

Ceylon Literary Register

THIRD SERIES

VOL. III.

JULY, 1934.

No. 7.

The Last Treaty of Peace

BETWEEN THE KING OF KANDY AND THE PORTUGUESE
1633

FATHER S. G. PERERA, S.J.

THE following translations relating to the last treaty of Peace between the King of Kandy and the Portuguese, are made from photo-stats of the original documents¹ in the state archives of Goa. The first treaty² was made in August 1617, but hostilities broke out in August 1630, and the Captain-General Don Constantino de Sa de Noronha was betrayed, routed and slain³ at Vellavaya. The King of Kandy, however, did not gain any advantage by his triumph. The attempt to besiege Colombo failed.⁴ Biagama, Kaduwala and Malwana were recovered by the new Captain-General, Don Jorge de Almeida, and

1. The King's letters in *Pazes ee Tratados* No. ii, Acco 1715-1746, ff. 92-99; 107-109: Proceedings of Council in L. I de *Pazes*, Acco 1571 ff. 22-25 Cf. also *Biker Tratados* ii 39-45: Danvers, *Report on Portuguese Records* 134; *The Portuguese in India*, ii 245-6.

2. See Ante Vol ii 529-538; iii 155-166.

3. See 'The Expedition to Uva made in 1630 by Constantine de Sa de Noronha, Captain-General of Ceylon, as narrated by a soldier who took part in the Expedition, Translated by Fr. S. G. Perera, S. J.' Govt. Press, 1930.

4. "An Account of the Siege laid to Colombo by the King of Kandy, written by Affonso Dias da Lomba," Appendix to above.

in 1632 Mudaliyar Don Theodosio,¹ one of the chief conspirators that betrayed Sa, quarrelled with the Kandyan princes and returned to the Portuguese. Thereupon Senerat resolved² to make peace.

The Captain-General sent Don Jeronimo Taveyra da Cunha³ to Kandy as his Ambassador with orders to demand the recall of the Portuguese prisoners from the insalubrious Badulla as a preliminary⁴ to peace. This was done and the prisoners were even released on parole, the Ambassador undertaking⁵ to deliver up any that should try to escape. The negotiations for peace were not successful. On instructions from the Viceroy, Taveyra was directed to exact a heavier tribute than the one imposed by the peace of 1617. This Senerat refused to accept. He wanted a peace without tribute and even demanded the restoration of Baticaloa. The Viceroy after some demur was willing to be content with the tribute of 1617, namely two elephants, but Senerat was inexorable and the negotiations broke down. "The circumstances under which the peace (of 1617) was made which the Conde de Linhares calls dishonourable" Senerat said to the Ambassador "were quite different, for in those days I wished to bring up my sons without being surprised into dragging them into the woods. Now they are men, who can sleep with spear in hand. If, when you came, you had wished to make peace with me in the manner in which I desired to make it, the Portuguese would now be in possession of the lands, the prisoners in their homes, you honoured and I content in this Court: but taking better counsel I do not think it good for me to go hunting elephants for the King of Portugal. You may go in peace. I will send my Ambassadors to Goa, and if the Count is not pleased to dispense us from that tribute, the forests of Candea are large and my rock is not a little secure"⁶

Two Sinhalese Ambassadors were accordingly sent to Goa along with three of the most prominent Portuguese prisoners. The king's letters, draft of article, and memorial are dated 4th and 5th December,

1. Kattota Rala who had been a soldier under Mudaliyars Don Fernando Samarakoon and Don Constantino and finally under the Captain-General Sa who made him Mudaliyar and Dissawa of Matara. See Abbe l'Grand. *Hist. de l'isle de Ceylan*.

2. Queyroz *Conquista* 792-795. For a summary of the events see *A History of Ceylon for Schools* ss. 257-262.

3. Captain, Queyroz 560, 578, 584, 592.

4. The Exped. to Uva 72.

5. *Ib.* 78.

6. Queyroz, 790, The Exped. to Uva 72-3.

1632. The attempts of the Ambassadors and the intercession of the prisoners were frustrated by a party headed by the Secretary of State, Ambrosio de Freitas da Camera, who had been in Ceylon¹ and was an adversary of Sa. One of the Portuguese prisoners, the aged Domingos Carvalho Cao, pleaded the cause of the King of Kandy so warmly that he was even reprimanded by the Viceroy.² The Ambassadors were finally persuaded to consent to a tribute and to give up the fort of Baticaloa to the Portuguese. On 15th April 1633, accordingly, a meeting of the Council was summoned to conclude the treaty. The King's letters and memorial were read and the amended articles of treaty drawn up. When the Viceroy demanded from the Ambassadors their authority for accepting the terms repudiated by the King, they showed that they had come prepared for such an eventuality by producing a signet ring and a blank sheet signed with the royal sign manual and stamped with his seal. This was accepted as proof of their authority and the peace was sworn to and signed by the Viceroy, the Ambassadors and the members of the Council.

Senerat however repudiated the treaty the more readily as he saw that Mudaliyar Don Theodorio had been again arrested for treason and punished. But Diego de Mello de Castro who came as Captain-General marched against Kandy with a large army and met Senerat at Attapitiya where the peace was finally concluded as graphically described by an eye-witness in his Narrative: *The Expedition to Uva made in 1630*.

Treaty of Peace made with the King of Candea Maastane in the year 1633 by the Viceroy Dom Miguel de Noronha Conde de Linhares.

In the name of God Almighty

To all to whom this treaty of peace and perpetual friendship
(shall come)

Know ye that in the year of the birth of Our Lord Jesus Christ one thousand six hundred and thirty three, on the fifteenth day of April of the said year, in this city of Goa, in the Salla Real and fortalice in which the Viceroys reside, there being present the Excellent Lord Dom Miguel de Noronha Conde de Linhares, of the Council of His Majesty, his Gentleman of the Chamber and Captain-General of

1. As Comptroller of Revenue, Queyroz, 693, 770.
2. Queyroz 791.

India, and the Ambassadors of the said King of Candea, Jaisundra Modeliar of the Council of the said King and Disawa of Urunore¹ and Curoparrala² and Don Diogo interpreter of the said Ambassadors, and the Secretary of State Ambrosio de Freitas de Camara, as well as the most reverend the Bishop of Hyerapolis Dom Joao da Rocha of the Council of His Majesty, Dom Francisco de Moura also of the Council of the said Lord and Captain of this City, Goncalo Pinto da Fonseca Chancellor of State, Joseph Pinto Pereira Comptroller General of Revenue and Lourenco de Mello Deca ;

There was read in the presence of all the letter of credit which the said Ambassadors brought from their King along with the articles of peace which the said King asked from His Majesty for ever ; for the purpose of deciding and swearing to the peace between this state and the said King of Candea Maastane³ : and the tenor of the said letter and articles of peace are as follows :

Letter of the King of Candea about peace entered
in the Book of Moncoes folio 22 and written
in the year of 1632.

The process of my negotiations for the peace with His Majesty which I greatly desire shall be as follows, and my Ambassadors before Your Excellency will serve to caution against any contrary information that may have reached your Excellency.

Although this be the first acquaintance between Your Excellency and me, I am quite sure that Your Excellency will not deny me all the favour that circumstances allow, and hereby Your Excellency can well understand that you have in me one who will not fail in gratitude, and if in this realm of Your Excellency there be anything in which I can show it [gratitude] Your Excellency may dispose of all things as all things are Your Excellency's, and of my person also in the same quality of friend that I am who desire nothing more than that Your Excellency should be the same to me. Have no misgiving about my fidelity not only in disposing of any matter as if it were your own but also in favouring and supporting them as your own.

1. Udunuwara.

2. Kuruppu Rala.

3. Maha Astana " His Majesty," title, not a personal name. The person meant is Rajasinha, youngest son of Senerat and Dona Catherina.

May our Lord protect the person and state of Your Excellency.
From Candea, the 5th of December, 1632.

Domingos Carvalho Cao,¹ Miguel de Fonseca² and Gaspar da Costa³ I send to your Excellency. They are my procurators, and let Your Excellency be pleased to hear them and help them not as coming from me but as persons who treat of the public weal.

As Ambassador there came to this kingdom Jeronimo Taveyra da Cunha, a person of goodly parts and understanding, but as the resolution of my Council did not permit of any other course than that which was decided, it was through no fault of his that the final settlement of this peace was not concluded, which I hope will be concluded by means of Your Excellency, and will be perpetual in these realms.

SRI

Articles of the peace which the King of Candea offers
to His Majesty for ever, the conditions
of which are as follows:

1^o Firstly that the kingdom of Candea is divided⁴ among the three kings, sons⁵ of the Queen Dona Catharina lawful heir of these realms of Candea whose heirs they are: and they already have the lands distributed to them by the king their father which they willingly accepted.⁶ And as the kingdom of Candea is the chief of these realms⁷ and king Maastana remains their chief, and His Majesty and his Captains-general shall likewise be obliged to favour and help the said kings, and they will have the same obligation in all matters of the service of His Majesty that occur in this island.

2^o The King of Candia says also that he will be the friend of the friends of His Majesty and enemy of his enemies: that all merchants who wish to pass to the said kingdom may do so freely if there is no manner of deception in their coming and commerce.

1. Dissawa of Matara, captured at Vellavaya. He was 80 years old at this time and died at Goa, Queyroz 791.

2. Sergeant-Major of the Field, taken captive at Vellavaya. The Exped. 28.

3. Cassado of Colombo (The Exped. 89) and Captain in Sa's army, captured at Vellavaya 71.

4. This partition took place about 1628 before the rout of Sa as implied by Rajasinha in his letter of 9 Sept. 1636, addressed to the Dutch (JC BRAS xviii 169.)

5. Kumarasinha, Vijayapala and Rajasinha.

6. The manner of the division is described in the Mahavansa c 95, the ruse adopted by Senerat to give Candy to his youngest son is described by Knox *Historical Relation* 33.

7. Kumarasinha was made Prince of Uva, Vijayapala of Matale.

3^o The King of Candia says moreover that any person that comes to his said kingdom on account of a criminal charge shall not be demanded, nor is he obliged to deliver him, but that if the said person desires to go away he will not impede him: And that the safe conduct given by either party shall be respected and that the same shall be observed with all persons of his kingdom that shall go to the lands of His Majesty.

4^o The King says moreover that every slave that comes from the lowlands shall not be obliged to be delivered, but the person into whose hands he shall fall shall pay for him at the price that obtains in Columbo, and should otherwise be restored to his master, and should the said slave not fall into the hands of anyone the said King will be obliged to deliver him. And the same will be observed with the slaves that come from the lands of Candia to the lowlands.

5^o He says moreover that every thief, freeman, or slave, shall be delivered with the thefts that he has made, by the one party as well as by the other if the theft is manifest.

6^o He says also that no Captain-General shall be able to break this peace towards the said King of Candia without first giving an account to the Viceroy and to His Majesty of the reasons he has for doing so, and that he shall send to the Lord Viceroy or to His Majesty the complaints that shall be made by the said King in his defence.

7^o He says also that in the port of Baticaloa and in the other ports belonging to the realms of Candia the said king will have his duties and customs as those ports always paid him and that his vessels shall sail with the *cartazes*¹ of the said King and the armadas of His Majesty shall give them all the favour and assistance that may be necessary.

8^o He says also that seeing that a fortalice is being built in his port of Baticaloa deceitfully in time of peace it shall be removed.

9^o He says also that he cannot give elephants seeing that these realms never paid them at any time, as is but reasonable and just.

10^o He says that in this city of Candia there shall be a Religious of St. Francis with a church for the administration of sacraments to the Christians that are there, and that he will give liberty in his

1. Safe-conducts.

kingdom to all persons who freely wish for it to receive the faith except to slaves because of the inconveniences that might arise between their owners and the Fathers.

11^o He says also that the demarcations made in the preceding peace¹ shall in no way be changed; the which are Quanhiâbalana limit of Panava and Valave, limit of Vellevava Andaolutota, limit of Cosgama Verahunahela, limit of Bulatgama Bocarabevila,² limit of Urupalata³ Ambuluava,⁴ limit of Urunuara Canugahahinna, of Jatinuara, Balane, of Tumpanha Muangammona⁵ Galabava,⁶ of Harcipatto Bocavala,⁷ of Asgueras Dehigashinna⁸ of Urugora⁹ Millavalcara¹⁰ of Nuaracalavia: These are the limits of the boundaries.

12^o The King of Candia says also that if peace is made in this way he will deliver up all the Captains and other Portuguese prisoners with their arms whom he has retained by right of arms and has treated so far with such good treatment as they will declare being vassals of His Majesty of whose greatness I hope all that is asked for herein will be granted.

SRI.

Seal of the King.

(*To be continued.*)

1. See ante p. 164.
2. Bokara Bevila, pass between Uda Bulatgama and Atulugam Korale. See D'Oyly's Diary, 179.
3. Udalpata.
4. Ambuluwa Kadawata, about which see Lawrie *Gaz.* 43.
5. Mudagammana in Teldenipalata (?).
6. Galabawa in Naranwenipalata (Udalpata) of Tumpane.
7. Bokkavala Kadawata.
8. Dehigashinna was a kadawata.—Unambuwe Disaralahamy Huluwadana Nilame Disawa of Matale described himself as Chief of the gravets of "Dehigashinna and Millawane" Lawrie *Gaz.* 270.
9. Udugoda.
10. Millawane. See n. 8 above.

Trustworthiness of the Mahavamsa

BY

WILHELM GEIGER, PH.D.

(Continued from p. 252)

We now come to that portion of the chronicle where in ch. 37, vv. 51-60 the history of seventy four kings is described beginning with Sirimeghavaṇṇa who ascended the throne about 362 A.D., and ending with Vijayabāhu I, who died 1194 A.D. It therefore covers seven and a half centuries. The chs. 61, 62, 63 containing accounts of the reigns of Jayabāhu, Vikkamabāhu and Gajabāhu make for the transition to the history of Parakkamabāhu I.

I do not hesitate to call just those chs. 37 to 60 perhaps the best and most reliable parts of the whole Mahāvamsa. Its statements are so often confirmed by external testimonies even in details, that, according to my conviction, doubts about its general trustworthiness are not justified. This does not mean, of course, that we must abstain from all historical criticism. But if, for instance, the same events are related in the chronicle and in a contemporary inscription, we may take this as a sufficient corroboration of the former account.

Thus we learn from the Mahāvamsa that king Vijayabāhu I conquered the Coḷas (58, 59), fetched bhikkus from Rāmañña (59, 4), erected a beautiful and costly temple for the tooth relic (60, 16), distributed alms three times to the poor of a weight equal to that of his body (60, 21), and took care to improve trade-route from the province of Uva to the sacred Sumanakūṭa, the Adam's peak (60, 64ff.). Now we read in the Ambagamuva inscription of king Vijayabāhu that he drove away wholly the darkness of Tamil forces and brought the whole island of Lankā under one canopy and the same inscription tells us of numerous works performed by him for the furtherance of the worship of the Adam's peak.¹ The other particulars mentioned above, are

1. Wickremasinghe, Epigraphia Zeylanica, II, pp. 202ff, 216, 217.

confirmed by a Tamil inscription in Polonnaruwa.¹ There we are told that Vijayabāhu invited priests from Aramaṇa, that he, through his senāpati Deva, had the temple of the tooth-relic built at Vijayarāja-pura, and that he bestowed thrice his own weight upon the three Nikāyas, I may add that in the Tamil inscription a reign of fifty-five years is attributed to the king in full accordance with the Mahāvamsa (60, 71).

In a similar manner the restoration of the Maricavattī-vihāra at Anurādhapura, done by Kassapa V (908-918 A.D.), according to the Mahāv. 52, 45, is confirmed by the slab inscription of the king found in his capital.² There is also in this inscription (lines 3-4) the interesting notice that the king was the son of Sena II and his queen, Sanghā, immediately after his birth received the consecration of *Yuvarāja*,³ and the prince is called *de-bisevā-jā*, the son of the twice-anointed queen.⁴ In the Mahāvamsa (51, 12) we read that Sena II consecrated his son *uparāja* in the most solemn form already on the day of name-giving,⁵ and in 52, 11 and 37 Kassapa has the surname *dvayābhiseka (sam) Jāta*.

The tenth century was a stirring time in Ceylon. The chronicler (52, 70 ff.) speaks of an expedition to Southern India which was undertaken by Kassapa V (908-918) in order to support the Pāṇḍu king against his Coḷa rival. But a disease broke out in the army and Kassapa was compelled to bring his troops back. The campaign therefore ended without success. To these events South Indian inscriptions allude as

1. The so-called Velaikkāra-inscriptions, written about thirty or forty years after the king's death. The Velaikkāra, p. Velakkāra were a group of Dravidian soldiers or a military clan and accompanied king Rajendra Cola I to Ceylon. Then they served the Sinhalese kings as mercenaries who had especially taken over the guarding of the tooth relic, Wickremasinghe, II, p.242ff.; Cūlav., I, p. 257, n.5. The Velakkāra are first mentioned in the chronicle just at Vijayabāhu's time (60, 36).

2. Wickremasinghe, Epigraphia Zeylanica, I, pp.41ff, 51.

3. Sinh. *Yuvarāj bisev siri pāmānā*—Pali: *Yuvarājābhisekasirim pāpunitvā*

4. Wickremasingha, Ep.Zeyl. I, p.46, 50.

5. There is a slight difference between the two accounts. The inscription speaks of a consecration as *Yuvarāja*, the chronicle of that as *uparāja*. In this case, I believe the latter is even more correct than the former. For the *yuvarāja*, as far as I can see, is never consecrated. One becomes *yuvarāja* in virtue of the right of succession or is appointed to that position, if the king has no brother or son as legal successor. See Cūlav. trans., I, Intro. pp. xix f. But the *abhiseka* of an *uparaja* is often mentioned in the Mahāvamsa. The conferring of this title upon a member of the royal family, often upon the *yuvarāja* himself, was apparently a matter of the king's pleasure. At the time of Kassapa's youth the younger brother of Sena II, Mahinda, was *yuvarāja* in accordance with the Sinhalese law (51, 13).

Hultzsch has shown.¹ The Coḷa king Parāntaka I, (907-947) actually boasts in the Udayēndiram plates of having defeated the Pāṇḍya king and of having routed an army of the king of Ceylon.

During the reign of Dappula V (918-930), a Pāṇḍya king came to Ceylon to ask for Dappula's help against the Coḷas. Since the assistance was refused he betook himself to the Keraḷa country, *leaving his diadem in Ceylon* (Mahāv. 53, 5ff.). Under king Udaya II (942-950) a Coḷa king sent his army to Ceylon to fetch the Pāṇḍya crown (Mahāv. 53, 40ff.). But although the Coḷas were victorious in battle and conquered the northern provinces, Udaya succeeded in escaping to Rohaṇa with the crown and other treasures. The victorious Coḷa king was no doubt again Parāntaka I (907-947), mentioned above, for he calls himself in his latest inscriptions conqueror of Īlam i.e. Ceylon.²

In A.D. 981 the weak king Mahinda V ascended the throne of Ceylon. Since he was unable to pay them, the Keraḷa and other mercenaries rebelled. Mahinda fled to Rohaṇa, but in Northern Ceylon the mercenaries carried on a military dictatorship. The Coḷa king, turning the confusion in Ceylon to his own advantage, sent troops to the island (Mahāv. 55, 14 ff.). The Coḷas advanced on Rohaṇa, captured the king and queen alive and brought them with all their treasures to India. This took place in the 36th year of Mahinda's reign, i.e. A.D. 1017.

The victorious Coḷa king was Rājendra Coḷa I, for he boasts in the Tirumalai rock inscription³ of having seized the crown of the king of Īlam (on) the tempestuous ocean; the exceedingly fine crowns of the queen of that (king); the beautiful crown and the necklace of Indra, *which the king of the South* (i.e. the Pāṇḍya) *had previously deposited with that* (king of Īlam); the whole Īla-maṇḍala (on) the transparent sea. Thus by this inscription even that single statement in the Mahāv. 53, 9 *thapetvā makuṭādīni* "leaving behind the crown and so forth" is confirmed.

Rājendra Coḷa's predecessor, king Rājarāja I (985-1011) had also made war against the Sinhalese. The conquest of Ceylon is mentioned in an inscription of the twentieth year of his reign, i.e. A.D. 1005. It seems that he, like Parāntaka, tried to capture the Pāṇḍya crown. But we know that the Sinhalese rulers guarded the regalia, the

1. J.R.A.S., 1913, pp. 525f.

2. *Epigraphia Indica*, VII, Appendix, p. 115, nos. 691, 692, Hultzsch, I. I.

3. *Epigraphia Indica*, IX, pp. 229, 233. Hultzsch, I. I., pp. 522 f.

rājasādhana, with utmost care, and they were apparently so carefully hidden in those disturbed times that even the great conqueror could not seize them. There is no account of Rājarāja's reign in the Mahāvamsa, it only relates the later events, the final catastrophe.

Already in the second half of the ninth century king Sena II (846-880), according to Mahāv. 51, 27 ff., undertook a campaign against the Pāṇḍyas which ended with the capture and the plundering of their capital Madhurā, and indeed his son Dappula V speaks of the victory obtained by his father over the Pāṇḍyas.¹ In a similar manner king Udaya II's (880-891) struggles in Rohaṇa and Malaya (Mahāv. 51, 94ff.) are proved as historical by an inscription of his brother Kassapa IV.²

Parākkamabāhu I's immediate successor Gajabāhu (Mahav. 62, 19ff.) is, strange to say, not mentioned in most of the Sinhalese books on history. But in the Devanagara inscription³ Parakkama expressly says that he has brought under his dominion after having captured two rivals, the first of whom is called Gajabāhu; then follows a *lacuna* of about 7 or 8 akkharas which Bell has no doubt rightly supplied by Mānābharāṇa.

Finally I may refer to a number of names of monasteries and of persons, mentioned in the Mahāvamsa—some of them only once—and occurring also in inscriptions. The Kassapagirivihāra (44, 98; 48, 24) and the Macchatittha (48, 24) are called Kasubgiri and Mastoṭa in the slab inscriptions of Mahinda IV on the Mihintale hill (Ep. Zeyl.; I, pp. 216, 221, 227). Maṇḍalagiri (46, 29 etc.) or Maṇḍaligiri (71, 3) may be identified with the Mādiligiri in an inscription discovered at that place (Ep. Zeyl., II, p. 28); Virankurārāma (50, 68) with the Virāṅkurā in a Vessagiri inscription (Ep. Zeyl., I, p. 23); Sangasena (50, 70) with the Sangsenārāma in an inscription of Kassapa V. (Ep. Zeyl., II, p. 51), and Kūṭatissa (51, 74) with the Kuṭutisa-rad-mahavehera in a Polonnaruva inscription (Ep. Zeyl., II, p. 50). From Mahāv. 39, 11 we learn that Kassapa I enlarged the Issarasamaṇārāma and that he gave the new vihāra the names of his two daughters Bodhi and Uppalavaṇṇā and of his own. In an inscription of Mahinda IV in Vessagiri we really find the name Isurameṇu-Bo-Upulvan-Kasubgiri-vihāra (Ep. Zeyl., I, p. 31).

1. Atavīragollāva pillar inscription, Wickremasinghe, Ep. Zeyl., II, p. 44, 48.
2. Ep. Zeyl., I, pp. 200, 204.
3. H.C.P. Bell, Report on the Kegalla District, p. 75.

Nālā, the wife of prince Udaya, the brother of Sena I, is mentioned in Mahāv. 50, 9 and in the Mahakalatteva inscription.¹ There also occurs the name of king Kassapa IV's chief scribe Sena who is mentioned in Mahāv. 52, 33. Kuṭṭhaka, the senāpati of Sena II (51, 88) is called senavirad Kutthā in two inscriptions.² The name of Vajiragga, general of Udaya II (51, 105 etc.) also occurs in inscriptions in various forms (Ep.Zeyl., I, p. 193). There is a slight difference between the chronicle (5, 49) and the inscriptions (Ep.Zeyl., II, pp. 184ff. 194ff.) concerning the name of Vikkamabāhu II's queen Sunāri or Sundarī.

I need not say so much about the third part of the chronicle. Chs. 80 and 81, dealing with the history of Parākkamabāhu II's predecessors, and again Ch. 90 dealing with that of his successors, have the same character as the portion composed by Dhammakitti. They are based on the same or similar documents.

Of king Sāhsamalla's³ coronation the exact date is given in an inscription. According to Fleet's calculation it took place on Wednesday, 23rd August, 1200, and this is the first absolutely certain date in the history of Ceylon.

The two queens Kalyāṇavatī, daughter of Nissaṅkamalla, and Lilāvati, daughter of Parākkamabāhu I, are mentioned in inscriptions (Ep.Zeyl., II, 94, III, 190; I, 176ff., II, 192ff.). The names of the latter and of her general Parakkama (Mahāv. 80, 50, 52) occur in the introductory stanza of the Dāṭṭhāvamsa⁴ which was composed by Dhammakitti at the general's suggestion.

There is some difficulty concerning king Kittinissanka or Nissankamalla (1187-1196). No Sinhalese ruler has left so many inscriptions as he, but in the Mahāvamsa the account of his reign is finished in 9 verses (80, 18-26). There is, however, hardly a fundamental discrepancy between the chronicle and the inscriptions. In the former, several of the meritorious works mentioned in the latter, are enumerated; as for instance, the adornment of the Jambukola-vihāra now Dambul, his liberality towards the Church, and his pilgrimage to the Adam's peak. Others, like his campaigns against the Coḷas and

1. Ed.Müller, Ancient Inscriptions in Ceylon, no. 110.

2. Wickremasinghe, Ep. Zeyl., I, pp. 164 and 175.

3. Mahāv., 80, 32. See the note in my transl. Cūlav. II, p. 130, n. 1.

4. Cf. Rhys Davids' edition in the Journ. Pali Text Soc. 1884, p. 109.

other peoples of Southern India, are passed over in silence. There is no doubt that Nissanka was an eminent ruler, but he also was a proud man and the founder of a new Kaliṅga dynasty in Ceylon. The bombastic style of his inscriptions probably had the object of increasing its prestige. The account of the chronicle is in this case, I think, nearer to truth than that of the inscriptions.

Virabāhu, Nissanka's son, and Vikrambāhu, his younger brother (80, 27, 28), are mentioned in inscriptions (Ep. Zeyl., II, 111, 92). The decline caused by the usurper Māgha (80, 58ff.) also appears to be true history although external testimonies are lacking. The rule of Vijayabāhu III (81, 10ff.) represents the national reaction against the tyranny of the foreigner.

The Pāṇḍu king Kulasekhara mentioned in 90, 47 as a contemporary of Bhuvanekabāhu I (1272-1283) is no doubt the Pāṇḍya Kulasekharadeva I (1268-1308), *alias* Māravarman, who has left several Tamil inscriptions in Southern India.¹ In one of them the name of his general Āriyacakkvattin (Mahāv. 90, 44) also occurs.²

The remaining chapters (82-88) however have a different appearance. They are dedicated to the favourite hero of the compiler of this part of the Cūlavamsa, Parākkamabāhu II (1225-1269). They resemble more a panegyric than a chronicle. The author intends to draw the picture of an ideal king. Parakkama is chiefly described as the devoted protector of the Buddhist Order who worships the sacred tooth relic and celebrates great sacrificial festivals in its honour.

The description of the miracle performed by the relic (82, 41ff.) is clearly the imitation of a similar passage in the old Mahāvamsa (31, 96ff.) and that of all the meritorious works done by himself or suggested by the king reminds us of a similar description in the latest portion of the chronicle.

There may be an historical kernel in some of the narratives even in this part of the Cūlavamsa, e.g. in chapter 83 entitled subjugation of the hostile kings. But Parākkamabāhu's victory is no doubt much exaggerated. We have seen above that he certainly never succeeded in governing over the whole island. The invasion of the Jāvakas, related in 83, 36ff. can also be taken as an historical fact, and it is also credible that the king made his son Vijayabāhu co-regent (88, 1ff.), as

1. See *Epigraphia Indica*, VII, Appendix, pp. 146ff., nos. 911, 919, 920, 921.

2. See Codrington, *Short History of Ceylon*, p. 80.

coregency repeatedly occurs in the last centuries of the Sinhalese kingdom. Vijayabāhu's name and that of his brother Bhuvanekabāhu (87, 16) occur in a Yāpahu inscription.¹

From the end of ch. 90, in its fourth and last part (II, 3), the Cūlavamsa gradually loses its value as an historical source. The introductory portion (ch 90, v. 105ff, and chs. :91-93) has a rather fragmentary character. It extends over the time from A.D. 1333 to A.D. 1593, comprising the history of the kings Bhuvanekabāhu III to Rājasīha I. About the most eminent persons like Alagakkonāra (91, 3ff.), or Māyādhanu, the chronicler has little to say. King Dharmapāla is not even mentioned. From the Cūlavamsa alone we hardly get a right idea of the disunion at that time of the Sinhalese kingdom; the chronicler pays regard to the Kandy court only.

A very remarkable episode in the history of Ceylon the knowledge of which we owe to Chinese sources is entirely passed over in the chronicle.² King Vijayabāhu VI, a scion of the family of Alagakkonāra, was taken prisoner to China in A.D. 1409, and there was an interregnum of about six years in Ceylon. That we have a gap here in the chronicle clearly appears from the words introducing the history of the next king Parākkamabāhu VI: *tato aparabhāgasmim* then at a later time (91, 15). The heroic figure of Rājasīha I does not also stand forth so prominently as it deserves. In this case the reason is that the king renounced the Buddhist faith, went over to Hīnduism and even persecuted the bhikkus.

It is noticeable that just the most important event within the whole period, the arrival on the Island of the Portuguese (A.D. 1505 or 1506) is nowhere related. The Parañgi are first mentioned a century later under king Senāratna (95, 4ff.) who was compelled by them to leave Kandy and to bring the tooth relic to a safe place. The chronicle alludes here to de Azavedo's expedition against the Sinhalese capital A.D. 1611.

In chapter 96 we also hear of the victories gained over the Portuguese by Rājasīha II and of his negotiations with the Olandas. The most valuable part of the latest Cūlavamsa is however the passage 99, 108-139 dealing with the military events of the year 1765 which

1. H.C.P. Bell, Arch. Survey Reports Ceylon, 1911-12, p.63.

2. See my transl. of Cūlav. II, note to 91, 14 (p.214, n.2); Codrington, I. I, p. 85f. 89.

were so disastrous for the Dutch troops. But in all these passages we never find any information which is more accurate or more detailed than what we learn from Portuguese or Dutch records. We only see with a mixture of amazement and compassion how Sinhalese eyes looked at those events which initiated the break down of their old and glorious kingdom.

We hear of victories only and successful battles whilst in reality the Sinhalese power was rapidly declining. All failures or internal frictions and calamities are suppressed. The standpoint of the chronicle is one-sided to the utmost. It was the fiction in the Dutch period that the Olandas were servants of the Kandy king and entrusted by him with the protection of the coast of Lankā (96, 32; 100, 63). In diplomacy the foreigners were no doubt superior to the Sinhalese and perhaps also in recklessness and sometimes even in cruelty.

We fully understand that Tibbotuvave Sumangala paid much more attention to clerical affairs than to foreign politics. Therefore those passages which deal with the *messsages sent to Burma and Siam*¹ by the kings Vimaladhammasuriya I and II by Vijayarājasīha and Kittisirirājasīha to fetch bhikkus from those countries and thus to renew the ecclesiastical life in Ceylon (94, 15ff., 92, 8ff., 98, 87ff., 100, 54ff.) are perhaps of some historical interest. Besides we hear in the last chapters of the chronicle, chiefly in chs. 99 and 100 which are verbose panegyrics on king Kittisirirājasīha, again and again of splendid feasts and processions ever described with the conventional phrases—of the open-handedness of the kings, of costly presents dedicated to the tooth-relic, of noble monuments and buildings erected here and there—all in sad contrast with the real conditions of the kingdom, so near at the time to its ruin.

To sum up the results of the inquiry: On the whole the Mahāvamsa is a trustworthy chronicle and the foremost document of Ceylonese history, though of course a sound and cautious criticism can never be dispensed with. The value of the chronicle is different in its different parts. The first few chapters of its oldest portion (I) contain a mixture of legends and historical truth. It is however not too difficult to separate the two elements from one another; the account of Devānam-

1. We hear of such clerical relations between Burma and Ceylon already in the Kalyani inscription of king Rāmadhipati of Pegu (1746 A.D.). Cf. Taw Sein Ko, *Indian Antiquary* xxii, 1893, p. 11, 29, 85, 150, 206, 236 (Major R C. Temple, *ib.* p. 279). The Sinhalese king who invited the theras from Burma to Ceylon is called in the inscription Bhuvanekabāhu (vi, 1473-1480 A.D.)

piyatissa's reign seems to be historical at least in the main features, and with Duṭṭhagāmaṇi's time we reach the firm ground of a trustworthy tradition.

The first part of the Cūlavamsa (II, 1) is probably the most reliable portion of the whole chronicle although allowances for some poetical licenses must be made in the description of the character and the deeds of Parākkamabāhu I. The second part (II, 2) is hardly inferior to the preceding portion but the exaggerations and embellishments in the account of Parākkamabāhu II's reign appear to have increased in comparison with the corresponding passages of II, 1.

The most recent portion of the Cūlavamsa (II, 3) is at the same time the most indifferent part. The narrative of the chronicle is incomplete and one-sided. The Portuguese and Dutch reports which now must be considered first also require criticism, but they are at any rate more ample and exhaustive. Nevertheless even these final chapters of the chronicle are not without interest, as they allow us an insight into the mental condition of the Sinhalese people in that tragic period of decline.

The British Monopoly of Cinnamon

BY

COLVIN R. de SILVA, B.A., Ph. D., BAR-AT-LAW.

(Contd. from p. 258)

The First Contract with the East India Company.

When Ceylon became a Crown Colony, some arrangement for the disposal of cinnamon was necessitated. Sales in Ceylon would be of very doubtful success, because of the provisions of the East India Company's Charter, which would give it a monopoly of purchase. Dundas therefore proposed that the Company should purchase 500,000 lbs. a year at 4s. per lb. for the European market. ¹ It was, however, demonstrated that the market would not bear the quantity which had been put on it during the last five years. The Company therefore contracted for the year 1802, to purchase from the Ceylon Government 400,000 lbs. of cinnamon of good quality at 3s. per lb. The cinnamon was to be delivered at Colombo, ready embalmed for shipping. All subsequent expenses were to be borne by the Company. Any excess of produce above 400,000 lbs. was to be destroyed or carefully preserved. Ceylon would thus receive £60,000 a year; which sum was to be paid in Bills on Madras. If, however, the Company made a profit of over 5% on its sales, all charges deducted, such excess profit was to be credited by it to the Ceylon Government. ² This contract was renewed in succeeding years till 1805. ³

But the Ceylon Government never fulfilled its part of the contract. North's cinnamon policy, the exhaustion of the plantations consequent on the too free cuttings during the East India Company's regime, the disorganisation of the Cinnamon Department as a result of North's tenurial policy, and the effects of the Kandyan war, all contributed to this failure. The East India Company had also appointed an Agent in Ceylon to attend to the embalming of the cinnamon, and to ensure that

1. C.O. 54. 36. Grant's paper on Cinnamon.

2. C.O. 54. 9. Memorandum of 8th July, 1802.

3. C.O. 54. 36. Grant's Paper on Cinnamon.

it was of proper quality. Maitland adds, as an aggravating cause, the too free rejection of cinnamon on his part.¹ The actual deliveries for this period were:—

	<i>lbs.</i>
1802.....	340,306½
1803.....	247,000
1804.....	247,715
1805.....	224,383½
	1,059,404

This amounts to a short delivery of over 33%. The East India Company, however, made no complaint. The Board of Revenue attributes this to the fact that the Company had a large stock in hand, that the quantity supplied was sufficient to satisfy existing consumption, and that the Company did not provide enough freight.²

In the course of four years sufficient time had been given to judge of the effects of the 1801 contract. In September, 1805, the Company represented to Castlereagh that the sum accruing from its sales over the period 1802—1805, far from giving a profit of even 5%, had scarcely reimbursed it for its expenses.³ Indeed, they pointed out in a subsequent letter, they had incurred an actual loss of £1,056 on the contract.⁴ The present agreement was demonstrably unfair. The Company incurred all risks of transport and sale, but could under no condition make a profit of more than 5%.

The Second Contract with the East India Company.

The Company therefore suggested a new agreement. Sales over the period 1802—1805 had averaged 429,000 lbs. a year. The Company offered to receive 430,000 lbs. for the year 1806 at 2s. 6d. per lb.⁵ Further negotiations led to an offer to receive either 480,000 lbs. a year at 2s. 6d., or 450,000 lbs. at 2s. 8d.⁶ Thus the Ceylon Treasury would be ensured, in either case, of £60,000 a year as formerly. The latter proposal was finally accepted.⁷ The agreement was to continue for three years, till 1809, but the Company was to take all profits, even as it assumed all risks.⁸

1. C.O. 54. 20. Maitland to Camden, 28th February, 1806.
2. Ibid. encl. Board of Revenue and Commerce to Maitland.
3. C.O. 54. 19. East India Company to Castlereagh, 12th September, 1805.
4. C.O. 54. 19. East India Company to Castlereagh, 23rd December, 1805.
5. C.O. 54. 19. East India Company to Castlereagh, 12th September, 1805.
6. C.O. 54. 19. East India Company to Castlereagh, 23rd December, 1805.
7. C.O. 54. 36. Grant's Paper on Cinnamon.
8. Ibid.

Maitland criticised this agreement as impossible of fulfilment. The assumption that Ceylon could produce 450,000 a year was incorrect, he averred, as it was based on the inaccurate data of North's sanguine statements. Throughout his governorship, he lamented this fact, and in spite of all exertions, he was indeed unable to fulfil the Government's part of the contract.¹

Maitland's opinion proved correct. Of a stipulated quantity of 1,800,000 lbs. he was able to supply only 1,566,865 lbs. for the years 1806-1809. The figures were:—

	<i>lbs.</i>
1806.....	385,455
1807.....	448,625
1808.....	371,110
1809.....	361,675
	<hr style="width: 100%;"/>
	1,566,865
	<hr style="width: 100%;"/>

In 1809, the East India Company pointed out these facts to Castlereagh² Maitland's arguments were stressed. The Company had, however, made a profit of £82, 686. 9. 10. on the contract for the years, 1806—1808.³ Prices had risen to 7s. 6d. per lb. and therefore a profit of at least £50,000 might be expected on the supply of 1809. Of this latter, 2,012 bales had already been received; 2,300 bales more had been shipped on the "Lady Jane Dundas."⁴ A new agreement was indicated, on terms more favourable to Ceylon. But Castlereagh overlooked the matter in the stress of other business, and the Company continued to receive Ceylon cinnamon till 1814 on the old footing.

The investments of the period 1810—1814 were as follows:—

	<i>lbs.</i>
1810.....	409,312½
1811.....	351,500
1812.....	370,000
1813.....	425,500
1814.....	274,262½
	<hr style="width: 100%;"/>
	1,810,575
	<hr style="width: 100%;"/>

1. C.O. 54. 20. Maitland to Camden, 28th February, 1806; C.O. 54. 27. Maitland to Castlereagh, 28th February, 1808; C.O. 54. 36. Maitland's Instructions to Johnstone, quoted in Grant's Paper on Cinnamon.

2. OP. cit. Grant's Paper.

3. C.O. 54. 36. Account of Profit and Loss on Cinnamon, November, 1809.

4. Ibid.

Thus, for the period 1806—1814, Ceylon was 652,560 lbs. in arrears. But, curiously enough, the Ceylon Government always credited itself with the full £60,000 which it would annually have received if it had fulfilled the contract.¹ The East India Company seems to have made no protest.

The Third Contract with the East India Company.

In 1814, however, Brownrigg and Bathurst renewed the subject of the contract. Brownrigg pointed out that since 1809 the Company had made huge profits in which the Ceylon Government ought to have shared, and would have shared if a new agreement had been made at that date.² In view of the improvement in prices, the Company offered to receive 450,000 lbs. per year at 4s. 6d. per lb. Further, it offered to pay the difference between 4s. 6d. and 2s. 8d. on the cinnamon received since 1809.³ This proposal was accepted by Bathurst after some hesitation.⁴ He contemplated a free trade in cinnamon in Ceylon.⁵ Moreover, private individuals seem to have offered better terms.⁶ But the advantages to Ceylon from an assured annual sum, the assurance of expanded credit with the Company's Government in India, and the retrospective nature of the terms offered, outweighed these considerations.⁷ Ceylon was thus assured of an income of £101,000 a year from cinnamon. Moreover, the Company paid £200,000 over and above what it had paid, in consideration of the high profits over the period 1809—1814.⁸ This sum was credited against the arrears which Ceylon owed the Company, because of having drawn the full amount of the contract though the stipulated quantity of cinnamon had never been supplied.⁹ The new contract was for seven years.

The improvement in prices was due to the Company having reverted to the Dutch marketing system of restricted sales at a high upset price. Indiscriminate sales, which had caused speculation and over-stocking, were stopped.

1. Bertolacci, 247.

2. C.O. 54. 46. Brownrigg to Bathurst, 4th March, 1813; C.O. 54. 51. Brownrigg to Bathurst, 28th February, 1814; C.O. 55. 63. Bathurst to Brownrigg, 10th May, 1815.

3. C.O. 54. 54. Court of Directors to Bathurst, 5th August, 1814.

4. C.O. 55. 63. Bathurst to Brownrigg, 10th May, 1815.

5. C.O. 55. 63. Bathurst to Brownrigg, 30th July 1814.

6. C.O. 55. 63. Bathurst to Brownrigg, 10th May, 1815.

7. Ibid.

8. Bertolacci 247.

9. Ibid.

Once again, however, Ceylon failed to fulfil her obligations. The figures for the period 1815—1821 were:—

	<i>lbs.</i>
1815.....	385,725
1816.....	393,217½
1817.....	466,570
1818.....	525,845
1819.....	323,102½
1820.....	376,660
1821.....	493,302½
	2,965,422

This was short delivery of 20,320 a year on the average. The reasons for this fact were, however, different from those of previous years. The shortage of 1815 was attributed to lack of labour due to sickness among the Chaliyas and to resting the preserved plantations.¹ The steady increase of the next three years was due to the occupation of the Kandyan Provinces, which placed this source entirely at the command of the British. In 1817 the plantations were rested. The 1818 investment came entirely from this source.² The defalcation of 1819 was also attributed to sickness and shortage of labour. The quantity needed had been cut, but could not be brought down in time from the Interior.³ In fact, the extensive policy of cultivation which had been followed hitherto, was now beginning to bear fruit; and with the free access to Kandyan supplies that was now gained the East India Company began to entertain a fear of over-stocking the market. Brownrigg had also established a valuable point. The East India Company was made to agree to accept over-delivery in some years to make up for short-delivery in others.⁴ But, with the opening of the Kandyan jungle for extensive cuttings the East India Company constantly complained of the quality of the cinnamon supplied. Much of it was represented as unmarketable.⁵ With the removal of its Agent, however, the Company lost all control over assortment.

1. C.O. 54. 51. Brownrigg to Bathurst, 28th February, 1815.
2. C.O. 54. 70. Brownrigg to Bathurst, 2nd February, 1818.
3. C.O. 54. 76. Brownrigg to Bathurst, 6th January, 1820.
4. C.O. 55. 63. Bathurst to Brownrigg, 30th November, 1819.
5. C.O. 54. 81. East India Company to Bathurst, 24th May, 1821.

The profit to the East India Company from this contract was £84,000 a year.¹ Nor did Ceylon benefit to the extent that was her due. On the renewal of the Company's Charter, in consequence of the financial agreement made between the Company and the British Government, Ceylon lost a sum of £145,000 which had been owing from the Company on account of this contract.²

The Controversy over the East India Company's Contract.

When the 1814 contract was verging to its close, negotiations were begun between the Company and Bathurst. The Company made alternative offers; either to receive any quantity up to 4,500 bales, at 4s. 6d. a lb. of standard quality, or to give the Ceylon Government a credit of ten lakhs of rupees a year, to provide ships to transport the cinnamon on Government account and to sell it on the usual percentage.³ It also offered to receive through the Indian Government all rejected cinnamon.⁴ Barnes, however, pointed out that this latter offer did not extend to the poor quality cinnamon which was the chief article of trade to the East.⁵

The Company was alarmed by the rapid increase of production.⁶ Also, they were perturbed by the large sales to the Eastward, the major portion of which they had good reason to suspect, was reaching the European market.⁷ The renewal of the contract, it said, depended on how far Ceylon would cultivate cinnamon. It wanted the quantity to be limited, in accordance with the Dutch and British tradition, to no more than 5,000 bales at the outside.⁸ Though it had received nearly 4,500 bales annually, sales had not exceeded 4,000 bales a year.⁹ Thus, the stock in the Company's warehouses was annually increasing. Though prices had risen to 12s. 3d. per lb. on the average in 1817/1818, they had since fallen steadily till they were only 7s. 6d. at the last sale in 1820, and 6s. 8d. at the latest sale in May, 1821.¹⁰ The actual cost of cinnamon to the Company was about 6s. 2¼d. per lb.¹¹

1. C.O. 54. 80. Barnes to Bathurst, 27th December, 1821.
2. C.O. 54. 97. Barnes to Bathurst, 22nd February, 1827.
3. C.O. 54. 81. East India Company to Bathurst, 24th May, 1821.
4. C.O. 54. 80. Barnes to Bathurst, 27th December, 1821.
5. Ibid.
6. C.O. 54. 81. East India Company to Bathurst, 3rd May, 1821.
7. C.O. 54. 81. East India Company to Bathurst, 24th May, 1821.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid. encl. H.
11. Ibid. encl. K.

At the same time, during the Dutch period—"little or no variation was found in its quality from year to year."¹ Broken cinnamon, etc. had been scrupulously withheld from the market and either distilled or burnt. Since the Kandyan Occupation, however, much bad cinnamon was being delivered. When rejected, this was sold to the Eastern market under bond. Though this was its presumable destination, a great portion of this cinnamon ultimately came on the European market, where it upset the legitimate course of the Company's quarterly sales.

The variation of quality was bringing Ceylon cinnamon into disrepute. "In former times," remarks a merchant, "great care was taken in sorting; nothing but the very best was put up as first quality, and bales the least defective were classed in second sort, from which again the inferior was separated and sold as thirds. But now because cinnamon is brought from Ceylon marked as first, which a Company formerly would have been ashamed to call second, the sorter here puts it up indiscriminately, and apparently without any regard whatever to the actual quality. Thus we have instance of third sort cinnamon intermixed in the first pile, first sort in the third, and all kinds under the name of seconds. Every sale for the last three years, and particularly lately, will illustrate the fact that often in the same lots there are bales varying in quality and value at least 2s. per lb. Good lots are rarely met with, and only come together by chance. This is what is called 'sorting the cinnamon.' It has therefore become necessary minutely to inspect every bale."

Bathurst and Barnes contended that there was no immediate fear of over-stocking the market.² Although some £4000 to £5000 a year was spent on improving the preserved plantations,³ the Ceylon Government had on the average made a considerable short delivery. Destruction was no doubt easy, but should an expansion of the market demand it, increase of supplies would naturally be, on the contrary, a slow and long process.

Barnes argued that the Company was too strongly under the influence of Dutch policy⁴—that of limiting the European supply under an impression that the market would bear only a certain limited

1. Ibid.

2. C.O. 54. 80. Barnes to Bathurst, 27th December, 1821.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

quantity. This opinion he characterized as "erroneous."¹ Cinnamon would be equally sought after whatever the price, and depreciation of price would not lower its value in the eyes of consumers. Rigging up prices only meant restriction of consumption. "I must be permitted to assume," he declared, "that cinnamon differs not from tea or coffee or wine in its marketable nature; that is, the lower the price, the greater the *number* of consumers."¹ An increased quantity should be brought to sale at a lower price, provided the total profit did not fall below that upon a smaller quantity at a higher price.²

Moreover, consumption should not be calculated only upon the quantity exported from Ceylon on behalf of the East India Company. On the one hand there was the rejected cinnamon which came on the European market. During the last seven years, 14,909 lbs. of such cinnamon had been imported every year to England alone by free traders. Howard later mentions considerable quantities of it as being imported to Bordeaux.³ On the other hand, over the same period, no less than 382,673 lbs. of Cassia lignea had been imported annually into Great Britain.⁴ Here, then, was a considerable market which might be captured for Ceylon cinnamon of inferior quality. Above all, the Company had made over £84,000 a year from the cinnamon contract over the last ten years. This might well go to Ceylon which would then receive at least £60,000 a year over and above the £101,000 it already made.

The argument was clinched by Bathurst's free trade proclivities.⁵ A free sale of the article in Ceylon would benefit the Island in several ways. Unhindered competition among traders would keep up prices. Ceylon could sell whatever quantity there was a demand for. The resorting of ships to Colombo for the cinnamon trade would bring other benefits in its train. Other articles would be brought in exchange, and Ceylon products would be exported along with the cinnamon to prevent ships being only partially loaded. Thus the export and import trade of Ceylon would gain a new impetus, and the Customs Revenue in particular, and other revenue in general, would be greatly increased.

1. Ibid.

2. Ibid.

3. C.O. 54. 99. Howard to Hill, 20th January, 1827.

4. C.O. 54. 80. Barnes to Bathurst, 27th December, 1821.

5. C.O. 54. 77. Barnes to Bathurst, 18th August, 1820; C.O. 55. 66. Bathurst to Barnes, 2nd November, 1820; Bathurst to Paget, 21st August, 1821.

The Open Trade Experiment.

It was therefore decided to let the contract lapse, to confine sales to Ceylon, and to throw the trade open.¹ The Government would manage its own sales. In March, 1822, the contract terminated.

A Government Advertisement² gave notice that after that date the cinnamon trade would be thrown open, and the export of the spice permitted duty free on any vessel, provided it was bought from the Government stores. Transferable certificates of this fact would be given on purchase. Unlicensed export was prohibited on pain of confiscation. The retail in the Island continued under the usual restrictions already enacted, as also penalties against sale or possession by unlicensed persons. The total quantity to be sold annually was 600 000 lbs. – this to include the third quality or rejected cinnamon not hitherto shipped to Europe. Sales would be at Colombo on the first Monday of each month, when about 50,000 lbs. graded into three sorts in bales of 100 lbs. each, would be offered. Payment was to be in Ceylon currency or specie at the current exchange.³

It was hoped to realize an average price of 5s. or 6s. per lb. for the three sorts.⁴ But Paget had determined to ship the first and second sorts to England if a proper price was not realized.⁵ It would there be sold by the Agent in London.

The 1822 experiment proved a complete failure

The East India Company, piqued at the non-renewal of the contract, refused to enter the market as a buyer. Ceylon merchants, who, it had been hoped, would be able to enter the market, were mere agents and could purchase little, as they lacked capital and credit. The resort of shipping from the various countries of Europe to Colombo fell far short of expectations. Agents were not appointed in Ceylon by any foreign merchants.

During the 2½ years over which the scheme was in operation, the total sales in Ceylon amounted to only 145,000 lbs., the average price being about 5s. 6d. In the very first year of the operation of the new system, 1823, Campbell had to order freight from Madras in which

1. C.O. 55. 66. Bathurst to Paget, 21st August, 1821.
2. C.O. 54. 82. Paget to Bathurst, 12th March, 1822.
3. Ibid. encl.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.

190,000 were shipped to England, ¹ there being no prospect of it finding purchasers in Ceylon. Of this quantity 100,000 lbs. were firsts, 50,000 lbs. seconds, and 40,000 lbs. thirds. A further 70,000 lbs. of firsts were shipped in December of the same year. ²

The first sale took place on 2nd December, 1822. ³ Only 18,500 lbs. were sold of the 50,000 lbs. offered. Prices averaged 6s. 10½d., which seemed to augur well. Campbell complained of a combination on the part of the English merchants in Ceylon in order to impose their own terms on Government; and of the change of system having been insufficiently advertised. ⁴ No further cinnamon found purchasers till the sale of 3rd March, 1823, ⁵ when 31,000 lbs. were sold at an average of 5s. 3½d. per lb. No more was sold till February, 1824, ⁶ when 55,000 lbs. were sold to a French vessel, and 40,000 lbs. to a House of Agency in Calcutta. Prices averaged only 3s. 5½d. per lb. Advices from London stated the prices to be falling, and that the East India Company's stock was still large. ⁷ There were no further sales effected in Ceylon.

It is to be feared that the safety value of the new system was one of the very causes of its undoing. So long as there was the possibility of getting cinnamon in London, buyers would not go the expense and risk of appointing agents and purchasing in Ceylon. Moreover, the East India Company's available stock was considerable. In May, 1821, it consisted of 486, 523 lbs. ⁸ to which must be added 493,302 lbs. imported in the same year under its contract with the Ceylon Government—or nearly a million pounds.

Moreover, a dual system of haphazard sales in Ceylon, and regular sales in London, proved disastrous. It encouraged speculation, created uncertainty, tended to over-stocking, produced violent fluctuations of supply and, consequently, unsteadiness of sales. Howard, a London merchant with extensive connections, who was entrusted with the sale

1. C.O. 54. 84. Campbell to Bathurst, 7th January, 1823, and 16th March, 1823.

2. C.O. 54. 84. Campbell to Bathurst, 31st December, 1823.

3. C.O. 54. 84. Campbell to Bathurst, 6th December, 1822.

4. Ibid.

5. C.O. 54. 84. Campbell to Bathurst, 16th March, 1823.

6. C.O. 54. 86. Barnes to Bathurst, 4th April, 1824.

7. Ibid.

8. C.O. 54. 81. East India Company to Bathurst, 24th May, 1821, encl. 1.

of the Ceylon cinnamon, made repeated complaints to the Treasury. Buyers were being discouraged by the constant fear that the arrival of new supplies on private account would depress the market and entail heavy losses to them. ¹

The New Marketing System.

In consequence of Howard's representations sales in Ceylon were finally and entirely stopped in June, 1825.² It is possible that the scheme had been given insufficient trial. For prices would naturally be low so long as the East India Company was in the market as a seller. When those stocks had been worked off, if sales had been confined to Ceylon alone, the scheme might ultimately have proved successful.

In disposing of the Ceylon cinnamon Howard copied the Dutch marketing system. The East India Company had sold about 400,000 lbs. a year at prices varying from 4s. 7d. to 16s. 3d. "And as the consumption of this article has been nowise affected by the difference in the prices, the inference may be fairly drawn that it requires only particular management to obtain for the produce something approaching the maximum prices exhibited by the East India Company's sales."³ The East India Company had varied its upset price. Howard aimed at raising it to 10s. per lb. and fixing it unvaryingly at that figure. He thus hoped to obtain a price of at least 12s. to 15s. per lb. For this "there is only wanting in my opinion, a proper management here, and a firm and uniform line of conduct on the part of the Ceylon Government in regard to some main points—namely

"To retain the entire control of it.

"To have recourse to the London market exclusively for its sale.

"To limit the production to a quantity rather under than above the estimated annual consumption of 404,000 lbs.

"It would be desirable also to have the bales marked with the red letters which have always hitherto indicated the different localities of growth, as these letters give a facility in assorting and arranging the different qualities for show and for the information of the buyers."⁴

1. cf. Howard's Reports to the Treasury in C.O. 54. 9D., particularly Howard to Harrison, 15th April, 1825.

2. C.O. 54. 89. Barnes to Bathurst, 1st August, 1825

3. C.O. 54. 85. Howard to Harrison, 29th October, 1823.

4. Ibid.

316 CEYLON LITERARY REGISTER.

Howard took care to grade the cinnamon carefully, and insisted that only good quality cinnamon should be forwarded to London. Though this point was not at first properly attended to, his repeated exhortations finally bore effect.

Over the period 1823—1832, the following quantities were exported to London:—

	<i>lbs.</i>
1823.....	180,485
1824.....	355,341
1825.....	235,947
1826.....	164,361
1827.....	826,311
1828.....	455,000 (?)
1829.....	452,300
1830.....	472,762
1831.....	459,200
1832.....	304,010

This was an average of about 455,000 lbs. a year.

Government sales in London commenced on 17th October, 1823.¹ At that period, the East India Company had a stock remaining of upwards of 6,500 bales.² Their quarterly sales, together with Howard's produced "the before unheard of situation."³ of eight cinnamon sales yearly—a circumstance of itself sufficient to depress the market, which was again further injured by several other intermediate sales brought on by individuals in consequence of Government sales in Ceylon.

From the 17th October, 1823, to 17th January, 1826, Government sold at its quarterly sales 6,688 bales. The Company sold over the comparable period, 6,584 bales, and private sales amounted to about 1,230 bales and a further 2,740 bales of low thirds belonging to Messrs Palmer & Co., of Calcutta.⁴ This works out at 1,724 bales a quarter, or 6,806 bales per annum. Howard was consequently compelled to reduce the quantity he put on the market. Nor could he stand out for the high prices he desired while the East India Company's sales governed the market. Prices averaged about 6s. 6d. and thirds could hardly find a sale.

1. C.O. 54. 99. Howard to Hill, 20th January, 1827.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

By 1827, the East India Company's stock was exhausted.¹ Prices, however, did not rise. Howard mentions the low state of credit, and the depression in the market for all kinds of colonial produce. But chiefly he attributes it to "the yet crippled state of trade in general, but more particularly from the very uncertain state of our present political relations with Spain, which is the principal consuming country in Europe for cinnamon, taking off generally about half the quantity usually sold here, and *still more particularly* from the unhappy disturbed condition of Spain itself, where trade is almost entirely at a stand. In consequence of this state of things, all confidence has been destroyed, or at least suspended between the importers at Bilboa and the other parts of that country, and the various merchants in the Interior to whom they have been in the habit of forwarding cinnamon for general consumption. Though actually wanted in the country, it had accumulated in the cut-ports of Spain, and hence the absence of orders which "...would otherwise have given life and vigour to the sale of yesterday."²

These unforeseen circumstances surmounted, prices rose steadily to an average of 10s. or so in 1830,³ but fell away again to about 8s. by 1833.⁴ The quantity sold annually by Howard had also increased to over 500,000 lbs. a year. The costs of transport, etc. which had been about 2s. 2d. to the East India Company were only about 10d. to Howard.⁵ He himself received 2% on sales.⁶

The nett income to Ceylon (deducting cost of transport to and all expenses in London, but not the expenses in Ceylon) was as follows:—

	£
1823.....	9,761
1824.....	51,260
1825.....	48,760
1826.....	42,400
1827.....	34,110
1828.....	51,070
1829.....	98,640
1830.....	95,041
1831.....	106,434
1832.....	147,549
1833.....	165,270

The expenses in England were about £17,000 a year.

(To be Continued.)

1. Ibid.
2. C.O. 54. 99. Howard to Hill, 16th January, 1827.
3. cf. Howard's Reports to Treasury in C.O. 54. 109.
4. C.O. 54. 128. Horton to Goderich, 20th May, 1833.
5. C.O. 54. 90. Howard to Harrison, 21st February, 1824.
6. Colebrooke's Report, 54.

Ancient Geography of Ceylon

BY

EUGENE BURNOUF

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH.

(Contd. from Vol. II p. 416)

The ancient Sinhalese traditions, as we have seen, throw much light on the two names *Tambraparnni* and *Sinhala*. These names go back to the origin of the nation established by the Indian colonists: they bear clear marks of Brahmin influence; in a word they belong to the Sanskrit language, that is to say to the sacred language of the conquerors. But though they were as strange to the aboriginal inhabitants as *Lanka*, they differ from it in that they originated with the Sinhalese people, that is to say the people of Indian origin who by conquest as well as by alliance took possession of Ceylon some centuries before our era. It was not the Brahmins who remained in India that gave these names to the colonies established in Ceylon. It is not at all sure, though Mannert affirms it, that they ever applied to Ceylon the name *Tamravarni*, which the Purānas give to a river that flows in the extremity of the peninsula. Hamilton is quoted by Vincent as having stated that he never found in any Sanskrit text a name even resembling Taprobane. It is the Sinhalese that applied to themselves and to their island the names *Sinhala* and *Tambraparni*, and for that reason these names must be regarded as national names. The first is however more popular than the second; it designates both the island and its inhabitants, while *Tambraparnni*, like *Lanka*, seems to have been used exclusively as a name for Ceylon. On the other hand the second name is of greater interest from the point of view of comparative geography, for as we shall presently see, it gives us the origin of the name by which this celebrated island was known to the Greeks. It is not easy to determine the relative priority of the names *Tambraparnni*, and *Sinhala*. That they are both ancient there is no room for doubt, but as one must submit to a critical examination the data of Sinhalese history regarding the year 543 before our era, the date assigned to the arrival of Vijaya,

one can not affirm that the names *Tambraparni* and *Sinhala* date exactly from the same period. Some avowals of the Sinhalese themselves permit us on the contrary to fix their origin to a century later, and on the other hand the testimony of the Greeks would lead us to consider the name *Tambraparnni* as anterior to *Sinhala*.

To complete the task we have undertaken we must now indicate briefly the fate of the diverse names of Ceylon which we have examined in the course of this Memoir. And first of all we must repeat the observation we made earlier about the number and variety of the names of Indian origin given in the Sinhalese texts, for it is not a little remarkable to notice under how many various names this island was known to Occidental nations.¹ From the beginning of the fourth century B. C. to the time of Ptolemy, there were three names altogether distinct one from the other. From the sixth century to our day there have been at least four new names, without counting the one which has become the distinctive name for the island among European nations and the greater part of the trading peoples of Asia. Names like *Tenarisim*, *Ilanare* and others which have no support from many or respectable authorities, do not deserve any long critical examination, and when we have said that they appear to be unknown in Ceylon and that no text which we can consult has any trace of them, we shall perhaps be excused from having to refer to them again. But we cannot do the same with the names which classical antiquity has preserved for us; and however difficult it may be to find them all in use among the Sinhalese, their importance demand that they should have a place in a study devoted to the names of Ceylon.

When Alexander's conquests in India opened to the Greeks a way to oriental Asia, Onesicritus and Megasthenes, according to Strabo and Pliny, came to hear of the island of Ceylon and they gave it in their accounts the name of *Taprobane*. This name thus appears along with the first positive knowledge which antiquity has handed down to us about Ceylon, and we are therefore warranted in regarding it as the first which the Greeks knew. Now this name of *Taprobane*, to which the rich productions of the island gave a great reputation, we trace to the Sanskrit and Sinhalese names of *Tamraparna* and *Tambraparnni*. This connection which I have already tried to establish elsewhere on the strength of a passage from a Siamese manuscript, seems to me to

1. The Commerce and Navigation of the Ancients in the Indian Ocean, ii, p. 493.

be now placed beyond all dispute by the texts which I have put together since and which I have used in the course of this Memoir. This opinion is confirmed by M de Bohlen and by an English critic who in the course of an article in the Edinburg Review, quoted by Bohlen put forward the conjecture that *Tambraparnni* was connected with *Taprobane*. It must however be remarked that this English writer, whose name I do not know, and who might well be Hamilton, only stated the fact without giving any proof, that *ambraparni* is found in Sinhalese writings as a name for Ceylon. The prolonged discussion which I was led to make of this subject has I hope removed any possible doubt of the assertion, and even the striking resemblance of the two names *Tambraparnni* and *Taprobane* shows their fundamental identity.

It can no longer be said with de Couto,¹ who had made vain efforts to find Taprobane in the geographical nomenclature of Ceylon or in the ancient traditions of the island, that this name has no meaning in the dialects of India and that it had been imposed by Ptolemy. Similarly we must abandon the explanations of *Taprobane* hitherto advanced: that of Bochart who found in it the two Hebrew words *Taph Porvan* "the gold coast"; that of Th. Hude, that *Taprobane* was compounded of the words *dib* 'island' and *Rohvan*, "the island of mount Rahoun" or Adam's Peak; that of Vossius who derived it from *Tranate*, which is applied to Ceylon by de Couto; that of Burrows, which Cordiner² repeated after him, that *Taprobane* comes from Tapobon for *Tapovana*, 'the forest of penance or prayer'; and that which Frederic Gunther Wahl refutes and that which he proposes when he sees in this name the words *là ore ouòn*, (*sic*) which scarcely sound Greek; and finally that of Duncan³ and Wilford, who see in *Taprobane* the two words *Tapa Ravana* "the island of Ravana." Even if the philological reasons I had advanced elsewhere against this explanation had not sufficed to prove how untenable it was, all discussion must yield to the undoubted fact that Sinhalese texts give to the island of Ceylon the name of *Tamraparna* or *Tambraparnni* which taken letter for letter is actually *Taprobane*.

1. Decadas V-i-7 "And it has given us no little trouble [Valentyn is not ashamed of deliberately lying, by taking over these words] trying to find whence this name of Tapobrana had its beginning and origin, which we have turned over in our mind many times: because in the whole island of Ceilao there is not a port, bay, city, town, promontory, spring, or river, that bears any resemblance to this name, neither in its chronicles, nor in those of the Canaras, nor in any language of India, has it any signification or is it understood, wherefore it seems to us that it is a Greek name given by Ptolemy, which was intended to signify some greatness or peculiarity of that island" Ferguson's Trans. JCBRAS xx 87-8.

2. Description of Ceylon i, 5.

3. Asiatic Researches V 39 in the 80 edit.

The second name which classical antiquity has preserved for us is *Palaisimoundou* or *Simoundu*. I call it the second because I have no hesitation in thinking with Dodwell and Dr. Vincent¹ that this name was known to the Greeks only after Taprobane. The author of 'Periplus of the Erythraean Sea' gives priority to *Taprobane* over *Palaisimoundou* when he states that the island of *Palaisimoundou* was known as *Taprobane* to the inhabitants in ancient times.² It would appear however that one ought to conclude from the text of Ptolemy as given by Agathemerus, by Marcian of Hereclea and by Stephanus Byzantius, that the most ancient of all the names of Ceylon is that of *Pala'simoundou* or *Simoundou* as it is generally read, taking *palai* as a Greek word. This was the conclusion of d'Anville as well as of M. Gossellin and of Mannert: and the last named even goes so far as to say that the name of *Taprobane* was not a national name used in Ceylon, but one which the Greeks learnt from the Indians; and that as that name was generally known and adopted Ptolemy had used it, stating, however, that it was formerly called *Palaisimoundou* and in his time *Salike*. We now know whence came the assertion on which Mannert based his argument, that the name Taprobane is not a national name in Ceylon. As for his argument itself we think it rather far-fetched to draw from it the conclusion that *Palaisimoundou* is anterior to *Taprobane*. What Ptolemy seems to have meant to state is that in his time *Salike* had replaced *Palaisimoundou*. He was there solely concerned with the comparative antiquity of the two latter names and if he asserts nothing about the age of the name *Taprobane* it is because he had no intention of examining the question.

Marcion of Heraelea does not say more about it in the passage in which he is only quoting the text of Ptolemy, and it is the same with

1. The Commerce and Navigation of the Ancients in the Indian Ocean ii, 494.

2. M. Gossellin gives this passage in the original text and makes the following observation: "The author of *Periplus* says that the island of Palaesimoundou was called Taprobane by the ancients; but he means undoubtedly the Greeks of the century preceding his". We cannot admit this conclusion. The Greek phrase used by the author of *Periplus* evidently means by 'ancients' those of Ceylon. Editors and translators of *Periplus* omitted *outon* and rendered the passage by *veteribus* which leaves the meaning undecided. The majority of geographers who interested themselves with Taprobane appear to have been content with taking this translation literally without consulting the original text, for how else could they have come to think that it was the ancient Greeks that were meant. It is by misunderstanding the formal testimony of this text that Mannert could say so positively that the name of Taprobane was not a national name in Ceylon. See Gossellin, *Rech. sur la Geogr. des anciens* iii 290; Mannert, *Geogr. der Griech und Rom.* v.

that of Stephanus Byzantius which is evidently taken from the same source. The only text which might be invoked in proof of the anteriority of *Palaisimoundou* over *Taprobane* is the first of the two passages in which Marcion speaks about an island of that name. The expression *tes te Taprobanes kaloumenes, tes Palaisimoundou legomenes proteron*, means undoubtedly that "the island named Taprobanes previously called Palaisimoundou." But if one compares this passage with that which the author uses in another place in his work, one is led to believe that it is only an abridgement of the text of Ptolemy, the common source of the various statements, and that Marcion was here but repeating the principal part of a passage which he quoted entirely elsewhere. The omission of the name *Salike* makes the question of anteriority lie between *Taprobane* and *Palaisimoundou* but I can scarcely believe that the intention of Marcion was to do so. Besides, even if it were so, and even if a comparison of the various texts of this author required us to conclude on the one hand that he lays down with Ptolemy that the name of *Palaisimoundou* was anterior to *Salike*, and on the other that he contends that *Palaisimoundou* was more ancient than *Taprobane*, thus placing the three names in the order, *Palaisimoundou*, *Taprobane*, *Salike*, the only conclusion would be that of all the authors who ever mentioned *Palaisimoundou* Marcion alone was of that opinion. But his opinion does not seem to me to deserve preference to that of Ptolemy, who makes no such statement.

In the preceding observations I employed the form *Palaisimoundou* in preference to *Simoundou*, though the maps of Taprobane made according to Ptolemy almost invariably give the second reading. It is because I can make no solid objection to the opinion of Saumaise, Dodwell, Mannert and M Gosselin, though the last named states it with some hesitation. A comparison of the texts of the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea of Marcion and Pliny with that of Ptolemy, leads to the conclusion that *Palaisimoundou* is the right reading. A variant of the text of Marcion has *Palligemoundou*, but Dodwell has established the reading *Palaisimoundou*, and one must admit that the variant *Palligemoundou*, being an isolated one, has far less authority than *Palaisimoundou*. Attempts have hitherto been made, unsuccessfully, as I think, to find this name of Ceylon in the languages of India. Vossius on the authority of a somewhat dubious tradition about an ancient conquest of Ceylon by the Chinese, thinks that the word must have been formerly *Palousimon*, a word formed of *palou* or *polou* 'island,'

and *Simon* Siamese, which that savant considered to be the same as Chinese. To this word *Palousimon*, the Persians, according to him, added the word *diou* 'isle,' so that this idea of an island is twice expressed in the compound word. This explanation, which is a mere conjecture, does not stand critical examination. The only observation worthy of remark is about the final syllable *dou* which Vossius regards as identical with *div*, which means 'island,' and which he wrongly supposes to be from the Persian. This connection may perhaps be well founded, and I will add that it has been put forward by Pinedo also, the editor of Stephanus Byzantius. The syllable *dou* is the usual ending of many of the names of the islands of the Maldives, and it, as well as the Sinhalese *dīpa*, comes from the Sanskrit *dvīpa*.

Fr. Paulin de Saint-Barthelemy who is apt to think too easily that everything which the ancients tell us about India can be explained from the languages of India, makes *Palaisimoundau* represent the Sanskrit *Parasrimandala* the country of Parasri, the Indian Bacchus. I have no hesitation in saying that if the word invented by Fr. Paulin exists in Sanskrit it cannot have the meaning which he gives to it, and one is surprised that Dr. Vincent¹ who has often consulted Hamilton in his researches on the geography of India should have approved the hypothesis of Fr. Paulin de Saint-Barthelemy.

Frederic Gunther Wahl has also been busy with this difficult word and he has given as many explanations of it as there are words in the Tamil dictionary beginning with *pal* with different meanings. As a general name of the island *Simoundou* (without *palai*) seems to him to be either formed from the Sanskrit *sima* limit or to be a corruption of *Siloundou* or *Silandou*: this second conjecture previously proposed by Renaudot has been renewed by Malte-Brun. As the name of the chief town of the island *Palaisimoundou* of Pliny is a compound of *simoundou* with one of the following Tamil words prefixed: *palli*, 'temple,' *palayiam*, 'encampment' or 'seat of Government,' *palam*, bridge, *pala* or *palaya* (Sanskrit 'governor or king): this name might be applied even to the whole island, in which case the Greek *palai* would be the Tamil *palia* or *valia* (or *peria*, 'great') fort. When one can assign so many diverse explanations to the same word it is a pretty clear proof that none of them is the true one.

1. The Commerce and Navigation of the Ancients in the Indian Ocean, ii 54-495.

On the other hand Wilford revivies an explanation already condemned by Saumaise and thinks that by *Taprobane* the Greeks meant the island of Sumatra, and he finds this latter name in *Palaisimoundou*, which, according to him, is compounded of *pulo* 'island' and *sumanda* or *munda*, a corruption of the Sinhalese *samudra* or *samunder*, 'ocean.' *Palaisimoundou* would then, according to this explanation, mean 'the island of the ocean.' But besides that Wilford cannot find any text to base these diverse transformations of the words, his explanation is insufficient, as it is today definitively proved that the *Taprobane* of the ancients is really modern Ceylon. Mannert who recognized the identity of these two places along with Saumaise, Boehart, d'Anville and many others, explains *palai*, as Vossius did, by *pulo*, and regards *Simoundou* as the proper name of Ceylon.

The best refutation of there conjectural explanations would be to show the word *Palaisimoundou* in a Pali or Sinhalese text, and to explain it as we have done with *Tambraparni* and *Sinhala*. But the exts which I have seen so far give us no help, and I have not beene able to find any word that has the least resemblance to *Palaisimoundou*. In this respect we are in the same situation as d'Anville who said that there was no trace of *Simoundou* or *Palaisimoundou*. There is, however, this difference between then and now. In the days of d'Anville one could not know whether a closer acquaintance with the Indian languages than was possible at the time would not, later on, reveal the existence of such a name. But today on the contrary we are able, if not to affirm, at least, to suppose with great probability that *Palaisimoundou* is not known to the Sinhalese as a name given to their island. That name does not appear in any of the three authoritative chronicles of Ceylon which are apparently the only ones they have.

(To be continued.)

Kandyan State Trial

EDITED BY

FATHER S. G. PERERA, S.J.

(*Contd. from p. 286.*)

The Defence

Mr. Staples commenced by saying that from the rumours prevalent at the time he was first consulted by the Prisoners, he was induced to believe that the cause which he should have to advocate would be not only the most important, but fraught with more difficulties than any he had ever been entrusted with, but when, by much importunity and after an unaccountable delay, he had been furnished with a copy of the indictment, the fears which those rumours had occasioned were considerably abated, and since it had been finally settled that the fate of his clients was to be left in the hands of those he had honour of then addressing, whose minds, he felt assured, were untainted by what had been circulated to the prejudice of his clients, all his apprehensions were dispelled.

“I am not, therefore, Gentlemen, (continued Mr. Staples) addressing you under the impression of fear; nor borne down with the hopeless difficulties of my cause. I am not craving your indulgence for my inefficiency, although opposed to the united talents of the two learned Crown Advocates, assisted with all the ability and influence in the place. I appeal not to your passions but to your judgment. I ask only that you will consider this cause with those feelings which every good man must possess when he sees a fellow creature depending on him for his life—that you will make all allowances for prejudice and ignorance. Beyond this I ask for nothing more than JUSTICE. And here, allow me, Gentlemen, to thank you, first on behalf of my clients, for the patient attention you have paid to these proceedings, protracted as they have been, and for your forbearance towards me. Probably you may think that I have been occasionally prolix in the cross-examination of the witness, but if I have been

so, it has been with a view of shortening this trial, and I flatter myself that I have gained that object. The King's Advocate has told you that the crime of which the Prisoners stand charged involves every interest which can be valuable to them; but when you are told at the same time, that the dearest interests of the community are affected, I must entreat you not to allow any impression of loyalty to get the better of your judgment, or to give them the smallest bias; and if the seriousness of the charge is to have any influence on your minds, it should be only that of rendering you more incredulous of its truth."

"The King's Advocate has also informed you that the Government do not desire the conviction of the Prisoners. I am bound to believe it, though I must confess, that unless I had received that assurance from so respectable a quarter, the conduct of *some of the officers of Government* might have led me to a different conclusion, and the anxiety, (to say nothing *more* of it) evinced in the course of this investigation, would have tended to strengthen that opinion. Without inquiring into the motives of those who have promoted the cause, or questioning their purity, I trust I may be permitted, in common with many other citizens, to doubt the good policy of these proceedings—whether it can possibly tend to strengthen the ties which bind the natives of these provinces¹ to the British Government, by accusing their Chiefs of disloyalty on such slender grounds—whether it does not bespeak a want of confidence in the strength and resources of our Government by listening to, and building legal proceedings on such idle reports."

"You have been told that *now* is the time for this intended insurrection, or *never*. What? Now? Just when the lower classes (without whose co-operation nothing could possibly have been effected) had just emerged from a comparative state of slavery, and had just begun to feel they had acquired a station in society? Was such the hour for a rebellion? And is it likely that, at the very time public demonstrations of respect and attachment were shown to the late highly talented Governor of this Island,² that these Prisoners particularly the two first, could have been meditating what is imputed to them? Why was not the incredible, diabolical plot of poisoning (spoken

1 i. e. Kandyan Provinces

2. Sir Edward Barnes, see Vol. ii. p. 554

of in the evidence but not alluded to in the indictment) *then* carried into effect? In the course of his observations, the King's Advocate has also stated that one of the grounds for which the Prisoners were put upon their trial was that they might have an opportunity of proving their loyalty. I cannot subscribe to the justice of such a proceeding, or that anyone has a right thus to speculate with the life, liberty or character of a British subject."

"The laws under which we have the happiness to live presume every man to be innocent until the contrary be *clearly proved*, and if the unimpeached and unimpeachable characters which the Prisoners (I allude particularly to the 1st and 2nd Prisoners) have borne for so long a time have not been sufficient to shield them from suspicion, of what use is character?"

Mr. Staples then proceeded to the consideration of the charges against the Prisoners, commenting at length on the Overt Acts, and contending that what were termed *Overt Vcts* were nothing more than a string of *intentions* from which the Jury were to infer the *intention* of subverting the Government. That the Prisoners were not charged with having assembled people and of haranguing them; nor with having engaged persons to form a deputation to the King of Siam and to the Mauritius; nor with *having* collected money for defraying the expenses of such deputation; nor indeed with having *done* one single act, but having *intended* to do them with the *intention* mentioned in the indictment. That with respect to the alleged conspiracy, it consisted of some loose conversations directed to indifferent objects; and the very allusions to Rammohun Roy and the inhabitants of the Mauritius clearly shewed that no traitorous design could have been contemplated.

"I have considered the case hitherto taking it for granted that the witnesses who had been called in support of the prosecution are wholly untainted and worthy of credit; but when you come to consider that the majority of them acknowledged themselves to be accomplices, and the hopes, not only of pardon, but of rewards held out to some,—when you reflect on the improbability of a Kandyan Chief who has so many at his command, (for it cannot be supposed that the abolition of compulsory labour has deprived them of *all* influence, or at least of confidants) should have put himself in the foreground, while his projects could have been matured by the instrumentality of others,—when you reflect on the improbability of the Prisoners confiding their designs to persons

with whom they were not at all, or very slightly acquainted, and doing so without having first held out inducements and prospects of personal advantage to them—on the improbability of conversations of this nature taking place in public, in houses of entertainment and in open verandahs,—weigh all this well—‘throw away the dross’ as the King’s Advocate has requested you, and see what remains.”

“You are well aware, Gentlemen, of the honour which has been bestowed on the 1st and 2nd Prisoners, and the marked attention paid to them by this Government,—you are aware, for it is a matter of history, that the 1st Prisoner’s family was the principal means of overthrowing the Kandyan Tyrant, and the active part which the first Prisoner himself took in quelling the Rebellion of 1818. Is it likely therefore that he should ever have contemplated the overturn of this Government and to re-establish the ancient one from which he had everything to fear and nothing to gain?”

Mr. Staples next pointed out the contradictions between the witnesses observing that although the points in which they differed were of little importance, taken by themselves, yet it was by these discrepancies, the credit of witnesses was to be tried: That with respect to the alleged payment of 100 Rds. by the 1st Prisoner, Mr. Staples considered it ought not to have been admitted in evidence, it not having been laid as an Overt Act, yet he did not object to it, as the very idea of advancing so paltry a sum for such a promise, was preposterous.

He particularly alluded to the *demeanour* of the witnesses for the prosecution, and asked whether any unprejudiced mind would say that they spoke the truth.—He also appealed to those who knew the character, manners and customs of the Kandyan people, whether conversations, such as have been related, would likely have taken place between the Prisoners and such people as have given evidence of them: that he was assured this would have due weight with those who knew the peculiarities of the people of the country.

That as to the unseasonable journey to Anooradhapoor, the collections of ancient customs of the country, etc., he did not think them worthy of an observation. That as to the throne, or rather Palanquin, which had been spoken of as a very *suspicious* circumstance, it was made for Sir Edward Barnes, has been paid for, and is at this moment lying in the store in Kandy! That, in short, every act of the

1st Prisoner, however innocent, or even loyal, had been misinterpreted, and perverted. He added that if the collection of the manners and customs of this country, was imputable to a treasonable intention, as is the case with the 1st Prisoner, he feared that two Gentlemen (one, a Member of the Executive Council, and the other holding a high station of trust) who betrayed equal if not more eagerness in that way, would ere long have a chance of standing in the same place where the Prisoners then were ! (a laugh.) Mr. Staples then remarked on the bad terms on which some of the witnesses for the Prosecution were with some of the Prisoners, particularly the second, arguing that although enmity might not go far towards impeaching the credit of a witness when he deposed to a fact which he had seen, yet did so to shew the improbability of any *confidential communication* having taken place between the parties

It had been also proved that some of the Prisoners were not on good terms with each other ; they therefore could not have *conspired* together.

In commenting on the statements of the Prisoners which had been put in evidence, Mr. Staples said; "I beg it to be understood that the observations I am about to make on these documents, (confessions as they have been called *Lucus a non lucendo*, confessions from their confessing nothing) are confined to the *writing*, and are not intended to extend to the *writer*. Mr. Turnour has told you that he has taken down the very words made use of by the Prisoners ; but if you refer to the statements, you will see that he must have been mistaken, for it is not only in the third person, but the person who is supposed to make the statement is called *Deponent*. Now if Mr. Turnour could have committed such an error in his own language, it is not unlikely he may have committed some in translating what was said in one language into another ; and considering that Mr. Turnour was at that time something in the light of a Prosecutor, and entertaining, no double suspicions of the guilt of the Prisoners, it would have been more satisfactory if he had employed an Interpreter. I need hardly tell you that the statements must be taken altogether and that which each Prisoner states can affect only himself." Mr. Staples was willing to admit that dissatisfaction, to a certain extent, did prevail, not only through the Kandyan Provinces but the Maritime Provinces also, but observed that until *Dissatisfaction* and *Disaffection* were words synonymous, the expression of the former, even in the strongest terms, could never

amount to Treason; that it was the peculiar privilege of the English nation to *growl* at every one and every thing, and it is a right that British subjects my exercise!" (a laugh).

"Gentlemen, I would willingly and with every confidence leave this cause in your hands, as it now presents itself, but I think it right for the sake of the public as well as my clients, to *expose the means* that have been resorted to in procuring evidence for the Prosecution. You have heard several of the witnesses make mention of one Mahawalatenna Dessave, who, I believe Mr. Turnour said, had been employed as an Agent to make enquiries and collect evidence for the Prosecution. I am instructed and I am *prepared to prove* that this man has not only held out inducements to persons to give evidence *against* the Prisoners but has also tampered with the witnesses *on their part*. I shall also prove the uniform loyal conduct of the Prisoners, particularly of the 1st and 2nd Prisoners, and produce the numerous testimonials³ which the former has received, from time to time, from Government. I shall likewise call a few witnesses to disprove what has been deposed to by some of the witnesses for the Prosecution. But you will readily see that I am unable to do this to any extent as almost all the witnesses seemed *determined to forget* whether anyone else was present at the alleged conversation."

"Gentlemen, I have said I do not intend to appeal to your passions, but if the Prisoners themselves were to address you, they could, perhaps, relate what would not have failed to arouse your feelings in their behalf. But I will only allude to the long imprisonment they have undergone, during which they were shut out from all intercourse with even their *nearest relatives*, and the ignorance in which they were kept of the nature of the charge and of their accusers."

"Gentlemen I will detain you no longer. Before you can find the Prisoners guilty, you will have to reconcile contradictions, you will have to credit the greatest improbabilities, but above all you must deny to the Prisoners the possession of that master passion which governs and regulates the conduct of all men, *self interest*. But I expect not such a verdict. In the name of the Law, in the

3. The Kandy Museum has acquired the original Act of Appointment of Molligoda Cf. Daily News, 24 Feb. 1932. The sannas granted to him by Sir Edward Barnes in 1827 is given by Bell in Kegalla Rep. 101, see 3CLR ii 190.

name of Justice, by the sacred ties to which the King's Advocate has so forcibly appealed, your allegiance to your King, your duty to your God, I Demand an Acquittal.

Evidence for the Defence

First Witness—Carolus Silva, *Interpreter of the District Court of Matale, sworn*—*I knew Welagedere; he came to Matale at the reading of the proclamation. I had no conversation with him regarding this then. As I was returning to my house I had some conversation with him and others, and advised them if they knew anything now was the time to tell it. To the best of my recollection Welagedere said he knew nothing about it.*

Cross-examined by Mr. Carr—*I am not sure but believe he gave an answer that he knew nothing. I told Captain Forbes.¹ I thought he knew something about that business because there was a common report that the first Adigar had given him a gun on going to Anooradhapoor. Welagedera is a man of rank and influence in Oodoogoda, Cadapalla, and Asgiri Korles. I can't say anything for or against him.*

Cross-examined by Mr. Staples—*I asked if he got a gun from the Adigar. He said he had purchased one from Tikiry Banda at the time they went to Anooradhapoor. Tikiry Banda purchased a stamp to summon him about that gun.*

By the Jury—*The stamp was purchased some time in December last.*

Second Witness—Captain Stannus,² A. D. C. *I arrested the second Prisoner, found him quiet; saw no war-like preparations nor anything to excite my suspicions; he came instantly.*

Third Witness—Ellepaate Basnaike Nileme.³ *I accompanied the Adigar and the others to Anooradhapoor. I did not take lodgings with any other persons, was with them the whole time, made a short stay at Matale, saw the Assistant Government Agent there and spoke to him; the Adigar was received with much attention by the people of Matale, it was known to him. He said nothing else except expressing his satisfaction. I knew of the entertainment given to the first Adigar at the second Adigar's house; there were a great many people; I was*

1. Capt. Jonathan Forbes of the 78th Regt. District Judge of Matale and East Nuwarakalaviya.

2. Captain William T. Stannus, 97th Regt. Aide-de-Camp to the Governor

3. See Ante Vol. ii. p. 78.

present the whole time; they sat down to dine, at the time the lamps were lighted in the evening; the dinner was over about twelve at night; we then went into different apartments to go to bed; it was about the 15th hour of the night; the Adigar did not get up and go anywhere, he did not go anywhere, the second Adigar did not go anywhere. It never came to my knowledge that the sixth Prisoner was on friendly terms with the first Adigar—if he was on good terms he would have frequented the house of the first Prisoner, which I never knew him to do. I know Welagedere; he went with us to the second Adigar's. He did not go into the house; as we went the second Adigar gave him leave and he went away; he said he might go, and he went away making his obeisance as other inferior persons do. We arrived five hours before night-fall and he went away before dark. I have heard of his presenting a petition. There were many persons present at the second Adigar's house. He may have gone with us, for many people went with us. No speeches were made to my knowledge. I don't understand what the Pinkama was meant for. I did not hear any speeches at Udapalate. They could not go away from the second Adigar's house without my knowledge.

Cross-Examined by Mr. Perring—This was in April; it was on our return from Anooradhapoorra to this place; we returned from Anooradhapoorra before this feast. It was also before Sir Edward Barnes' arrival.

I am a relation to the first Adigar; my sister is married to the first Adigar. I can't say if Welagedere went with me to the second Adigar. I know when he went away, I can't say for certain if he went with us, there were many people there. I could not speak of his coming, but as I saw him go away I know. That was the only meal we took, after that we went away. Don't know why the Rate Adikareme came there. He as well as others took his leave and went away. I do not know the people of Matale; except on this journey I never went to Matale before. Welagedere went to Dambool with us on our way to Anooradhapoorra; of those who were there I only saw him; the Maha Nileme went to bed first, saying I feel myself unwell. Then everyone of us went being fatigued by the journey. Two went to bed in one room. Tikiry Banda and Hanguranketa Basnaike Nileme¹ were together; when I went to bed I slept. I did not observe anything

1. Unambuwe Samaradiwakara Chandrasekera Wahala Kuruppu Mudianse, Basnayaka Nilame of Maha Dewale of Hanguranketa.

thing after that. Before the first Adigar went to his bedroom I was there. Did not go afterwards. When I went to the first Adigar's room I said it was before night-fall. After I went I did not come out. It might be that two servants went to the bed room of the first Adigar. *I am sure that four persons did not sleep in the room.* I know that no other persons than those two servants sleep in his room. I can't swear that Welagedere did not sleep in his bedroom, I cannot say that he might not have come afterwards—It is not usual that every one who wishes can have access to the Adigar's bedroom. I do not know of anything transpiring at Dodantale (1st Adigar's house) I was present at Molligoda, saw some olas given. I think fifteen days before going to Anooradhapoorā—The sannas (grants) were given to the Maha Nileme's son. The first Adigar (1st Prisoner) did not weep, he was not under any affliction. At the second Adigar's feast, Unambuwe was there, and the second Adigar, the Basnaike Nileme of Hanguranketa, Talgahagoda, Gajanaike Nileme,¹ Meddeketiya Banda.² There were spoons and forks, those who wished to eat with spoons did, others who preferred it ate with their hands. It was at 12 o'clock at night the supper was over; we sat down at the time the lamps were lighted. I do not know Allootgame Rate Adikareme; don't know if he was there, don't know the others who were there; they must have received food. It could not be that attendants would not take their food. I can say that there were other men of Matale that had caps on, but I don't know them, or where they dined. It was a thing which would remain in my recollections that Welagedere went away, I have not been told it since; I did not know this would be asked me. *I have been talking of Welagedere's going away since the session; what I said before on this subject was not the fact, what I say now is the fact.* I can't name one particular person; but I asked those who went with us the particulars of our journey to Anooradhapoorā. I did not speak of Welagedere in particular but of other matters connected with the journey; when we again met together we talked of the different circumstances connected with it. I don't recollect who spoke with me about this, I can name some of them. I spoke with the third Adigar, not about Welagedere in particular, but that the people took their leave and went away.

1. Talgahagoda Karuna Jayatilaka Rajaguru Mudianse, Gajanayaka and Kuruwe Nilame.

2. Meddeketiye Wijayakon Mudianse, Basnayaka Nilame of Kirindegolle Dewale.

I spoke to Hangurankete Dewale Basnaike Nileme. Welagedere took his leave in the yard—did not hear him speak anything. I did not hear him speak to the first Adigar; the second Adigar said “very well, no occasion for you to wait any longer.” I noticed that he did not come back—sure of this, for I did not see him afterwards; don’t know that he is a man of superior rank or of any influence as far as I know, he has an inferior office, I did not inquire what influence he had. I don’t know how high or low the office is.

Re-examined by Mr. Staples—I mean to say I don’t know the strangers. I know the followers of the first Adigar. While the Maha Nileme was in front we were behind; the persons first came to see the Adigar,

Fourth Witness—Hanguranketa Unambuwe Basnaike Nileme¹ — *I accompanied the Adigar to Anooradhapoorā; last witness went with me, I returned with them; when we went people came and assembled on the road. He did not speak to them; in some places he received respect; in others not. I did not hear him make any speeches; no Pinkama was held at Gampola, it was at Unambuwe, I was there; no speeches were made there; I know that Bambaradeniye is not on good terms with the first prisoner, not for a long time before the arrest. I was at dinner at the second Adigar’s. He did not leave the table; we got up at the same time; very late at night; we sat down to dinner at the time that a man could hardly be distinguished. I know Welagedere Rate Adikareme; saw him on our journey. I saw him at Dambool when we went, and at the second Adigar’s on our return; saw him come and take leave, about one hour before night-fall—it was daylight. I saw him go away; neither first nor second prisoner nor second Adigar could have left the table without my noticing it.*

Cross-Examined by Mr. Carr—We all five went together. I can’t say if Welagedere went with us, he was there; I did not see him talk with Ellapate, he had no opportunity to speak; we went together. I cannot say if he went with us nor whether he went before us or after. I saw him before he took leave, and as he was taking leave; he took leave at the hall outside. The second Adigar was there—When he took leave I was there. Ellapate the Embekke Basnaike Nileme was there; he was at the pinkama. Welagedere did not come back again, not at nine o’clock nor at all. I did not see him after he got leave and

1. See Note 1, p. 332.

went away, we were near the table inside the house. There is a large hall adjacent like this. After he got leave from the second Adigar he retired, but if he went alone I do not know. Keerepone Adikareme also of Matale went away. Don't know if Ellapate knows him. He did not go to Dambool. I know Keerepone more than eighteen or fifteen years—a number of persons got leave and went away; no others of Matale were present except the attendants; there might have been inferior chiefs outside; there were many people after we rose from the table; at night we went and slept in our respective places; the first Adigar (1st prisoner) said nothing; when he got up he went to his room, saying he was not well.

There were servants who followed him—Ellapate followed him—that is all I saw—Ellapate followed him into his room. I am quite sure the second Adigar did not follow him; there was another apartment on the outside; Dunuwille went into his room—it was in the same house—about 10 fathoms from 1st Adigar's room—there were several apartments. My apartment was near the bed room of the first Adigar—I think about five fathoms off—I am related to first prisoner Molligoda, but not to Dunuwille (2nd prisoner)—*I am married to the first Adigar's sister—cannot explain how I am related to Dunuwille*—Ellapate slept in the first Adigar's room that night—I did not shoot—did not see Molligoda, first prisoner, shoot. That country had a different climate. Wine and beer were used medicinally. Their attendants fired off the gun at an offering near the sacred Bo-tree—There were about five present with us—they did not approve of the others drinking. I slept in Tikiry Banda's apartment; our servants were in that room.

(*To be continued*)

Notes and Queries.

PHILIP BALDAEUS FOUND OUT

Professor Jarl Charpentier of the University of Upsala in his recent work "*Livro Da Seita Dos Indios Orientais* (British Museum MS. Sloane 1820)"¹ has exposed the methods of Philip Baldaeus. Baldaeus wrote in 1672 his well known work on "The Coast of Malabar and Chromandel and Ceylon." It is divided into three parts, the first, 'Description of Malabar and Chromandel', second, 'Description of the mighty Island of Ceylon', and third 'An Account of Heathendom'. This last part is, according to Baldaeus himself, the most important of the three, the other two being merely subsidiary to it. This Account of the Indian religions he gives as the result of years of careful investigation and personal observation, and it won for him the admiration of writers who looked upon Baldaeus as "an early and for those days not discreditable precursor of Jones, Wilkins etc."

But now Dr. Charpentier writes: "I may perhaps to a certain extent flatter myself with having proved the rather unscrupulous way in which Baldaeus—whose fame has been great as well amongst contemporaries as amongst scholars of a later date—made use of different sources in order to put together that patchwork, the title of which is *Afgoderye der Oost-Indische Heydenden*." After giving a table of the passages taken by Baldaeus verbally from the *Livro da Seita*, he proceeds:

"Add to this that Baldaeus, instead of telling his readers that he had simply translated great parts of a Portuguese manuscript, always expresses himself in very vague phrases, e.g. 'I think I have read it in a manuscript of a certain Roman Catholic priest' (p. 56): Add further that he knew next to nothing of Tamil and Malayalam,² and that his knowledge of Portuguese was notoriously weak as has been proved in the *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, II 752, and could be corroborated from numerous other examples: And add finally that all the portions of his work, which he did not copy out from Fenicio, he took over almost verbally from a Dutch manuscript (Sloane 3290) without once troubling himself with even mentioning his source. By summing up all these instances it will be easily deduced that Baldaeus was neither an honest nor a trustworthy author, and that his work on the Idolatry of the Hindus is a simple compilation—one might rather call it a plagiarism—which lacks an ounce of original value." pp lxxxiii—lxxxv.

(1) The *Livro da Seita Dos Indios Orientais* (Brit. Mus. MS. Sloane 1820) of Father Jacobo Fenicio, S.J., edited with an Introduction and Notes by Jarl Charpentier, Upsala 1933.

(2) "From the forms of Tamil and Sanskrit proper names which he uses in parts of his work it is quite clear that he took them from Portuguese sources without any knowledge of the originals. On the transcription of Indian words into Portuguese cp. *Oriente Portuguez* iv 370 sq; *Dalgado Glossario* i, xxv."