines in the ancient city. On the other hand the Jāvaka too was a Buddhist and may not have interfered with the religious activities of Parākramabāhu.

We are told that Vijayabāhu called in craftsmen from the surrounding area and undertook the restoration of the Ratnāvalī Cetiya, which his father had initiated. The supervision of the restoration work here was entrusted to the chief therā of the Senānātha Parivena, which has been identified with the Senāpati Parivena founded in the reign of Udaya II (887-898 A.D.).² An undated inscription from Amurādhapura belonging to Bhuvanekabāhu Mahapāṇan, a younger brother of Parākramabāhu who occupied the position of yuvarāja during Parākramabāhu's reign, refers to the grant of land to a parivena founded and named after him.³ The Pūjavaliya adds that repair work was also initiated in other

¹ T.B.G., LXXVII, 267, strophe 11, line 5.
² Geiger, Cv. Tr., 188, note 3.
important shrines in Anuradhapura. It is stated there that the jungle was cleared, repairs were effected and terraces of sand (vālimalu) were built in the three Nikāyas (the Mahāvihāra, Jetavanārāma, and Abhayagiri Vihāra), in the Lohamahāpsāda, Śrī Mahābodhi (the shrine of the sacred Bodhi Tree) and at the Ratnāvalī Cetiya.¹

However, the restoration of the numerous shrines and vihāras in the city, covering a vast complex of buildings neglected for nearly half a century, was evidently a tremendous task. This appears both from the Culavamsa and the Pūjāvaliya accounts. 'How the ruler betook himself to Anuradhapura and there round about the Thūpārāma and all the other sacred places he had the mighty forest - that was like a stronghold created by Māra - felled and a wall erected which was as a bridge over the stream of craving.'² Apart from many years of neglect it was Polonnaruva that had become the royal capital from the time of the Cola occupation in the eleventh century and, naturally, more attention was given to Polonnaruva than to Anuradhapura, though the sanctity of the latter city was never forgotten.

Vijayabahu initiated repairs at the more important shrines and vihāras in Anuradhapura and turned his attention to Polonnaruva. According to the accounts in the Chronicles it appears that work at Polonnaruva was taken in hand with greater urgency. This is clear from the

¹Pīv., 136.
²CV., LXXVIII, 80-81, see Buddhadatta's corrections, U.C.R., VIII, 175.
more detailed account of the restoration work undertaken in Polonnaruva. It is moreover significant that vanni kings were entrusted with the protection of the city of Anuradhapura. It is stated that Vijayabahu exchanged gifts and good wishes with these chieftains. They were presented with rocking-chairs (andoli), white umbrellas (dhavalachatta), fly-whisks (cāmara) and so forth. It is significant to note that no member of his royal family was stationed to look after the city and the administration of that region. On the one hand, it points to the virtually irretrievable decline to which this ancient centre of civilisation and royal authority had been reduced. On the other hand, it shows that effective authority over that area was a difficult task and evidently the most expedient course of action was to leave concessions to the vanni chiefs and to enlist their goodwill as indeed Vijayabahu seems to have done. At any rate the control or restoration of the city of Anurādhapura to anything nearing its ancient glory was a task to which Vijayabahu or any of his successors was hardly equal.

The greater interest taken in the restoration of the city of Polonnaruva is understandable. Prior to the foundation of Dambadeniya it was the capital from which the Sinhalese kings ruled. It was also the seat of authority of Māgha who was defeated after a protracted struggle. In fact the Dambadeniya kings looked upon Polonnaruva as the basis of royal power (mūla rājadānī). This point is illustrated by

1Cv., LXXXVIII, 87-89; Pjv. adds the detail that the wives and children of these vanni kings seized by the Sinhalese kings in former times were restored to them, Pjv., 136.

2Pjv., 131, 136; Cv., LXXXVIII, 90.
Parākramabahu's desire to hold his consecration in Polonnaruva, even though he had been already consecrated at Jambuddoni on his accession to the throne. We may compare the case of Vijayabāhu I, who held his consecration at Anurādhapura but preferred to rule from Polonnaruva. It would have given satisfaction to Parākramabāhu to hold his consecration in the old sacred capital from which his enemy, who had occupied Rājarattha for nearly half a century exercised authority. Besides it was perhaps considered to have symbolic importance, and it is likely to have aroused interest in the people for whom it was meant to have been a recognition of his victory over the Damilas. It appears therefore that Polonnaruva was conceived of as the seat of royal sovereignty, although these kings were resident in Dambadeniya.

The condition of Polonnaruva when Vijayabāhu entered it was not different from that of Anurādhapura. The Cūlavamsa and the Pūjāvaliya give a description of its pathetic condition, which may well be compared with the accounts of its grandeur which prevailed in the time of Parākramabāhu I. The contrast is indeed more real than apparent. Under Māgha the city and its numerous and imposing buildings, both religious and secular, would hardly have received the attention they deserved. In the words put in the mouth of Vijayabāhu, the Cūlavamsa describes:

1 Cūv., LXXXVII, 70, LXXXII, 1-2; Pīv., 131-32.
2 Cūv., LXXXVIII, 90 ff; Pīv., 136-37; cf. Cūv., LXXVIII, 44-109, LXXIX, 1-85.
'In the town called Pulatthinagara, there are now pāsādas, image houses, vihāras, parivenas, cetiyas, and relic temples, walls, gate towers, houses of the addha-yoga and of the hammiya kind, mandapas, sermon halls, temples to the deities and other buildings. Some of these stand erect, covered with grass, trees and whatever has grown upon them. Others have collapsed without support as the whole of their pillars perished; others again alas! will fall, bending under the weight of walls cracked from top to foot, because other support is wanting. Some of these through decay and old age are like grey beards, and unable to stand erect they become more bowed from day to day. With many the joists are broken and their pinnacles destroyed, with others the roofs have decayed and the bricks are broken. In others by the breakage of the damaged roof-tree the bricks of the roof-tree have fallen and only walls and pillars remain. In others again the gates have fallen in and the hanging of the gate-posts destroyed; in others again the steps have become loosened and the railings have fallen in. Of many all that can be seen are parts still hanging together from the original foundation wall. Of many not even the place where they once stood is now to be seen. Of what use are many words? This town which has lost all its glory we shall again make glorious.'

We cite this long passage in order to illustrate that during many years of neglect, in which the island was menaced by repeated foreign invasions, the city of Polonnaruva as well as the civilisation of which it had become the centre had suffered severe adversities. In a tropical climate such as that prevailing in the Dry Zone of Ceylon in which this civilisation flourished, even the most solid buildings had to be kept in a constant state of repair, if they were to withstand the destructive impact of the scorching heat and rain. The numerous Sinhalese kings who in the past repaired and restored the numerous religious monuments in the

\[^1\text{Cv., LXXXVIII, 92-101.}\]
sacred cities successively were doing so perhaps not entirely due to an exuberance of religious zeal, though no doubt it was an important consideration. It was evidently also a matter of practical necessity, if these structures were to withstand the ravages of the weather. Thus the description of the condition of Polonnaruva can well be taken as a fair picture of the decadence and decline which had set in 'in the devastated land, long desolate'.

Vijayabahu, however, applied himself energetically to recreate even partially the lost splendour of the former capital. Parakramabahu secured to him the assistance of the circle of ministers (mahāmaccamandala) in this task.¹ The services of various craftsmen such as workers in iron (ayakara), bricklayers (iṭṭhikavaddhakī), carpenters (dāruvaddhakī) painters (cittakāra) and others were secured from different parts of the country.² The restored shrines and other edifices are not mentioned by name. We are told that the city was adorned with vihāras which were provided with their characteristic complements such as parks, bathing-ponds, mandapas and pāsadas. The defences of this city such as its walls and moats were rebuilt. Apart from this, we are told that Vijayabahu had the 'tanks, ponds, dykes pools and the like - in which the em-

¹ Cv., LXXXVIII, 103-104; Piy., 137.
² Cv., LXXXVIII, 105-110; Piy., 137. These passages contain a list of different occupations at the time, and the names of the tools and implements used by them.
bankment had given way, and which were deprived of their deep water damned up as before, filled with deep water, covered with diverse lotus blossoms and stocked with all kinds of fish.\(^1\) Some attempt seems to have been made towards the promotion of agriculture by having 'all kinds of crops grown here and there and made the whole fair land prosperous'.\(^2\) None of this, however, should create the impression that any effective measures were taken to repair the major irrigation works on a large scale, as these were tasks which required the expenditure of vast resources. Placed as they had been, in the grip of foreign invaders, these rulers would not have been able to meet the exacting demands of great resources, which were called for in the implementation of a programme for the systematic restoration of the irrigation works.

The description of the restored city is a piece of obvious exaggeration. 'In this fashion the king had the town of Pulatthinagara - comparable to the city of Indra - restored, so that it surpassed Mithilā, subdued Kāncīpurī, laughed to scorn Sāvatthi, subdued Madhurā, turned to shame Bārānasī, reduced Vesālī to do nothing and made Campāpurī tremble with her glory.'\(^3\) Compared with the earlier account, which probably was very near the actual state of the city at the time, it is beyond belief that Vijayabāhu could transform it to conform even remotely to the picture painted in the passage cited above. This would have meant

\(^1\) Cv., LXXXVIII, 111-13; Pjv., 137-38; Pjv. 138 refers to the resettlement of that region with people: 'laksagānaṁ manusya-yāyangena mahājana gahana karava'.

\(^2\) Cv., LXXXVIII, 114-15; Pjv., 138.

\(^3\) Cv., LXXXVIII, 121.
in practice the rebuilding of the entire city.

When the city was restored by repairing at least its more important buildings and other features Vijayabahu made the necessary preparations for the performance of the royal consecration. Then Parākramabāhu was called into the restored city from Jambuddoni where he remained at the time and the consecration ceremony was performed which, it is stated, lasted seven days.¹ This was one of the cherished desires of Parakramabahu, the achievement of which must have given him great personal joy. The performance of his royal consecration in the old capital must have appeared to the people as an acclamation of the defeat of the Damila and Javaka enemies with whom he waged a long-drawn struggle. Consequently, it is likely to have given an understandable degree of joy both to the king and his subjects.

The next important task before Vijayabahu was the restoration of the Tooth Relic to its sacred temple in the old capital. We have already seen the circumstances under which it had been brought to Mayarattu for reasons of safety when Māgha occupied Rājarattha.² It had since remained first at Beligala and later at Dambadeniya where Vijayabahu III and Parākramabāhu II erected temples in which they were deposited.³ The Cūlavamsa and the Pujavaliya contain a picturesque description of the festivity amidst which the relics were taken to the old capital before A

¹ Pjv., 138; Cy., LXXXIX, 7-10.
² See above, 229-33.
³ See above, 264-66.
they were enshrined in its traditional temple.\textsuperscript{1} The highway from Jambudöni was gaily decorated, and the relics-bearing chariot is stated to have passed along it, accompanied by the five-fold music (pañcatūryanāda), singing and dancing, amidst the tumultuous joy of the people. The procession consisted of the king and his retinue, princes (rāja), nobles (rājañā), councillors (manti), warriors (yodha), the lay devotees and the Sāmgha.\textsuperscript{2} Having thus brought the relics, they were deposited in the traditional temple at an auspicious moment set apart for it. The festival is said to have concluded after paying great homage to the relics. The elaborate ritual followed in the Tooth Relic festivals is detailed in the Daladasirita.\textsuperscript{3} No doubt the Tooth Relic festivals were celebrated in great enthusiasm and these were occasions when practically every section of society gathered together in piety and devotion.\textsuperscript{4}

It is not stated in any of our sources that the Tooth Relic was brought back to Dambadeniya at the end of these celebrations. Indeed one gets the impression that it was permanently deposited in its traditional shrine in Polonnaruva. But this would seem strange, for it was customary to have the relic enshrined in a temple close to the royal

\textsuperscript{1}Cv., LXXXIX, 13 ff.; Pjv. 139 states that the Tooth Relic Temple in Polonnaruva had been desolate for sixty four years; this is probably a conventional figure; Dal. S., 45.

\textsuperscript{2}Cv., LXXXIX, 24-27.

\textsuperscript{3}Dal. S., 46-54.

residence. However, it is clear from a later passage in the Čūlavamsa where it is stated that Aryakaṅkravarti, who invaded Ceylon in or shortly after the reign of Bhuvanekabāhū I, sacked Subhagiri and carried away the Tooth Relic and other treasures to the Pāṇḍya country. It is therefore clear, as Geiger has pointed out, that the Tooth Relic had been brought to Subhagiri by Vijayabāhū's successor. Apart from the desire to have the Relic close to the royal residence, this would point to the insecurity which prevailed in Rājaratṭha.

Vijayabāhū directed his mind to the performance of the festival for the admission to the Order (upasampadāmāṇgalā). This was perhaps even more important than the restoration of the shrines viewed from the point of the welfare of the Sāsana. The Vinaya rules for the discipline of the Samgha underline: in no uncertain terms how vital it is to hold this ceremony in the proper manner. Successive Sin­halese kings devoted their attention to see that facilities were provided for its performance. The Upasampadā ceremony fell into abey­ance when Buddhism was forced to hardships, especially in times of foreign invasions. Vijayabāhū I invited monks from Rāmaṇāma so that the ceremony of admission to the Order could be reinstituted.

---

1 Cp., xc, 43-47; Cp. Tr., II, 204, note 3.
Parākramabāhu I also took interest in this matter and his Katikāvata (edict) contains information on the manner in which it should be performed. Vijayabāhu III similarly invited the members of the Order who had fled to South India in the time of Māgha's sack of Rājarāṭṭha and had them perform this ceremony. Parākramabāhu II, we are told, had this ceremony performed eight times in his 3rd, 6th, 11th, 12th, 17th, 21st, 27th and 30th years respectively. However, Parākramabāhu appears to have had a great desire to have this ceremony performed in its traditional site at Sahassatitthā (Dāstotā), a ford to the south of Polonnaruva, located on the Mahavāli Ganga. This was one of the tasks entrusted to Vijayabāhu when he took over the administration of the kingdom. And now Vijayabāhu made arrangements to have the Upasampadā performed at Sahassatitthā as requested by his father.

The special emphasis given to this ceremony by Parākramabāhu was necessitated by the abuses and corruption that had been going on in the Samgha. The Dambadēṇi Katikāvata which embodies the code of disciplinary rules issued during his reign reflects very clearly not only the indiscipline of the monks in a variety of ways, but indicates that such abuses had crept into the manner in which this import-

---

1 Ep. Zeyl., II, no. 41, 256-83; Cv., LXXVIII, 12-27 contains a graphic description of the corruption and disunity in the Samgha.

2 P.i.v., 109-110; Cv., LXXXI, 49-50; Nks., 87-88, Dal. S., 43-44.

3 P.i.v., 123; Cv., LXXXIV, 32-37.

4 Cv., LXXXVII, 71-72.
ant ceremony was conducted. It lays down that:

'The ceremony of admission to the Order is an act of first rate importance for the stability of the Dispensation and the ceremony of admission to the Order should not be performed except in the presence of the Ṣāsanānu-sāsaka ('the Head of the Buddhist Community'), or with those who are proficient in the Discipline as are appointed by the latter, and with royal authority, but not in various places'.

Now this shows that the ceremony had been performed in contravention of the disciplinary rules applicable to it. Thus repeated performance of this ceremony through the patronage of Parākramabahu II, as well as the efforts of his predecessors was an attempt to deal with the growing indiscipline in the Samgha. The earlier ceremonies of the Upasampadā which Parakramabahu caused to be performed were probably local in scope. This time, however, we are told that the monks of the whole island gathered at Sahassatittha for the performance of the ceremony of admission to the Order. The vanni kings of Patitharaṭṭha (Rājarāṭṭha) and Rohana are said to have brought with them the requisite provisions of alms for the assembly of monks who gathered at Sahassatittha.

At this ceremony held at Sahassatittha many monks are said to have

---

1 Upasampadāva nam Ṣāsanasthitiyata mul vū garukarmamahayak bhūvin tatkēl- aśasanānuśāsaka tūn mādava hō eṁū visin āṇavana laḍa vyakta vinaya-dharayan āṭiva rajasammatayan misa nā nā sthānayehi upasampadava nokata yutu, Damadeni Katikavata, see Ktk. Sng., 10.

2 Cv., LXXXIX, 57-59; Piv., 139-40.

3 Cv., LXXXIX, 51-53; Piv., 139.
received the higher ordination. The deserving theras were invested with the different ranks such as that of the Grand Master (mahāsāmi-padaṃ), Chief Thera (mūlapadaṃ), Grand Thera (mahāthera padaṃ), and Parivena Thera (parivenatherapadaṃ). The ceremony is stated to have lasted for a period of half a month (addhamasāgī). It is interesting to note that at the conclusion of the ceremony, he (Parakramabāhu) sent many remaining articles of use to the bhikkhus settled in the Paṇḍu and Coḷa countries. It is an indication of the cordial religious intercourse between Ceylon and the Damil country, which prevailed during this period—a fact to which we have already drawn attention.

So far as the outcome of the efforts of Parakramabāhu II to bring about the 'purification' of the Saṃgha is concerned, we may well say that the results were not lasting, as had been the case with the efforts of his predecessors in this direction. The promulgation of similar edicts concerning the discipline of the Saṃgha not long after the reign of Parakramabāhu II by his successors, indicates the limited nature of the results of the efforts of this monarch. It is, however, important to bear in mind that Parakramabāhu devoted his attention and energy to improve the discipline of the Order in order to further the welfare of the Dispensation at a time when royal patronage was most urgently needed.

1 Cv., LXXXIX, 64-65; Pjv., 140.
2 Depōyakin mālukam pūjāva nimava, Pjv., 140; Cv., LXXXIX, 63, 67-68.
3 Nks., 90, 94, 96; Cv., XCI, 9-11.
irrespective of what success he achieved.

After these ceremonies were over Parakramabahu returned to Dambadeniya and the administration of the Northern Province (Uttara Rathas) had been entrusted to Virabahu who took up his residence in Polonnaruva. How long he continued there or what fate ultimately overtook him is not known.

And that brings us to the end of the long and eventful reign of Parakramabahu II which is recorded in complimentary language in the Culavamsa: 'After he had for a long time made over the burden of government to his own world-famed son, this most excellent King Parakramabahu who as described, performed through his son an abundance of meritorious works, entered heaven when he had attained his thirty-fifth year (of reign). There is no reason to doubt that his reign lasted thirty-five years, for the Pujavaliya too refers to his thirty-fifth regnal year in which the Upasampadā ceremony at Sahassatittha is stated to have been held, though his death is not specifically mentioned.

---

1 Cv., LXXXIX, 11; the expression is rattham uttamam which Geiger rightly thinks is a reference to Rājaraṭha, Cv. Tr., II, 194, note 3; This is confirmed by the Pujavaliya: Kandavurupurehi dī abhīṣeka maṅgul karavā Virabahu rajahata e siyalu rajyaya ma pāvā dī ovun ehi raṅdavā', Pijv. 138.

2 Cv., LXXXIX, 71; Pijv., 46 gives thirty two years.

3 The text of the Pujavaliya which Geiger consulted seems to give the length of Parakramabahu's reign as thirty three years, Cv. Tr., II, p.200, note 2; but see the improved recent edition of this text (Suvira), 140, mesē mē pantis vannēhi karanalada Vijayabahu mālukam pūjāvak karavā tumū ema Jambudroṇi nam purayehi tava da vaḍa vaḍā putrayan viṇṭinā śri sampat bala bāla tāvāda vaḍa vaḍa pin rās kota rajāsirī viṇṭināhā'.

Quite clearly, his death occurred in his thirty-fifth regnal year, though the Rājāvaliya places this event in his thirty-second year.¹

Before we wind up this chapter it would be appropriate to draw attention to some of the more noteworthy features of the period covered by the reign of Parākramabāhu II. One fact which stands out clearly is that the major part of his reign was marred by his struggle with foreign-invaders, namely Māgha, the Pāṇḍyaś and Candrabhānu. His task was indeed a very difficult one. He made determined efforts to maintain the integrity of the province of Māyāraṭṭha and to extend his authority into Rājarāṭṭha, the traditional seat of Sinhalese royal power. Here, of course, we have to bear in mind that in these efforts it was his nephew Vīrabāhu, and his sons, particularly Vījayabāhu who carried the practical burden of organising and leading the defence of the kingdom in the face of repeated foreign invasions. We have to agree with Paranavitana when he says: 'Whatever the qualities for which this monarch deserves our esteem, capacity as a leader in warfare was not one of them and he was not cast in the same heroic mould as his predecessors whose

¹The Cūlavamsa refers to his death in the thirty fifth year, LXXXIX, 71; the Pujāvaliya passage quoted above states that the king was resident in Jambuddoni in his thirty fifth year enjoying the happiness of the success of his sons, 140. Some manuscripts of this text, however, end with the statement that Parākramabāhu entrusted the kingdom to his eldest son Vījayabāhu and that he ruled thirty two years: jyestha vū Vijayabāhu nam put raja haṭa rājyaya bhāra kota di tumū. detis. avuruddak rājyaya kalaha'. Puj., 140, note II. The Alutnavara Devalaya Karavima, however, mentions his death in the thirty second year, British Museum Library, manuscript No. Or. 6606(145).
achievements he desired to emulate'. ¹ It is evident that he was not made of the fighting fibre which the realities of the times demanded, but we would be too harsh towards this monarch if his importance is allowed to diminish on that account.

Though he did not figure in the battle field, as for example Virabahu and Vijayabahu did when the occasion demanded, nevertheless it appears that Parakramabahu was a source of inspiration.² And one could see in this troubled time: a remarkable degree of unity and peace in the royal family. We have seen how the members of the royal family - each one of them went out to play their part in the defence strategy. We have indeed hardly any evidence that personal ambition or sectarian considerations deflected them from their cause. It is a remarkable feature, for it continued right through the reign of Parakramabahu of over three decades. Whatever be the limitations under which these rulers struggled there is reason to believe that the unity which prevailed in the royal family in some measure added to, rather than weakened, their position.

In this reign of repeated foreign invasions which caused so much confusion even natural calamities set in. We have seen that Parakramabahu himself was afflicted with an incurable disease from his twenty-second year onwards.³ There is also a reference to a famine which oc-

² *Gv.*, LXXXVIII, 29 ff.
³ *Sinh. Sā. Ipī*, 'Alutnuvara Dēvālaya Karavīma', 67; see above.
Now once upon a time when through the influence of evil planets, a great heat arose in Lāṅkā by which everything was burnt up, when the corn withered up and a famine was inevitable and the whole of the people dwelling in Lāṅkā were filled with the greatest anxiety, the king gave orders for a splendid festival to be held for the three sacred objects, for the cetiyas and the bodhi trees and for the protection of Metteya and other miracle-working deities who were to be venerated by various offerings and even to turn the whole of Lāṅkā into one great festival.  

We are told that famine was warded off by the recitation of Paritta and by paying homage to the Tooth Relic, a practice which survives to this day as a means of overcoming natural calamities.  

The date of this famine is not recorded, but it is referred to in the chapter dealing with 'The Handing over of the Burden of Dominion'. It is possible, therefore, that it took place about the time when Vijayabāhu was entrusted with the administration. However, this famine is not unique, for similar calamities occurred both before and after his reign. But such an unfortunate visitation at a time when these princes were committed to bitter struggle with foreign invaders is likely to have proved a considerable setback to their war efforts. It was amidst these difficulties that Parākramabāhu had to face powerful adventurers like Māgha and Candrabhānu, who successfully

---

1 Cv., LXXXVII, 1-4; Pjv., 128.

2 Cv., LXXXVII, 4-13.

3 For a tradition concerning a famine in the reign of Vatta Gāmanī Abhaya see Sammohavinodanī; for other famines see Mv., XXXVI, 74-79; Cv., XXXVII, 189-198; Xc, 43; Cv. Tr., II, 204, note 1.
carved out portions of northern territory for themselves, as well as the impact of the imperial power of the Pāṇḍyas, who were desirous of extending their influence into Ceylon. At the same time it was not easy to keep vanni kings under control, and there is sufficient indication that they in fact proved refractory.¹ One has to take into account these difficulties in order to understand the magnitude of the problems Parākramabāhu was faced with.

We have shown that towards the end of his reign Parākramabāhu succeeded in extending his control into Rājaraṭṭha, and that was at the end of a bitter and protracted struggle. Similarly this 'victory' was symbolised in his consecration which he held in the old capital of Polonnaruva. But these attempts do not seem to have led to a permanent occupation or a lasting reclamation of Rājaraṭṭha. The treatment meted out to the vanni kings in Rājaraṭṭha suggests that for all practical purposes, they were independent chiefs, but for a possible nominal acknowledgment of the supremacy of the Dambadeni kings. We are told that when they came to show their respects to Vijayabāhu in the city of Anurādhapura, bringing with them presents to the king Vijayabāhu also presented them with 'rocking chairs, fly-whisks, and other insignia for the great kings of the vanni people' and entrusted them

¹Pjv., 136; Parākramabāhu VI is also stated to have defeated the vanni kings, Girāsandēsaya, verse 140. See also Pūrakumbā-Sirita, verse 28.
with the protection of the city of Anurādhapura. The Pujāvaliya states that Vijayabāhu returned to these vanni kings their wives and children previously captured in war and retained as hostages. This shows that often force had to be used if these were to be kept under control, for they would not have tolerated any interference in their domains, by the Dambadeni kings.

After Parākramabāhu's death his son Vijayabāhu, who had already been in control of the administration for many years, succeeded to the throne and ruled from Jambuddoni for a brief two years at the end of which his reign came to a tragic end. His successor Bhuvanekebāhu I (1272-84) remained at Jambuddoni for a few years but later moved to Subhagiri where he set up his seat of authority. Among the latter's successors, Parākramabahu III (1287-93) reigned at Polonnaruva for a brief period, and after that this ancient city is never mentioned again in the Gūlavamsa and had evidently passed into oblivion.

1Cv., LXXXVIII, 87-89; Pjv., 136.

2Pihiti rajayehi mahavannin taman giyahiy asa bhaya ativa avut dānvū kalhi ovunta prasāda di pera noekvara yuddhayehi ovungen alva kastira kotagat ābudaruvanudu pāvā di ovun nuvara rakinā se ārakṣavehi niyukta kota esidu piya rajuṭa danvā yavā, Pjv., 136.

3Cv., XC, 1-3.

4Dal. S., 45; Cv., XC, 34-35.

5Cv., XC, 48-58.
Even in Rohana there is no clear indication that his authority was effectively exercised. Among the numerous religious foundations established by Parakramabahu or among the vihāras and shrines repaired, no reference is made to any such activity in Rohana. The only time Rohana is mentioned is when its vanni chiefs are said to have come with provisions for alms, for the Upasampada festival held at Sahassatittha. In all probability, the control of Rohana remained in the hands of these vanni chiefs, who acknowledged nominally at least the supremacy of the Dambadeni kings. Annual gifts to Dambadeni kings and their assistance in important functions such as the Upasampada ceremony referred to above possibly amounted to an acknowledgment of that supremacy.

There is no doubt that Parakramabahu had a fair control over Mayarattha. During his reign the minister Devapatiraja, yuvaraja Bhuvanekabahu and his son Vijayabahu carried out numerous activities, as stated earlier, in southern, south western and central Ceylon. The Pali Chronicles and Sinhalese literary works give a fairly detailed account of these activities. It is reasonable to conclude that Parakramabahu's authority was effective in these regions. This is confirmed by a few inscriptions datable in his reign. The Devundara inscription of this monarch, which lays down rules for the elimination of abuses in the administration of the port there, is located on the coast.

1Piv., 139; Cv., LXXXIX, 51-53.
2Cv., LXXXV-LXXXVIII; Piv., 122-36.
in the extreme south of Ceylon. It refers to his defeat of the Tamils and goes on to state that he was the ruler of the whole island implied in his title, Trisimhalādhiśvara (Lord of the three Simhalas viz., Ruhunu, Māya and Pihitā). Another inscription of a Parakramabāhu dated in his 30th regnal year, styled Sirisaṅgabo Prākramabāhu Cakravarti Syāmīnvahanse is found at the Galapāta Vihāra, situated at a distance of two miles from the Bentota Rest House, in the Valallāviti Kūrāla in the Southern Province. The location is thus very close to the south coast, half way between Colombo and Galle. Paranavitana has argued that the inscription should be attributed to Parakramabāhu I, as against the earlier views held by Muller and Bell, who had assigned to Parakramabāhu II. The real difficulty in determining the ruler who figures in this record, as pointed out by Paranavitana, is that paleographic considerations can be of little assistance, for the time separating the reigns of these two rulers is too small to lead to noticeable paleographic developments to be reflected in the records of the period. Similarly the titles of the king mentioned in it can well be applied to both these monarchs. There is no criterion by which the ruler can be identified beyond doubt with either Parakramabāhu I or II. However, on the arguments given by Paranavitana, though by no means conclusive, this inscription may be tentatively attributed to Parakramabāhu.


\[Ep. \text{ Zeyl.}, IV, No. 25, 196-211; \text{ For the views of Muller and Bell see, Ancient Inscriptions of Ceylon, No. 165; No. 165; J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., July, 1914, pp. lxix-lxxvii.}\]

\[Ep. \text{ Zeyl.}, IV, 205-11.\]
As for its contents, it records the foundation of the Galapāta Vihāra by a dignitary named Mindal (Mahendra) who held the office of Demela adhikāra and was in charge of the administration of the Pasyodun (Pañceyojana) District. He had the royal assent for the construction of this vihāra, in which he had the co-operation of his mother and certain other relatives. The record gives a long list of lands and serfs granted to the vihāra and ends with the signatures of the donors and the witnesses. This record adds, however, very little information to our knowledge of the political events of the period with which we have been chiefly concerned, though it is certainly a valuable source of information for a study of the social conditions, especially the institution of slavery in relation to its prevalence in the Buddhist monasteries of medieval Ceylon.¹

Another inscription of Parākramabahu II has come to light from Nāranbudda, a village situated at a distance of two miles from the Raṃbukkana Railway Station, in the Deyāladahamuna Pattuva, Kinigoḍa Kūrale of the Kāgalla District.² It refers to Parākramabāhu's defeat of 'the Damilas who came to destroy the Māyā kingdom', the recovery of the Tooth Relic and the Alms Bowl, and the protection given to these relics and the Samgha. Further, it records the construction of the Sela vihāra (i.e. Rock Monastery) which was named after him as Parākramabāhu Pirivāna, to which certain lands were granted. The record

²H.C.P.Bell, Rep. Kg. Dt., (1892), 77-78.
is undated, but there cannot be any doubt that it belongs to Parākramabahu II. Bell comments on this record: 'The allusion to the Tamil invasion, and the recovery of the Relics, together with the style and character in which the inscription is written justifies its ascription to Parākramabahu III'. Bell means Parākramabahu II evidently, and the third ruler of that name is mentioned by a printer's error. This scholar is right in identifying the pirivena mentioned therein with that built by Parākramabahu as stated in the Cūlavamsa: 'Thereupon the king erected a parivena that was called by his name Parakkamabahu, adorned with lofty pāsādas granted the vihāra diverse objects of use suited to it as well as rich maintenance villages and celebrated a great sacrificial festival'.

One more inscription belonging to the reign of Parākramabahu II has come to light from Tuttirivela in Yapahu. The record refers to the twenty-ninth year of Sirisaṅgabo Parākramabahu. It records a grant of land (to a vihāra?) by the two brothers Vijayabahu and Bhuvanekabahu. The identification of these royal personages present no difficulty. The king in whose regnal year the record is dated is Parākramabahu II and Vijayabahu and Bhuvanekabahu who are referred to as 'brothers' (debāyan)

1Bell, Rep. Kg. Dt., 77. Svastiśrīnavarat /nādhi/ pativū Parakramabahu svēmi māyārajaya nasanta a Demalun (parāja kota) daladā pātradhātun-vahanse da mahāsammghayavahan /se/(va) da rūka.

2Cv., LXXXV, 57-58.

are his two sons who bore those names. We know that Bhuvanekabahu
was stationed at Yapahu to safeguard the defence of the kingdom against
any invasion from the North, and therefore the discovery of this record
in its vicinity is not surprising.\footnote{1}

Bell refers to an inscription from the village of Bēruvala, in
the Beligal Kōrale of the Kāgalla District, which mentions a king named
Parākramabahu.\footnote{2} The text of this inscription remains unpublished, but
Bell has assigned it to Parākramabahu I or Parākramabahu II. We may
also take into account the construction of the Devālaya at Alutnuvara
in the Galboda Kōralē of the Kāgalla District, referred to in the docu-
ment known as the Alutnuvara Devālaya Karāvīma already cited.\footnote{3}

Joseph Pearson refers to a copper plate, dated in the year 1809
of the Buddhist era, which records a grant of land by king Parākramabahu
of Daṃbadeniya.\footnote{4} At the time this plate came to the notice of the
Archaeological Survey of Ceylon it was in the possession of the chief
thera of the Rajamaha Vihāra at Vihāragama in the Daṃbadeni Hatpattu.
Pearson doubts the authenticity of this record: 'It professes to be a
grant of Parākramabahu II of Daṃbadeniya and is dated in the year 1809
of the Buddhist era, but the script and the language in which the document

\footnote{1} Cey., LXXXVIII, 23-26.
\footnote{2} A.S.C.A.R., 1911-12, see list of inscriptions on p. 122, No. 256.
\footnote{3} A part of this work is published by Sir D. B. Jayatilaka in his
Simhala Sāhitya Lipi, 67-68. A complete manuscript is available at
the British Museum Library, Or. 6606 (145), 12 leaves.
The provenance and the contents of the inscriptions considered above, taken along with the accounts of Parākramabāhu's activities as given in the Sinhalese and Pali sources would lead to the inference that his authority was effective in Māyāraṭṭha. The Čulavamsa and other Chronicles would have us believe that Parākramabāhu II unified the three kingdoms and brought them under his dominion. So does the Devundara Inscription which refers to him as Trisimhalādhīśvara. These claims, however, cannot be taken seriously. The diminishing sphere of royal authority did not prevent the eulogists from attributing to their patrons much more greatness than their achievements warranted. The high-sounding epithets with which Parākramabāhu IV (1302–1326) is referred to by the author of the Daladāsirita may serve as a fine example:

'Sūryavamsaāvatamsa Lāṅkāganāvallabha navarāṭna- dhīpati, Trisimhalādhīśvara, bhujagapatiḥbhogabhu, ranadharanisahasrabhu, pararājarhubhu, ājānulambhu, anavaratadānadharardrabhu, dhanadānapahā- sabhu, tribhuvanaikabhu, sriḷābhavanabhu, ratnatreśamucitabhu, viṣvāmbharāsambaranodya- tabhu, dharālatavatirgasantānabhu, nikhilajanasaṅkṛta parināmabhu, parākramabhu, Śrī Parākrama nam īti, rājādhirājaparamesvara, rājakulakauṣṭhubharaṇa, rāja- kulaćintāratna, rājakulaśekhara rājakulakalpaṇa vu rājacandrakenek Śri Lāṅkādvīpaya eksat kāru...

1 ASCAR., 1931, page 6.
2 Cv., LXXXVII, 24–25; Dravida Keralā Yāvakādi viyavul sanhiṇduvā sakala Ĉalamātalaya hastagatakoṭa, Dambadēni Katikavata, see Ktk. Sng., 8, Nks., 88.
3 Dal. S., 47.
These epithets or the eulogistic tone in which the kings are referred to in some of these works can be little more than the poetic fancy on the part of the eulogists, and can hardly be taken as a reflection of actual political power. In fact with the dwindling of royal authority to a limited sphere, such eulogistic claims became even more commonplace in the writings of this period. This difficulty is also found in the accounts of Parākramabāhu II. But there is sufficient reason to believe that his authority was effective in Māyāraṭṭha. We have already shown that his authority was possibly less effective in Rohaṇa.

The 'conquest' of Rājaraṭṭha does not appear to have resulted in a permanent annexation or occupation. After the defeat of Candra-bhānu, Parākramabāhu succeeded no doubt in extending his control into this traditional seat of Sinhalese royal authority, but it appears to have lasted for a brief period only. Indeed Paranavitana has shown after a critical examination of the Sinhalese, Tamil and Pali sources that the Tamil Kingdom in the north of Ceylon originated in this period. Of Polonnaruva and Anuradhapura nothing is recorded in the Chronicles in the later period. Several centuries later, however, with the revival of Buddhism under Kīrttisrī Rajasimha, we are told that this monarch visited the sacred shrines and made offerings to them. This was no more than a pilgrimage to the desolate shrines on the part of

The last time Polonnaruva is mentioned in the Cūlavamsa is in its account of Parākramabāhu III (1287-93). The ancient royal cities of Rājarāṭha with all their Buddhist monuments as well as the network of irrigation works, which embody the achievements of the Sinhalese civilisation over the centuries, finally gave way before the progressive advance of the jungle tide.

In these circumstances the claims of Parākramabāhu II to have effected the unification of the country have to be taken with the necessary reservations. This will, no doubt, bring us to a grasp of the limited success he achieved compared with the achievements of his illustrious predecessors such as Vijayabāhu I or Parākramabāhu I in the political field. But as we have already shown one has to bear in mind the particularly difficult circumstances under which he worked. Apart from the repeated invasions by foreign enemies he was also faced with natural calamities. On the other hand the neglect of the irrigation works in Rājarāṭha during the rule of foreign invaders, and the consequent decline in agricultural production on which was dependent a large part of the royal revenue, meant that he had to face these invaders when the state coffers had suffered considerably. Even if Parākramabāhu was not a warrior and lacked the warlike qualities which the times demanded, certainly his nephew Vīrabāhu and sons like Vijayabāhu made amends for it when they went out to battle each time the country

1 Cv., XCIX, 36-37.
2 Cv., XCI, 55-56.
was invaded, and displayed courage and determination in their efforts to rid the country of foreign rule. What is perhaps most important to note is that even though their success in the political sphere was necessarily limited, they waged a protracted struggle against these invaders, and were able to maintain their authority in at least a good part of the Island. In Māyāraṭṭha the people and the Samgha were thus given a degree of peace and protection certainly remarkable when viewed in the light of the stark realities of the troubled history of the island during this period. This spell of comparative peace was particularly welcome at this time and Buddhism recovered from the plight in which it had been. And arts and letters flourished in these parts of the island, benefiting from the peace and patronage given by the Dambadeni kings.

The foreign invasions and the consequent political confusion did not prevent the Dambadeni kings from extending their patronage to Buddhism. In spite of these adversities the kings took a keen interest in restoring the position of Buddhism, which had suffered heavily during the rule of foreign invaders. It is outside the scope of the present study to examine in detail the various activities undertaken in the field of religion and the notable results they produced, which were not confined to the religious sphere. It was undoubtedly a productive period in the field of literature and learning, testified to by the numerous works written by the writers who flourished in this period.¹

¹For an account of the writers and the literature of this period, Degammāda Sumanajoti Thera, Dambadeni Yugaya, 209-324.
We propose to note in brief some of the noteworthy developments in these spheres, reserving a detailed investigation for a future occasion.

We have already referred to the recall of the learned theras who had taken shelter in the countries of the Pandyas and the Colas during these adverse times. New vihāras were founded and the dilapidated shrines and residences were repaired in various parts of the country where their authority prevailed. The endowments of the vihāras, consisting of the villages, lands etc. seized by 'the alien foe' were restored to them. An attempt was made to eliminate the abuses which prevailed in the conduct of the Samgha, by the issue of edicts (kati-kāvatas) through the co-operation of the chief dignitaries of the Order. Apart from the attempts made by Vijayabāhu III in this direction, the Dambadeniya Katikāvata issued during the reign of Parākramabāhu II bears ample evidence of the steps taken by the latter. This katikāvata is a very valuable source of information for a study of the condition of the Samgha during this period. The leading theras of the two chief communities of monks at the time, namely the Grāmavāsi and the Vanavāsi, co-operated with the Dambadeni kings in their efforts to improve the discipline and unity in the Buddhist Order. This is confirmed by nearly all our principal sources. Similarly, the recovery of

---

1 Cv., LXXXIV, 3-4; for an account of the monasteries of this period see Dambadeniya Yugaya, 127-144.

2 The purification of the Samgha and the issue of this edict is stated in several principal sources: Pjv., 118; Cv., LXXI, 7-8; Nks., 88-89; Dal.S., 44-45; for the text of this edict see, Sir D.B. Jayalilaka, Katikavat Saṅgarē, 6-20.

3 Cv., LXXXI, 17 ff; Nks., 88-89; Ktk.Sng., 8-9; Dal.S., 43-45.

the Tooth Relic and the Alms Bowl was an important event—certainly in the eyes of the Buddhist people who held them in the highest veneration. These measures taken by the Dambadeni kings not only gave the Samgha an appreciable degree of relief after a period of hardships and suffering, but the peace thus given enabled its members to devote a good part of their time to the study of the Dhamma and to the writing of books devoted to its exposition. The result was a prolific literature, written both in Pali and Sinhalese and to lesser extent in Sanskrit. The quantitative output of literary works in this period is remarkable, and even from qualitative considerations quite a few of them, indeed, reached a high degree of artistic and literary excellence. The Samgha and some of the lay writers were thus enabled to continue the high literary traditions of the age of Parākramabāhu I, irrespective of, if not unhampered by, the political confusion which characterised this period.

It is clear from the Dambadeni Katikāvata that the attainments of the average monk in the doctrines was lamentably low, a factor which is also known from the Katikāvata issued in the reign of Parākramabāhu I. Similarly, Vijayabāhu III is stated to have lamented that 'on the island of Lankā that so many books that dealt with the true

---

1 On the Pali Literature of this period see Sugatadāsa Karunāratna, 'Dambadeni Samayē Pāli Sāhityaya', Sāhityaya, Dambadeni Kalāpaya, (1958), 97-108; on Sanskrit Literature, see Moratuve Sasanarata, 109-121.


doctrine had been destroyed by the alien foe' — a statement which is in agreement with the charge levelled against Māgha that 'many books known and famous they tore from their cord and strewed them hither and thither'. Vijayabāhu made an attempt to improve the position by taking measures calculated to promote the knowledge of the Dhamma in the Samgha. We are told that

'the Ruler called together laymen endowed with a good memory and with knowledge, pious, well instructed, free from indolence and skilled in quick and fair writing, and along with these many other writers of books and made all these write down in careful fashion the eighty four thousand divisions of the doctrine and made over to them in accordance with the number of divisions the like number of gold kahāpanas'.

Parākramabāhu II was also alive to this need and he appointed his brother Bhuvanekabāhu to look after the ecclesiastical affairs of the Samgha, and in particular to encourage and supervise the instruction of the bhikkhus in the doctrines. We are further informed that

'With the reflection that theras who were acquainted with the sacred texts were rare in the island, he had all books brought from Jambudīpa, had many bhikkhus instructed in the sacred texts as also in all sciences such as philosophy and grammar and the like and made of them cultivated people'.

---

1 Cv., LXXX, 67 and LXXXI, 41.
2 Cv., LXXXI, 41-45; Piv., 110.
3 Cv., LXXXIV, 29-31; Piv., 119; Nks., 89: tamange sahōdara mal vā Bhuvanekabāhu āpānan lavā bohō mahāna gaṇayāta asana tan kiyavī.
4 Cv., LXXXIV, 26-27; Piv., 119.
He also invited learned bhikkhus from the Colacountry.\(^1\) Such measures as the ones referred to above undoubtedly promoted learning and scholarship in the Order. As a result several Buddhist vihāras at the time, such as those/the Puṭabhuttasela, Vātagiri, and the Vijayasunderārāma in Jambuddoni became important centres of learning and productive intellectual activity.\(^2\)

In the first place, these efforts resulted in an active study of the Buddhist doctrine, by analysing and examining the works of previous authors. Commentaries and subcommentaries and glossaries came to be written in order to facilitate a better understanding of the sacred texts.\(^3\) The Visuddhimārga Mahā Sannaya, a Sinhalese translation of the Visuddhimagga, by Parākramabāhu II himself, is an illustration of the vigorous intellectual activity in this period.\(^4\)

This work is not a mere translation of the original text but provides comments and explanations which bear ample testimony to the author's profound knowledge of the developments in other schools of Buddhist thought than the one to which he subscribed. Scholars like Godakumbura and Sorata Thera have drawn attention to his keen awareness of the works

\(^{1}\) Cv., LXXXIV, 9-10.

\(^{2}\) On these vihāras and their learned incumbents see Dambadenī Yugaya, 127-44, 162-181.

\(^{3}\) For a survey of the Pali and Sinhalese Literary works, see Dambadenī Yugaya, 244 ff.

\(^{4}\) Ed. Bentara Śraddhā Tīṣya (Reprinted in 1955); For Dharmaratna edition see Bibliography.
of reputed Indian scholars. Well known works like the Saundarananda of Asvaghosa, Abhidharmakosa of Vasubandhu are cited, and many other authors are quoted, some of whose works are not extant now, often refuting their arguments to substantiate his standpoint on doctrinal questions. There cannot be any doubt about the wide learning of the author of this important work.

Apart from works of a philosophical nature several writers of this period brought out voluminous works of a popular nature extolling the virtues of the Buddha. The Pujavaliya (The History of Offerings), written by Mayurapāda therā, the Head of the Mayurapāda Pirivena is one of the best examples of this class of literature. The Saddharmaratanavaliya of Dharmasena, which is a Sinhalese translation of the Pali Dhammapadalakathā is assigned to this period. It is written in easy prose, and the author has taken liberties to draw heavily from the then current folk lore and similies and parables intelligible to the unerudite readers. And thus the translation is not restricted to a rendering into Sinhalese of the original work. The simple prose written for the easy comprehension of the readers is an important stage in the

---


development of the Sinhalese language, which gradually became a more pliable instrument in the hands of these writers, whose works were followed by the later writers. 'The Pujavaliya more than any other book of Sinhalese prose has been the model for Sinhalese writers during periods of literary revival'.

The Rasavāhini, which is a compilation of Buddhist stories of an earlier date by the Vedaha Thera, is a work composed in the Dambadenī period. 'Vedaha who was of a poetic temperament, and, therefore, loved beauty of diction, was not satisfied with such an inartistic presentation of these homely stories and he, therefore, proceeded to clothe them in a new garb. The result is the Rasavāhini, exquisite in its simplicity, charming in its naïveté, and delightful in its innocence.' The Samantakūta Vannanā also a Pali work of the same author, is a compilation of 800 verses, and claims to be a description of the peak on which the Buddha is said to have implanted his foot print. But the author has also described in it many incidents in the life of the Buddha as well as the scenic beauty of the hills, mountains and valleys of several parts of the island. The Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa to which we have already drawn attention, deals with the history of the Hatthavanagalla

1 Godakumbura, Sinh. Lit., 66; see Sāhityaya, Dambadenī Kalāpaya, comment on p. 6.
Vihāra; it is a Pali poem with a strong influence of Sanskrit displaying at the same time a fair degree of literary merit. It was composed at the request of Anomadassi Mahāsāmi, during the reign of Parākramabāhu II.¹ Buddhappiya’s Pajjama dhū was also written during this period. It is written in cultivated Pali and deals with the beauty of the person of the Buddha.²

The writers of this period did not confine themselves to the exposition and explanation of the doctrines of the Buddha. They also ventured into more mundane fields of knowledge such as grammar, prosody, medicine and astrology. As a matter of fact some of these branches of learning were considered unsuited to be pursued by the Buddhist monks. The Dambadeni Katikāvata lays down the injunction that 'One should not learn the despicable sciences such as poetry and drama. (One) should not teach (them) to others'.³ These injunctions did not deter the monk-authors from trying their hand in these 'despicable sciences', and some of them, indeed, made clever excuses for undertaking the writing of such works. For example the Mayurapāda Thera who was the author of two Sinhalese medical works, the Yogārṇavāya and the Prayōgaratā-nāvaliya, states in justification of writing these works that he com-

¹Ed. C. E. Godakumbura, P.T.S. (1956); See introduction; Pali Lit. Cey., op.cit., 218-19.
²Malalasekara, op.cit., 222.
posed these books dealing with the various methods of healing in order that people may be free from disease, facilitating thereby a healthy virtuous life so that they could attain Release. He has stated that disease was an impediment to the attainment of that objective.\(^1\) The Anomadassi Mahāsāmi who wrote in Sanskrit verses a book on astrology, the Daivajñakāmadhenu, however, had given no such pretext, but it is clearly a field not permissible to a Buddhist monk, included in the category of 'despicable sciences' (garhita vidyā).\(^2\)

This illustrates the divergent interests and the diversified nature of the pursuit of knowledge in this period, which often bypassed the boundaries set out for the conduct of the Buddhist monks, in cases where the latter were writers. Among the medical works of this period mention may also be made of the Pali Ehesajja mañjusā (Casket of Medicine) composed by the Pañcamūla Parivenādhīpati (Pasmula Mahāsāmi).\(^3\)

Grammar (viyākarana) was another important fruitful field to which the authors of the period devoted their energies. Grammatical works dealing with the grammar of both Pali and Sinhalese came to be written. Buddhappiya Thera wrote the Rūpasiddhi or Pada-rūpa Siddhi dealing with the etymology of the parts of speech in the Pali language,

\(^1\)See the opening passages in the Yogārṇava, ed. Kiriṅllē Ṇañavimala.

\(^2\)Ed. C. A. Silakkhanda Sthavira and Sītarāma Upādīyā (Benares, 1906).

\(^3\)Ed. Urugamuvē Candajoti (1924), see bibliography for DhammāvēnaThera's edition.
modelled on Kaccāyana but treating the subject in greater detail.¹ Payogasiddhi of Vanaratana Medhaṅkara, based on the Moggallāna system of grammar is another important work on the subject.² Equally important in the field of grammar is the Sidatsaṅgarāva written during the reign of Parākramabāhu II, which is to this day the only extant work on Sinhalese grammar. It has become an almost indispensable work for modern Sinhalese scholars who undertake the study of the Sinhalese language, pursued alike in the traditional seats of learning as well as the modern universities of Ceylon.³

If we subscribe to the general view held by a majority of Sinhalese scholars that the Kavsilumina is a work of Parākramabāhu II, as also the standard Sinhalese grammar still enjoying unrivalled authority, we have in this period the best example of a mahākāvya (epic poem) written in the Sinhalese language. The work amply illustrates the author's poetic gifts and profound learning—in addition to his mastery of the canons of Sanskrit poetics. Kavsilumina still enjoys a very high reputation among the Sinhalese literati.⁴ Parākramabāhu is also credited with the authorship of the Vanavinisa Sannaya a Sinhalese translation of the Vinaya Vinicchaya which is a treatise on the Discipline of

¹Ed. Dehigaspe Paññāsāra (Colombo, 1925); see also Malalasekara, Pali Lit. Cey., 220-21.
⁴Sorata Thera discusses its authorship in his introduction to his edition (cont.)
the Sangha. We have here referred only to a few of the literary works representative of the different fields in which the writers of the period gave expression to their learning. These would, however, suffice to illustrate the fact that the various measures adopted by the Dambadeni kings to promote learning and scholarship were not in vain. Apart from the quantitative output, which is remarkable, quite a few of them possess a high degree of literary and artistic merit. This is a noteworthy development in a period in which the country was repeatedly invaded by foreign rulers resulting in instability and confusion in the general situation in the country. The determined efforts which the Dambadeni kings made to rescue Buddhism from the great hardships to which it had been reduced in these troubled times, as well as the various measures they adopted to promote learning and scholarship, and the incessant struggle to which these rulers were committed to maintain the autonomy of their kingdom in the face of foreign invasions, have to be kept in mind, even though their achievements in the political sphere are less striking and appear to pale before the glowing achievements of the Age of Parakramabahu I, to which one may be naturally attracted in a study of the island’s history in a period of dwindling fortunes.

(cont.) of this text, (Wallampotiya, 1946), and assigns its authorship to Vijayabahu II; see Degammada Sumanajoti Thera, for a summary of other views on the subject; Sāhityaya, Dambadeni Kalāpaya, 68-73; Godakumbura, Sinh. Lit., 148-51.
Conclusion

The main aspect of the history of Ceylon during the Polonnaruva period from the death of Parākramabāhu I to the foundation of Daṁbadeviya as a royal residence by Vijayabāhu III is one of rapid disintegration, manifested both in the political and the economic fields, though more clearly in the former. This process reached a marked stage with the invasion and sack of Rājarattha by Māgha, who established himself as its ruler with his capital at Polonnaruva.

It may appear surprising that such a fate overtook the Sinhalese kingdom so soon after the death of Parākramabāhu, whose reign in some respects marks the culmination of the Sinhalese civilization. The causes usually suggested to explain its rapid decline, such as foreign invasions and the spread of Malaria appear to be of doubtful validity. Though Parākramabāhu cannot be held entirely responsible for these developments, it has emerged sufficiently clearly that his ambitious policies both at home and abroad had important repercussions on the fate which befell the Sinhalese kingdom after his death. Thus Māgha's attacks fell on a kingdom which was already weakened politically and possibly also economically and had lost much of its vigour and vitality. The oppressive rule he established only hastened its further decline.

The prevailing ideas about Māgha and his reign could be considerably modified in the light of our study. In the first place, it would
be difficult to dismiss Māgha as a mere adventurer who ruled Rājarattha for a time, as is often put forward. For, quite apart from other considerations, his rule over Rājarattha covered a period of about half a century. Secondly, the common belief that the entire reign of Māgha was one of unqualified oppression and cruelty had to be considerably modified. Such an accusation may apply mainly to the first part of his reign. It would be unfair to endorse the unqualified viewpoint of the Cūlavamsa, which has coloured the present image of Māgha, that he was nothing but a blood-thirsty tyrant. Thirdly, it is sufficiently clear that Māgha's policies were not dictated by political considerations alone, but that his persecution of Buddhism was motivated by tendencies suggestive of religious fanaticism. This aspect of his rule would be particularly significant as it is clearly contrary to the spirit of religious tolerance, which has marked the relations between the different Indian creeds and sects throughout the ages. Although we have pointed out the striking similarities in the tenets and attitudes of the Vīrāsaivas - a Śaivite sect with fanatical tendencies which rose to prominence in Southern India during this period - it has not been possible to establish his precise religious identity with the limited data at our disposal. Māgha was perhaps one of the notable exceptions to the spirit of religious tolerance known from certain parts of India during this period.

The present-day image of Parākramabāhu II is that of an erudite scholar whose name has been immortalised by the great Sinhalese poem
Kavsilumina, the authorship of which is ascribed to him, apart from two other notable works. To the literati of today his name is always associated with the title Kalikāla Sāhitya Sarvagña Pandita, which bears testimony to his learning. In addition to this image, which reflects on the personality of this monarch, the times in which he flourished are also best remembered as an age of prolific literary activity. It has emerged from our study that, while this memory of Parākramabāhu and his times is not unworthy of him, his long reign was one of momentous significance also in the political history of the island.

Māgha had already established himself as a ruler of Rājaraṭṭha many years before Parākramabāhu's accession to the throne. Apart from Māgha, Candrabhānu - a Jāvaka ruler from the kingdom of Tambralinga in the Malay Peninsula - invaded Ceylon twice during his reign. The accounts in the Pali Chronicle of these two Jāvaka invasions create the impression that they were merely sporadic incursions which were successfully repelled. It would emerge from our study that Candrabhānu had brought considerable areas of Rājaraṭṭha under his control and sought a career in Ceylon.

Equally important are the invasions of Ceylon by the Pāṇḍyas during the reign of Parākramabāhu II. By our examination of the Pāṇḍya inscriptions, particularly the Kuḍumiyamalai Prasasti of Vīra Pāṇḍya, whose expedition is recorded with considerable detail, it has emerged that this event led to active intervention in the affairs of Ceylon. These invasions are not mentioned in the Chronicles,
but they would have us believe that Parākramabāhu's fame had spread in foreign lands such as those of the Pāṇḍyas and the Colas. The historicity of the Pāṇḍya invasions referred to in these records is beyond doubt, though the account contains exaggerations. In the light of these data we are now able to modify further the picture of Parākramabāhu II and his times presented by the Ceylon Chronicles.

Though Parākramabāhu was by no means a warrior, and was certainly not made of the warlike calibre of Vijayabāhu I and Parākramabāhu I, he was called upon to defend his kingdom against these invaders at a critical stage of the island's history. There is no evidence that Parākramabāhu went out to battle in person, but certainly his sons and other members of the royal family committed themselves ardently and fought in defence of his kingdom. After a protracted struggle, Parākramabāhu succeeded in bringing parts of Rājarattha temporarily under his control so that he was able to hold his consecration in the former capital of Polonnaruva, to restore the Tooth Relic to its traditional shrine in the latter city, and to have the Upasampadā ceremony performed in the traditional site in Sahassatittha. Considerable restoration work was also undertaken in the ancient cities of Anurādhapura and Polonnaruva.

These activities did not, however, lead to the permanent occupation of Rājarattha. His effective authority appears to have been mainly confined to Māyārattha. In spite of his long and partly successful struggle with foreign invaders, the decline of Rājarattha, which had been the centre of the ancient Sinhalese civilization, could
not be arrested so as to yield lasting results.

Even if Parākramabāhu failed to reclaim Rājaraṭṭha and re-store its ancient splendour — a task to which indeed none of his successors was equal — he gave the people of Māyāraṭṭha an appreciable measure of comparative peace. An earnest attempt was made to rescue Buddhism from the plight to which it had been reduced. The patronage extended by Parākramabāhu and other members of the royal family led to the emergence of reputed centres of learning, the scholarship of whose learned inmates shed lustre on an age otherwise so marred by foreign invasions. These men of letters dedicated themselves to worthy pursuits of peace, undeterred as it were by the political upheavals of their times. The result was a large body of literature, which is remarkable not only on quantitative but also on qualitative considerations. In sculpture, painting and architecture hardly anything comparable with the grandeur of the monuments in Rājaraṭṭha has come to light. Thus, to those who are impressed by the great achievements of Parākramabāhu I the work of his namesake may offer little satisfaction. However, considering the times in which he flourished and the exacting demands made of him, it would do this ruler less than justice to under-estimate his contribution.

Another important point that has emerged from our study is that the rule of the Daṁbadeṇiya kings, the main feature of which has been usually taken to be its prolific literary activity, was never-
theless a period of great importance in the political history of Ceylon—a fact which has not been sufficiently recognized. Perhaps the fact Parākramabāhu was a great scholar-king has obscured the political significance of his reign. He lived in an age of momentous developments in the history of Ceylon. Parākramabāhu's brilliance as a scholar should not be allowed to obscure the political importance of his reign.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Literary Sources

Pali and Sanskrit

Bhesajjamañjusā  ed. Varadivela Dhammārāma Thera and Dumbara Dhammaddhaja Thera, Maradāna, 1934.


*Cūlavamsa  tr. Wilhelm Geiger, translated from the German into English by C. Mabel Rickmers, 2 pts., Colombo, 1953.

Daivagīnakāmadhenu

Dāthāvamsa  ed. C.S. Silakkhanda Thera and Sītārāma Upādhyāya, Benares, 1906.

Dāthāvamsa  with Sinhalese Paraphrase, ed. Ṛṣabha Tissa iscard, 1883.


*Mahāvamsa  English translation by Wilhelm Geiger assisted by M.H. Bode, reprinted Colombo, 1950; first published 1912.


Padasādhana Tīkā  ed. Śrī Dīrānananda and Vācissara, 1908.

Pajjamadhu  ed. Hakmana Sri Sanghatissā, Ambalumgoda, 1941.

Paramatthavinicchaya  ed. Devānanda Thera, Colombo, 1926.

Rāsparīṇī Vśākhyā

Rūpasiddhi

Sahasavatthuppakarana

Sīhalavatthuppakarana

Samantakutavannanā

Thūpavamsa

Upāsakajanālāṅkāra

Vṃsatthappakāsinī

Vinayavinicchaya

Vuttaodaya

Sinhalese


Dhātuvaṁsaya  ed. Giṃtoṭa Dhammakkhanda, Doḍandūva, 1889.

Eḷu Attaṇagaluvamsaya  (of Śaka year 1324) ed. P. Āriyaratna,
Colombo, 1932.


Kaṇḍavuru Sirita  ed. Sir D. B. Jayatilaka in his Simhala
Sahitya Lipi, pp. 63-66, reprinted Mahāragama,
1956.


Kāvyasekharaya  edited with paraphrase, Dharmakīrti Śrī
Dharmārāma, Colombo, 1915.

Kūkila Sandesaya  ed. Rāgigallē Paṁnā Tissa Thera, Colombo,
1945.

Katikāvat Sangara  ed. D. B. Jayatilaka, reprinted Kūlanīya 1955,
first published Colombo, 1922.


Nikāya Samgrahaya  English translation by C.M. Fernando, revised
ed. English translation by C.M. Fernando, revised
edition by Mudaliyar D.F. Gunavardhana,
Colombo, 1908.

Nikāya Samgrahaya  ed. Nāvullē Dhammānanda Thera and Devinuvara


Pūjāvaliya  Chapters 1-11, ed. D.E. Hetṭīracci and D.C. Disānāyaka, Colombo, 1936; chapters 12-16

Pūjāvaliya  Chapter xxxiv, ed. Mābōpiṭiyē Medhamkara,
Colombo, 1932.
ed. Baddēgama Kirtiśrī Dhammaratana, Mātarā, 1911.
ed. M. Dharumaratna, 8 pts, I–VI, Colombo, 1890–1926; pts. VII–VIII were continued by Vūboda Sangharatana Thēra, Hōmāgama, 1946, 1948.
Manuscripts

Alutnuvara देवलय दरवास, British Museum Library, Manuscript No. Or. 6606 (145).

Buddha राजवलिया, British Museum Library, Manuscript No. OR.5290 (13) A.C.

Dāthavamsa-kavi, British Museum Library, Manuscript No. Or.6606 (129).

Kurunāgala Vistaraya, British Museum Library, Manuscript No. Or.6607 (12).

II Archaeological Material

Ancient Inscriptions of Ceylon, E. Muller, London, 1883.

Annual Reports on South Indian Epigraphy, 1887-1945.

Archaeological Survey of Ceylon Annual Reports, 1890-1962.

Ceylon Journal of Science Section G - Archaeology, Ethnology etc., Colombo, 1928-33.


Inscriptions (texts) of the Pudukkottai State, Pudukkottai, 1929.


Recueil des Inscriptions des Siem, Bangkok, 1924-1929.


*The translations of passages quoted from the गुलावाम्स and the महावाम्स are from Geiger's translations, with occasional modiﬁcations indicated in foot notes.
Adikaram, E.W.  
The Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon, Colombo, 1953.

Aiyangar, S. Krishnasamy  
'Kalingadeśa', Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society, II (1911), 1-11.

Ariyapala, M.B.  
Society in Mediaeval Ceylon (The State of Society in Ceylon as depicted in the Saddharmaratnavaliya and other Literature of the Thirteenth Century), Colombo, 1956.

Arunachalam, Sir P.  

Banerji, R.E.  

Basham, A.L.  

---  

Bell, H.C.P.  
Report on the Kūgalla District of the Province of Sabaragamuwa, Colombo, 1892.

Bhandarkar, R.G.  
Vaisnavism Śaivism and minor religious systems, Strasbourg, 1913

Bode, M.H.  

Briggs, L.P.  

Brohier, R.L.  
Ancient Irrigation Works in Ceylon, 3 parts, Colombo, 1934-35.

Buddhadatta, A.P.  

---  
'Some Corrections to Geiger's Cūḷavamsa Translation', U.C.R., VIII (1950), 96-109, 161-160.

---  

---  

Cartman, Rev. James  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title and Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chatterjee, Bijan Raj</td>
<td>Indian Culture in Sumatra and Java, Calcutta, 1927.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelvanayakam, V.</td>
<td>'Dates of Cilappatikāram and Manimekhalai', U.C.R., VI (1948), 96-105.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceylon Coins and Currency, Colombo, 1924.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Gāvuta Pillars', C.J.S.G., II (1930), 129-34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coedès, G.</td>
<td>'Le royaume de Śrīvijaya', B.E.F.E.O., XVIII No. 6 (1918), 1-36.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coedès, G.  Recueil des Inscriptions du Siam, Bangkok, 1924-1929.

---


---

Histoire ancienne des états hindouisés d'Extrême-Orient, Hanoi, 1944.

---


---


---


---


Cunningham, Sir Alexander The Ancient Geography of India, edited by S. M. Sastri, Calcutta, 1924.


---


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ferrand, G.</td>
<td>'L'empire Sumatranis de Črīvijaya', <em>J.A.</em>, XX (1922), 1-104 and 161-246.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts of the Bombay Presidency from the Earliest Times to the Musalman Conquest of A.D.1318, Bombay, 1895.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'The Day on which the Buddha Died', <em>J.R.A.S.</em>, (1909), 1-34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'The Origin of the Buddhavāra, the Ceylonese Reckoning from the Death of the Buddha', <em>J.R.A.S.</em>, (1909), 323-56.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geiger, Wilhelm</td>
<td>The <em>Dīpavamsa</em> and the <em>Mahāvamsa</em> and their Historical Development in Ceylon, translated into English by Ethel M. Coomaraswamy, Colombo, 1908.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Culture of Ceylon in Mediaeval Times</em>, edited by Heinz Bechert, Wiesbaden, 1960.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Godakumbura, C.E.  
"Historical Writing in Sinhalese", Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon, (1961), 72-86.

---

Goloubew, Victor  

---

Gnanaprakasar, Father S.  
"Sources of the Yālpuṇa-vaipavamālai", C.A.L.R., VI, 135-41.

---

Grimes, A.  

---

Gunasekara, Mudaliyar B.  
A Contribution to the History of Ceylon, translated from the Pājāvaliya, Colombo, 1895.

---

Harvey, G.E.  
History of Burma, London, 1925.

---

Hettiäracci, D.E.  

---

Hirth, F. and Rockhill, W.W.  
Chau Ju-kua, His Work on the Chinese and Arab Trade in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries, entitled Chu-fan-chî, St. Petersburg, 1911.

---

Hocart, A.M.  

---


---

The Temple of the Tooth in Kandy, A.S.C.Mem. IV,

---

Howard, J.  

---

Hultzsch, E.  
"Materials for Calculating the Date of Sundara Pāṇḍya", Ind.Ant., XXI (1892), 121-22.

---


---

Jayatilaka, Sir D.B.  
Simhala Sāhitya Lipi, Second impression, Maharagama, 1956.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kanapathi Pillai, K.</td>
<td>'A Tamil Inscription from Pañcavasnuvāra', U.C.R., XVIII (1960), 157-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'An Examination of Mr. Codrington's Work on Ancient Land Tenure and Revenue in Ceylon', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXXIV No. 91 (1938) 199-219; see also 220-230.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le May, R.</td>
<td>A Concise History of Buddhist Art in Siam, Cambridge, 1938.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majumdar, R.C.</td>
<td>Ancient Indian Colonies in the Far East, I Champā; II Suvarnadvipa, 2 parts, i Political History, ii Cultural History, Lahore, 1927.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hindu Colonies in the Far East, Calcutta, 1944.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kambujadesa or an Ancient Indian Colony in Cambodia, Madras, 1944.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td><em>Ancient India as Described by Ptolemy</em>, edited by S. N. Majumdar, Calcutta, 1927.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muller, E.</td>
<td><em>Ancient Inscriptions of Ceylon</em>, London. 1883.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


"Śrīvijaya, Candrabhānu and Vīra Pāṇḍya",  T.B.G., LXXVII (1937), 251-68.


Nilakanta Sastri, K.A. *Foreign Notices of South India from Megasthenes to Ma Huan*, Madras, 1939.

---

'Sri Vijaya', *B.E.F.E.O.*, XL (1940), 239-313.

---


---


---


---


---


---


---

*A History of South India from Prehistoric Times to the Fall of Vijayanagar*, Madras, 1955.

---


---

'A Note on Vi Rasaiwism - its History and Doctrine', 18th All Ind. Or. Conf., Anamalainagar, 1958, 386-91.

---


---


Norman, M.C.

---

'A Defence of the Chronicles of the Southern Buddhists', *J.R.A.S.* (1908), 1-16.

---

Pandita, Vincent

---


---

Pannasara, Dehigaspe

---


---

Paranavitana, S.

---

Paranavitana, S.  


'The Capital of Ceylon during the Ninth and Tenth Centuries', C.J.S.G., II (1930), 141-47.


'Matrilineal Descent in the Sinhalese Royal Family', C.J.S.G., II (1933), 235-40.


'The Kāliṅga Dynasty of Ceylon', Journal of the Greater India Society, III (1936), 57-64.


The Shrine of Upulvan at Devundara, A.S.C.Mem.,VI, Colombo, 1953.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paranavitana, S.</td>
<td>God of Adam's Peak, Ascona, 1958.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Sahassavatthu athakathā or Sahassavatthuppakarana', U.C.R., II (1944), 86-91.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasanayagam Mudaliyar, C.</td>
<td>Ancient Jaffna, Madras, 1929.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray, H.C.</td>
<td>A Dynastic History of Northern India, 2 Vols., Calcutta, 1931, 1936.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhoads, Murphey</td>
<td>'The Ruin of Ancient Ceylon', J.A.S., XVI (1957), 181-200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sannasgala, Puncibandara</td>
<td>'Pujaivaliya', Sāhityaya (1958), Daṃbadeni Kalāpaya, 43-51.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Mātalē Kađaim Pota', Itihasaya, III (1962), 73-84.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Pujaivaliya dākvanā Lakdīva rājya pravṛtti', Sāhityaya (1958), No. 1, 67-73.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tennent, Sir J.E.  

Warnakulasuriya, W.M.A.  

Wheatley, Paul  

Wickramasinghe, Sirima  

Wickramasinghe, D.M. de Z.  

Wijesekara, N.D.  

Wickramasinghe, D.M. de Z.  

Wijesekara, O.H. de A.  

Wijesekara, O.H. de A.  

Wijesekara, O.H. de A.  
The People of Ceylon, Colombo, 1951.

Wijesekara, O.H. de A.  

Wimalakitti Thera, Mūdauyangoda  
'Sīlālekhana Samgrahaya,'  

Wolters, O.W.  