

Ceylon Literary Register

THIRD SERIES

VOL. III.

AUGUST, 1934.

No. 8.

“The only Asiatic to figure in European
History”

Pieter Philip Juriaan Quint Ondaatje¹
1758—1818

PETER PHILIP JURIAAN ONDAATJE was born at Colombo in the Island of Ceylon in the East-Indies on 18 June, 1758. His parents were Willem Juriaan Ondaatje, who also was born there, and who since 1757 was Predikant to the Reformed Dutch, Tamil and Portuguese Congregation, first of Colombo and afterwards of Jaffna, and Hermina Quint,² born at Amsterdam. After the death of his maternal grandfather Pieter took the surnane of Quint Ondaatje.

On 16 November 1773, he set sail for Europe³ from Point-de-Galle and arrived at Amsterdam on 10 June, 1774. There he attended the Latin and Greek schools till 20 September, 1778. From the 21 September, 1778, to the 13 of January, 1787, he followed the academic courses in the four faculties of Theology, Philosophy, Medicine and Law, and graduated in Philosophy at Utrecht on 15 November, 1782, and in Law at Leyden on 13 January, 1787.

Meanwhile he became a citizen at Utrecht on 10 February, 1783 and at Wijk bij Duurstede on 16 February, 1784, and was elected by the citizens as popular delegate and was solemnly recognized as such by

1. Translated from the Dutch autobiographical notes of Ondaatje.

2. Whom Willem Ondaatje had married in Holland when he was sent there for his studies by the Company.

3. Also sent by the Company as his father had been.

the government on 21 February, 1785. On the 7th and 11th of March of that year he devoted himself to the interests of the citizens as their speaker and was on that account prosecuted¹ at law since 21 May, 1785, but on the 2nd of August through the mediation of the citizens he was freed from all prosecution by a decree of the State.

In that same year of 1787, after he had served as Ensign, Lieutenant, Captain-Lieutenant, Captain and Major of the armed citizens, he was entrusted by the Statenslands of Utrecht with a company of infantry in the regiment of Lieutenant-General Van der Borch and was nominated by the States of Holland as Adjutant-General of the United Hollander and Stichtsche troops then garrisoning Utrecht and as Commandant and Chief of guides and Director-General of the general secret correspondence at the headquarters of the Rhijngraaf of Salm Grömbeck.

When on the invasion of the Prussian troops in 1787 the town of Utrecht was evacuated of military and civic garrisons, he held out and on receiving counter-orders he sustained skirmishes with the enemy till the 2nd October, when he received a hint to quit the country as soon as possible.

He then left Amsterdam for Hamburg by sea and arrived there on 9th October, but being again privately warned he left Hamburg on the 25th, and after a perilous voyage on the North Sea arrived at Ostend and thence continued his way to Brussels where he established himself on the 22nd.

Here he received news of his banishment from Utrecht, the confiscation of his property and of corporal punishment decreed against him as guilty of *Lese Majestie* in case he fell into the hands of Justice. His crime was zealous patriotism contrary to the interests of Anglomania and Orangism.

At Brussels he was Doctor or Professor to the children of Westrenen and Smissaert, his co-refugees, teaching them divers branches of study, but owing to the existing disagreements of the citizens he left Brussels and repaired to Ghent on 9 April, 1790.

There he carried on his studies in private along with his friend Von Liebeherr in the castle of Groeningerveld outside Ghent, and when on the night of 10th June, 1790, his friend was seized and imprisoned

1. See Appendix.

in the Dominican Monastery of Ghent, he accompanied him to the jail where he also was arrested on suspicion. But on the third day their innocence was proved and they were honourably released and conducted to the castle under a military escort. The alleged crime was that of taking part in the affairs of the General Van der Meersch against Van der Noot and Van Eupen.

In the meantime he joined the establishment of Blok at Grave-lines for herring-fishery and rope-walk, and went on 16 October, 1790, to live at Duinkerken.

On 31 July, 1792, he joined the French Foreign Legion as volunteer rifleman being passed over as Captain owing to the jealousy of superiors; but after he had served in the Legion General Dumouriez appointed him, at Antwerp on 18 February, 1793, to his old rank of Captain in the French army destined for the Dutch expedition and made him deputy-Captain to the Adjutant-General.

On 23 February, he took part in the bombardment of Breda under General Westermann and on its capitulation on the 25th he occupied the city gates on the next day: on 4th March likewise of Geertruidenberg after its bombardment and capitulation on 1 March. On the 8th and 9th he was in command at Capelle and Waalwijk and seized and cleared the vessels for crossing from Biesbosch to Dordrecht to dislodge the English. On the 10th when Westermann was ordered to Turnhout he was under the orders of his successor Devaux with whom he removed the headquarters to Sundert and on the 21st drove the Prussians back to Tilburg.

After the defeat of Dumouriez at this time he followed the remnants of the army through Brussels to Rijssel on the 25th of March, and placed himself on the next day under the orders of General Lamoriere.

On 26th June, 1793, he returned to Duinkerken and from 23rd August to 9th September he served as a volunteer soldier in the siege of the English, and after the defeat he went on 12 September to Calais where he settled down and established a printing press under the title of Bellegarde, Ondaatje & Co,¹ with a licence from the Council of Administration of the District of Calais.

1. Which even published a daily newspaper "*Courier de Calais*". In the Books published by the firm its name is sometimes given as "Quint Ondaatje & Co".

On 11 April, 1795, he came to the Hague and on 10 May he was appointed Undersecretary to the Council of War—and on 1 March 1796 a member of the Asiatic Council or administrator of the East India Company—in which capacity he left Amsterdam on 6th November and sailed from Texel to St. Ubes in Portugal to save the return vessels from the East Indies that called there from the hands of the English. But on the 18th November he was shipwrecked and being brought to the Spanish harbour of Camariñas by a Bayonese privateer he and his Secretary, La Prê, continued the journey by land through Coruñas and Oporto and reached Lisbon on 20 December.

At Lisbon in spite of the Hollander Consul and the Director Hartsinck, who were in concert with the government which ordered him to quit Lisbon within three and the kingdom of Portugal within eight days, he saved the East Indian ships with their cargo and set sail from Lisbon on 17 January, 1797, for Madrid where he was presented by the Hollander Ambassador Valekenær and the French envoy Perignon and supplied with a passport and military convoy by the Prince de la Paz and despatched to the French frontier. Arriving there on 17 February he continued the journey to Paris which he reached on 2 March. Here again he was entertained by the Ambassador Meijer till the 13 of March—just as he had been by the Minister Valekenær from 1st to 9th February at Madrid and Aranjuez. He left for Amsterdam where he arrived on 19th March, 1797.

In the following year, namely on 21 February, 1798, he was nominated Secretary General of Police and Inland correspondence without prejudice to his membership in the Committee on East Indian affairs. On 13 December, 1799, having received his dimission of the Secretaryship above named he took part in the sessions of his College at Amsterdam from the first of January, 1800. On 15th March he was licensed—the reason for which he does not disclose out for regard for the government of the time—though honourably and free from all responsibility. In that same year he settled down to practise at the Hague.

Then came the peace. There was question of taking over the Hollander possessions in the West and East Indies from the hands of the English. He therefore offered his service, to go there as an officer, especially as Colonel (a rank justly due to him since 1795) and at that time not refused but as it was known to lead him to politics as it were reserved for him though after the reorganisation of the army,

it was not offered to him, they accepted his offer. He brought his family¹ to Utrecht and leaving them with his wife's family on 6 November 1802 he awaited instructions and orders. Then war broke out again and he finds himself deprived of the one and the other up to now.

On 1 September, 1801, he had been appointed solicitor for the Marine. On 20 March, 1804, he was thanked for his post of permanent solicitor by the State government and his resignation followed. On 29 November, 1805, he was appointed to the Council of Finance and member of the Prize Court at the Hague. On 21 April he was appointed Judge of the Prize Court of Paris.²

Appendix

Citation of the High Bailiff, the Count of Athlone, against E. P. Juriaan Ondaatje, issued 3rd, May, 1785.

“That after the death of Mr. John Jacob Godin tot Cockengen Lord of Vuylcop, the ‘Constituted’ of about twelve hundred citizens, on the 21 February of this year, thought fit to address, by way of Petition, the Noble, Great and Worthy, Lords, Burgomasters and Council, of the City, and to request of them that in the approaching election of a Councillor to the Council those might be passed over who had declared no grievance or who had opposed any proposition laid down in the fourth article of a certain plan mentioned: That afterwards

1. He had married Christiana Hoevenar of Utrecht.

2. On 31 March, 1816, he set sail with his family on board the *Nassau* for Batavia where he arrived on 3 September. He was a Councillor of the Supreme Court of Justice and died at Batavia on 28 April, 1818. He had two sons Johannes Elaardus Jurgen Ondaatje who settled down in Borneo and Peter Philip Christian Oortman Ondaatje who took to a military life and became a Major and a Knight of the order of William. One of his daughters married a Mr. Archensbeek another a Mr. Waller. A son of this younger daughter joined the Survey Department in Ceylon and died at Kalutara. One of her daughters married Captain Gother Mann Parsons of the Ceylon Rifles who died in 1870; another married Capt. Staples.

“In whatever light we may consider Ondaatje” wrote George Vreede, Professor of the Utrecht University in his introduction to the “Memorials and Times of Doctor P. J. Quint Ondaatje” published by Mrs. C. M. Davies,—“as a student of our Universities or as a valiant Burgher patriotic reformer, whose zeal and energy aroused his contemporaries and exercised an unmistakable influence on the conditions of Netherlands in general and of Utrecht in particular—his name will never be blotted out from the memory of the inhabitants of the country. It was in the East that he was born and there too after a distinguished career in the West, he found his last resting place. He stands unparalleled as the only Asiatic who figures in European History”.

the Great and Worthy Council on the 3rd of March of the same year, 1785, having proceeded to the nomination and election of a person to fill the vacant place in the Council Mr. J. Sichterman was chosen by a majority, and it was further resolved to assemble on the 7th of the said month of March, in order to administer the oath to the said Mr. J. Sichterman, and give him sitting in the Assembly of the Council: That information thereof was communicated to the said Mr. J. Sichterman, who then made the necessary arrangements for the payment of Office-money, as well to the Province as to the Town. But, because this election was contrary to the limitations which were proposed in the above-mentioned Petition, the same 'Constituted' and among them P. P. Juriaan Ondaatje, Burgher and inhabitant of this Town and officer of the town-schuttery, not only disapproved of the choice but moreover in order to represent to the Noble, Great and Worthy Councillors their supposed grievances with the more force and emphasis, joined themselves with the "Commissioned" of the Schutters of the eight burgher-companies, and together addressed themselves to the Lords Burgomasters of this City, to obtain an audience in the Senate of this City, in order to state their grievances by word of mouth: That notwithstanding the Lords Burgomasters made a difficulty concerning it, as being hitherto without precedent that private citizens should be admitted to an audience for the purpose of making oral representations; yet they were so urged by the above-mentioned 'Constituted' and 'Commissioned' and especially by P. P. J. Ondaatje for an audience, that they could not satisfy them till the Lords Burgomasters had promised them a hearing in an extra-Council: That accordingly, the Council having assembled on Sunday the 6th of March, after an adjournment, at the earnest instance of the said 'Constituted' and 'Commissioned' resolved to admit them on Monday the 7th of the same month into the Assembly. And on the same 7th of March, after the audience granted, P. P. J. Ondaatje with the deputies of the said 'Constituted' and 'Commissioned' came in and there made the following harrangue—(*Here followed the first speech*)—That the speaker in this oration, besides the unbecoming expressions relating to the former Constitution and mode of action of the Senate, openly declared his absolute democratic principles, in opposition to the established form of government and Constitution of this City and Province, assuming for the people and himself authority over the Government and Magistracy of the City.

That the speaker declared he would cause the popular voice speaking through him and the other deputies, to be respected, and further by such means and calling on God's Holy Name and Omnipresence endeavoured to force the Senate to annul the Election they had made and thus to deprive the Elected by a political disposition of an acquired legal right, and in order to create alarm, described the continued discontent and rage of the citizens, and declared that probably they would cause this voice of the people to speak immediatly to the Senate: That P. P. Juriaan Ondaatje would not be satisfied with this, but after the Great, Noble and Worthy, Magistrates of this City on the morning of the 11th of March confirmed their resolution, the said 'Constituted' and 'Commissioned' and among them P. P. J. Ondaatje ventured, under a declaration that their Constituents could not acquiesce in the resolution of the Council, to insist in an earnest manner with the Lords Burgomasters upon an extraordinary Council to receive a deputation from the 'Constituted' and 'Commissioned', who would represent the intentions and wishes of the citizens in the matter of Mr. J. Sichterman, with a declaration that they would not be answerable for any prejudicial consequences in case of refusal. That the Lords Burgomasters having consented to this requisition, the Council assembled about half past six, where audience was again granted to the deputies of the 'Constituted' and 'Commissioned' and among them P. P. J. Ondaatje, when the said Ondaatje made the following address (*Here follows the address of 11th March, 1785*). That this address contains the most extravagant pretensions of authority over the Magistrates of this City, as the speaker pronouncing their resolution illegal, with a declaration of withdrawing himself from the obligation to acknowledge Mr. J. Sichterman as Senator, demanding at the same time that during the sitting of the Assembly, a final resolution should be taken by which Mr. J. Sichterman should be declared not chosen, and a day fixed for electing another person to the Senate, more agreeable to the feelings and wishes of the Citizens. And in order to persuade the Senate to this resolution, the speaker alleged that in case of noncompliance the most melancholy and threatening consequences would necessarily ensue, and were to be certainly expected, the speaker not omitting to mention at the end of his discourse of a crowd there assembled, in order to give more force to his prophecy of threatning and melancholy consequences,

That also during the Assembly, the crowd, armed with side arms as well as unarmed, having increased, one of the Secretaries of this town went out, when P. P. J. Ondaatje and other deputies spoke to the Secretary, Mr. Nicholas Van Voorst, in words to this effect: "That the present crisis of affairs was such, that it must be now decided whether the voice of the people is to be heard, and whether they should succeed in their first desires, or be refused, in which case not only the City and Province but the whole Republic would be endangered.

"That the Citizens were enraged, and had forced the 'Constituted' to continue their assembly from eight o'clock in the morning to the present moment:"

"That they desired an absolute conclusion of the affair of Sichterman:"

"That the entrances to the Town Hall were beset on all sides with a multitude of people, who, although unarmed, would not permit the Senate to leave the Town Hall until they had abandoned the choice of J. Sichterman or finally confirmed it: That in the latter case the 'Constituted' would not be responsible for the dismal consequences that such a conclusion would entail and which they then foresaw:

"That the Council would communicate their resolution immediately to the people, and not to the 'Constituted' since these withdrew themselves from the business and would thenceforth appear no more as mediators;" the above-named P. P. J. Ondaatje saying lastly "that the people declared that their eyes were opened and that they would enforce and uphold their rights not as men of the forty-eight but of the eighty-five."¹

And that the result of the former and these latter importunities and methods of inducing the Council to annul the election they had made was that the Council, to prevent the pernicious and dreaded consequences and evils, thought proper to desist from the election of Mr. J. Sichterman and to consider it as not made.

That the purpose of the said P. P. J. Ondaatje and his partizans being thus accomplished, to force the Senate to submit to their determination, he, Ondaatje, gave intelligence thereof to the assembled crowd, with these insulting expressions towards the Council:

1. i.e. of 1748 and 1785.

“That the Burgomasters and Council had desisted from the election of J. Sichterman as Senator: that the citizens must now return home and rejoice decorously, and tell it to their wives and children and instil it into the minds of their children and children’s children; that this matter had been accomplished only by the courage of the citizens and some Governors, and that it was a great triumph for Utrecht’s citizens.”

That the speaker by this gave more clear evidence of his purpose and in proclaiming a triumph plainly showed that he had resolved to make the Council bow before this usurped authority of the ‘Constituted’ and ‘Commissioned’ and had prevailed.

That all the above-mentioned acts of P. P. J. Ondaatje comprised in themselves an open rebellion against the resolutions of the Magistracy of this City: that he to attain his object made use of discontents and movements of the people—whether real or feigned by him – and professing to speak in the name of a dissatisfied multitude and by the representation of disastrous and threatening consequences to be expected, forced the Council to deprive Mr. J. Sichterman of a right acquired by him to be a member of the Council.

This being open violence offered to the Magistracy, tending to the subversion of all good order and subjection, and to the dissolution of all the most indispensable bonds of society, such deeds ought to be visited with corporal punishment, to the necessary terror of others. Wherefore the demonstrator R. Athlone makes application to your Noble Worships against P. P. J. Ondaatje, praying your Noble Worships appointment, etc.

Sgd: C. A. VAN WACHENDORFF.

Citation issued

31 May, 1785.

An Ancient Tamil Word for Sheep

BY

REV. S. GNANA PRAKASAR, O.M.I.

THERE has been, of late, some discussion among Tamil Pundits concerning the phrase *eli-mayir-pōrvai* occurring in the *Civaka-Cintāmaṇi* (1874, 2471, 2680, 2686) and the *Perunkatai* (1, 47, 179). One held that the text should be corrected as *eri-mayir*, 'heaty hair' and another as *meli-mayir*, 'soft hair' since it is altogether unlikely that ancient Tamils were using rat-hair for making clothing of any sort. A third, however, suggested, with more insight into the vagaries of word-formation and corruption, that *eli* in the phrase does not mean rat at all, but it straightaway means sheep, the word having been borrowed from the Sinhalese *eluwā*, sheep, which itself is akin to the Pali *ēḷaka*, the latter being borrowed from the Tamil *ēḷaka*. But the fact is that our *eli* is by no means a borrowed word. It is the original for the later Tamil form *ēḷaka*, Pali *ēḷaka* and the rest.

The following quotation from the *Cintāmaṇy* would show that the word *eli* was a very ancient one—more ancient than some of the hymns of the Rig-Veda :

செந்நெருப்பு உணும் செவ்வெலிம் மயிர்
அந்நெருப்பு அளவு ஆய் பொற் கம்பலம்.

That is: "the hair of *cev-eli* which assimilates red-flaming fire: the golden *kambalam* considered like unto that fire." Here *kambalam* is said to have been made of *cev-eli mayir*. What does *cev-eli* represent and how does the word *kambalam* come? If we would pause a little to note how, in Tamil phonology, the letter *k* is anterior to *c*, we would at once see that the *cev-eli* of the *Cintāmaṇi* would have stood as *kem-eli* in an earlier stage of linguistic evolution. The Tamil adjective *cem* indeed still stands, in most cases, as *kem* in Kanarese and Telugu. If we should translate *cev-eli* into these dialects, we would have to say *kem-eli*, *kem-elika* or *eluka*. In Tamil itself we have still such forms as *kem-ṣu*, red (stone); *ken-ti*, gold coloured (antimony); *ken-takam* the

yellow-coloured (sulphur) *kev-uli*=*cev-ilanir*, the yellow coconut; *kovv-ai* (for *kevvai*), the red (fruit: coccinia indica) etc. It may therefore be safely assumed that the *cev-eli* of the Cintāmaṇy represents the *kemmelī* of more ancient times. This *kemmelī* would have indeed become *kembelī* by a very natural phonetic process, and later *kambalī*, always meaning the red species of *eli* or sheep. This name of *kambalī* is found to designate a kind of deer in Sanskrit, and a species of sheep (*kambalam*) in Tamil. By metonymy, the name of the woolly sort of sheep would have come to be used for woollen fabric. We should be thankful to Tiruttakka Devar for having given us a clue to tracing the origin of the word *kambala* for which Sanskrit is unable to give a convincing derivation. The word *cevveli* seems, in those days to have been current in the country of the author of Cintāmaṇy as, to the present day, we hear sheep named *cemmalī* in certain parts of Jaffna. This *cemmalī* is nearer to the original *kem-eli* than the *cevveli* of Cintāmaṇy.

But how does *eli* come to mean sheep? Does not that word designate a rat, in our modern usage? To answer this question we should consider how, in the earliest stage of language, objects were named by designations signifying their outstanding characteristics. The idea of white (=brightness) was designated by the word *el*, from the name of the sun, which was itself named *el* from the fact that it rises in the East. *Elu* is to rise, from which *el* the 'riser.' We have also the word *eluvān* the 'riser' for the same heavenly body. From *el* came words such as *eli-ya* (Sinhalese), light; *vel-iccām*, light; *vell-ai*, whiteness etc. Now the sheep was named *eli* 'the white animal' from its being such. This was probably the name first given to the white kind of sheep, and later extended to other kinds. The name has remained as *elu* in Sinhalese, an ancient Dravidian dialect. In Tamil too we have *vellai*, (*elū*, *eli*) a name for a particular kind of sheep. The distinction is now made between *vellai-āḍu* and *cemmalī-āḍu*, the first denoting goat and the second sheep. The word *cemmalī-āḍu* is seen to be a redundancy as *cem-eli* already means red kind of sheep. And the adjunct *āḍu*, which will be presently seen to be a later form of *eli* itself, is superfluous. So, too, is the word *vellai-āḍu* or *vellāḍu* redundant. *Vellai* already means sheep (or goat, to be more in accordance with modern usage) and *āḍu* itself comes from *eli* just as *vellai* is from the same source. *Sic habet usus!* But, on the other hand, another creature had been also designated *eli* by its outstanding quality of whiteness: the rat, which still has

a name *vellai-eli* or *velleli*. It was, therefore, found necessary to differentiate *eli* the sheep from *eli* the rat. We know the various devices used by the makers of our language for differentiating names of common origin. In this case, it was the lengthening of the initial vowel and varying the enunciate, thus producing a new word *ēla*. The formative itself underwent a change (*l* in to *l̥*) as in the case of the word *elil* brightness, derived from the same original theme *el*, light. (On these interesting phonetic laws see my *Studies in Tamil Etymology*.) *Ela* the new name for sheep underwent many further changes in Tamil itself and in other languages which adopted the name from Tamil. Compare the following :—

Tamil,—*eli*, *ēla*, *vell-ai*, *ēla-kam*, *ēḍa-kam*, *ēra-kam*, *ēṇ-ai*,
mēla-kam, *mēḍa-m*.

Sinhalese,—*elu-wā*, *elu-dena*

Telugu,—*mēk-a* [for *mēḷaka*] *mesha-mu*.

Sanskrit,—*ēḍa*, *ēḍa-ka*, *ēṇa*, *mēsha*, (Ved. meaning woollen fabric), *mēsha-ka*.

Pali,—*ēla-ka*.

Kurukh,—*ērā*.

Greek,—*erra-os*.

Old German,—*irah*.

Tulu,—*yēḍu*.

Toduva,—*āḍru*.

Tamil,—*yāḍu*, *āḍu*.

Kanarese, Malayalam,—*āḍu*.

Latin,—*ari-es*.

Again, there is no doubt that the Sumerian *elim* represents our *eli* as the script of the Sumerian word is a clear picture of a ram. (Barton, *Orig. and Devel. of Babylonian Writing* No. 374). The same *eli* and *ēḷaka* are found in Egyptian as *ail*, a stag; in Greek as *eriphos*, a kid, goat, *ellos*, a young deer, *alkē*, an elk; in Old High German as *elho*, *elaho*; German, *elke*; in Sanskrit (Ved.) as *riṣya*, male of a kind of antelope (See Boisacq: *Dict. Etym. de la Langue Grecque*). Note also that Kui, a Dravidian dialect, has *oḍri* for the rat and *ōḍa* for the goat, both forms having been probably the same at one time, as our *eli*, originally designating both rat and sheep. *ōḍa*, like the Tulu *yēḍu*, is of course, a transformation of our *ēḷa* or *ēḷa-ka*, becoming *ēḍaka*. With these compare the Latin *haedus*, a goat.

Gundert, in his Malayalam dictionary, as well as Caldwell, traced our *āḍu* to the verb *āḍu*, to move about, and believed that the name was given to the animal on account of its frisking. But it is clear from the above that it has had quite a different pedigree: *eli—ēḷa—ēḷà—yēḍu—yāḍu—āḍu*. The Skt. *mēsha* is certainly from our *ēḷa*. Its derivation from *mish* (*mēsho mishatēh*, *tathā pasu pasyatēh*—The Nirukta) is not tenable. Doubtless *ēḷa* (எழு pronounced also எஷ) has become *mēsha*. It is not an uncommon phenomenon in Skt. to find an initial *m* introduced before certain vowels, e. g. the first personal pronoun *aham* becomes *mām* etc. in the oblique cases. *Mēsha*, woollen fabric, is found in the Rig Veda, and this shows how old is our *ēḷa*. The Tulu *yēḍu* and our *yāḍu* are identical, the initial *ē* becoming *ā* as in *ēvan*,—*yāvan* etc. It is interesting to compare the Kurukh *ērā* with the Greek *erra-os*, as well as the Tamil *āḍu* with the Latin *ari-es*. Aries, the old Latin name for a goat, is now used to designate a sign in the zodiac. Our *āḍu* too was the ancient name of the same sign, as in “திண் நிலை மருப்பின் ஆடு தலையாக” (Neḷunalvāḍai). The later use of the word *mēḍam* is in imitation of Sanskrit usage.

The Last Treaty of Peace

BETWEEN THE KING OF KANDY AND THE PORTUGUESE

1633

BY

FATHER S. G. PERERA, S. J.

(Continued from page 295)

Memorial of the King of Kandy to the Viceroy of India.¹

Memorial which the King of Candea makes to Your Excellency, in which he asks some favours that are in your giving, and begs you to be his intercessor with His Majesty for other favours which he asks and shows to be just and reasonable.

The King of Candea says that these Realms, which he now has and governs, were never tributaries and never² paid tribute (pareas) to the King of Cota who was ever the chief King in this Island: that they always had natural heirs who governed the said realms as the sons of Dona Catherina now do as her lawful heirs.

He says also that when Raju³ succeeded to the Realms of Cota of which he made himself master by force and tyranny, its King was Preapandar⁴ who claimed to be its legitimate heir and who therefore turned to the Portuguese. Afterwards when the said Raju seeing himself in power came upon these Realms⁵ also with the same pride and conquered them and was master of them for some years,⁶ the Kings of Candea, who at the time had friendship with the Portuguese and even with the aforesaid Preapandar without any differences and had

1. Original in *Pazes e Tratados* No. 1 Ac de 1571 f 28.

2. This statement is inaccurate, Rv. 72. Bhuvanaka Bahu's letter (28-11-1543) in Schurhammer's. *Ceylon zur Zeit de Konigs Bhuvaneka Bahu, etc.* 123; and other historical sources show that the Kingdom of Kandy was tributary to Kotte. On absolute kings who held court at Kandy see Codrington' "Notes on the Kandyan Dynasty" 3 CLR ii 289-296 and 343-351.

3. Rajasinha of Sitawaka.

4. *Periya Pandavam* the Tamil form of *Maha Bandara*, 'Emperor' used as a personal name of Don Juan, last King of Kotte, 1551-1597.

5. Rajasinha invaded Kandy in 1582

6. About 12 years

relationship with him by marriage, for these reasons asked succour from the Portuguese against Raju: and they sent to their help the Captains of the fortresses of Columbo and Manar: and the natives of these Realms of Candea always acted with peace and friendship with the Portuguese without ever giving any occasion to His Majesty or to his vassals to make war on them and take their realms and lands.

He says moreover that when Pero Lopes de Souza came to this Island as conquistador,¹ he without further compliments tried to conquer and seize these Realms and to make himself² master of them: in which attempt his ill luck made him fall with the greater part of his companions, and open and bloody war lasted from that time to the time when Nuno Alvarez Pereira became General of this Island, a period of four and twenty years³ in all of which there were great hazards of war and many deaths and miseries of persons of all ranks both on the one side and on the other according to each one's fate.

The King of Candea says also that seeing matters in such danger and making for the destruction and end of the whole Island, he sought to avoid the evil by offering peace to the said General Don Nuno Alvarez Pereira on the conditions and oaths⁴ which Your Excellency can see from the informations which my⁵ ambassadors and procurators will present to you: this peace was observed entirely, neither side giving occasion for discord or difference.

He says moreover that there came as General to this Island Constantino de Noronha, and when the peace had lasted the better part of 13 years,⁶ the said General went to Baticalou by stealth and without any excuse and there built a fortress in his (the King's) port and lands: and he, the King, being informed of it sent to demand of him in the name of His Majesty not to erect the fortress as they were at peace and tranquillity but he replied deceitfully that he was only building a house and a Church for the work of conversions: but the King saw that all this was deceit and that the fortress was being built, and he was also called upon by his subjects and by all the people of this Island not to let such a fortress be built; thereupon war broke out so that in

1. In 1594

2. Expedition to enthorne Dona Catharina

3. 1594 to 1617

4. See ante II. p. 529 e sqq

5. The writer does not succeed in keeping to the third person.

6. 1617-1630

the whole extent of this Island there was no place that was not dyed with the blood of the poor and of all sorts of persons. In the midst of these troubles the General lost his life,¹ and in that war the said King took and captured two hundred and fifty Portuguese along with the Captain-Major and some Disawas and Captains, to all of whom he gave their lives and good treatment for the last two years and four² months awaiting an opportunity of coming to terms, being moved by the great loss and damage that this war had caused in all the lands of this Island and would still cause if they were not obviated by mean of a peace,

He says also that seeing a means and opportunity to remedy all these evils and that they might not continue, he sent ambassadors to treat of the matter with Don Jorge de Almeida the present Captain-General offering him every fair means of peace and friendship and the liberation of the prisoners in his power and to observe the conditions that should be agreed on in the peace. The said Captain-General immediately sent to this Court and Realm as ambassador Jeronimo de Oliveira³ da Cunha, a person of great quality, and having spent four months in discussing on both sides the negotiation of peace, it was resolved to inform Your Excellency of it and meanwhile during the coming and going of the reply a Truce and Suspension of Arms was made and sworn to by both sides in great security.

He says moreover that now he is sending his ambassadors and procurators to the Court of Your Excellency that you may hear them with justice and do them the favours he expects by ascertaining the truth about all affairs of this Island and the little occasion that he has given for the outbreak of this war, begging Your Excellency also to inform yourself particularly about Baticalou, both about its scanty revenues and importance of those lands as well as about that fortress, of what little value it is to His Majesty, so that you may thus do me⁴ the favour of removing it and giving me back my port without reserve so that these Realms may be at perpetual peace with the vassals of His Majesty, and I bound to serve him in all matters that occur in this Island and in other things that on his part ambassadors and procurators may demand in his name from Your Excellency from whom I expect great things.

S R I

1. At Vellavaya in August, 1630. •
2. From August, 1630 to December, 1632, the date of these letters.
3. Apparently a slip for Taveira.
4. See note 5 on previous page.

When the letter and the terms of peace which the King of Candea offers had been read, the Lord Count Viceroy settled with the said ambassadors the following with regard to each article

As regards the first it was resolved that His Excellency accepted the peace offered by the King on condition that the two sons, the Kings of Uva and Matale, would confirm and swear to the same along with the old King and Maastana King of Candea, though the old King is recognized as the chief of all.

On the second His Excellency observed that it was the obligation of tributaries to be friend of friends and enemy of enemies; but out of regard for the Kings of Candea, Uva and Matale, he said he would be friend of the friends of these Kings and enemy of their enemies on condition that their enemies are not friends of the State, for in that case the State will be neutral.

On the third His Excellency said that this was to be understood only of soldiers and lascarins in our army, and of other natives of the country that are not captured slaves, but not of other people; and even in the case of the persons mentioned, if they commit any treasonable crime or some disobedience against their Captains they may not be sheltered in the said Realms but should be delivered up: and that the General of the Island would do the same with those who commit similar crimes against the said King of Candea.

About the fourth article it was resolved by His Excellency that it was not proper except in the manner pointed out in the previous article.

As for the fifth article the Lord Viceroy concurred.

Regarding the sixth he said that the State would do the same, but that the said Kings should act in the same way: that in case the Captain-General of the Island sought to violate the peace towards the King of Candea or the said King towards the General, he, the King, should inform the Camara of the city of Colombo as he had no vessels wherein to send warning.

Regarding the seventh article His Excellency held that the lands of Batalou and that fortress belonged to His Majesty, but as the Lord Viceroy wished to do honour and favour to these Kings in the name of His Majesty, he granted the lands of Batalou to the said King of Candea but on the understanding that the land for two thousand geometrical paces round the fortress shall remain (to His Majesty), and should the land be less¹ as far as a shot from our pieces of artillery carries: the which shall be measured by a person deputed for it by the Captain-General of the Island, planting marks and buoys; and that the revenues of the custom dues of the port shall go half to the said King of Candea and the other half to His Majesty, and that, lest there should

1. The fort was on an island in the lagoon.

be any dispute on the subject or embarrassment in the recovery of dues, there will reside a Receiver of the said King of Candea in the said custom-house along with the officers of His Majesty so that each may receive what falls to him, and that thereby the entry of prohibited articles may be prevented. And the Captain of Baticalou will have order to issue all *cartazes*¹ to the King of Candea and his vassals for their navigation and commerce, and that in the said *cartazes* it will be noted what cargoes are shipped in the vessels and to whom, with a declaration that prohibited articles are not sent therein, such as arms and all appliances of that kind, in which case the vessel as well as the cargo shall be forfeit.

To the eighth and ninth articles His Excellency replied that the matter treated therein was one which he did not even wish to hear mentioned, because it was not only derogatory to His Majesty but even to the fidelity expected from the King of Candea; but in order to show him grace and favour in the name of His Majesty he will grant that of the two elephants which are obligatory² as tribute every year, one shall not be demanded for a space of six years, when that period is elapsed two elephants will be given as tribute as was always done, and that the arrears due will be paid immediately; in consideration for the delivery of the Portuguese whom he holds as prisoners and for the three hundred *amunams* of *nele* that was from ancient times paid as tribute by the Vaneas³ of Baticalou to the Captain of Manar and for other considerations that there are in this matter.

To the tenth article His Excellency replied that he accepted what was stated therein, and would fulfil on his part what concerned him on the understanding that the King would maintain the said Religious as was always the custom.

As regards the eleventh article His Excellency agreed to the demarcations in terms of the settlement in the time of Don Nuno Alvarez Pereira subject to the declaration in the seventh article in which it is stated that there shall be exempted an extent of two thousand geometrical paces of land around the fortress of Baticalou and if the land is less the extent of a cannon shot.

To the twelfth and last article His Excellency replied that he accepted the delivery of the Captains and the other Portuguese whom the said King of Candea held as prisoners, the which was always expected to be done as there could be no peace if the Portuguese or any other prisoners of war remained such,

(To be continued.)

1. Safe conducts
2. By the treaty of 1617
3. Vanniyars

The British Monopoly of Cinnamon

BY

COLVIN R. DE SILVA, B.A.PH.D. (LOND.)

Bar-at-Law.

(Continued. from p. 317.)

Cinnamon Oil.

Cinnamon Oil, which was extracted by distillation from chips and leaves, may be briefly dismissed. Though this was a valuable article of commerce, the income from this source was very small. Cordiner says a quart sold for ten guineas.¹ Every year a certain quantity was sent for sale to London. In 1799, for instance, four bottles, weighing $6\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. each, were forwarded,² but did not find a remunerative sale.³

During the period of the East India Company's contract only eleven bottles were sold.⁴ The prices averaged 11/9 per oz. and produced about £14. annually. Howard, during the period of his management, sold twenty-five bottles a year at 16/- per oz., producing an income of £500 a year.⁵ An attempt to sell this article as clove oil failed; for buyers soon discovered that it belied its name.⁶

The market for Cinnamon Oil was restricted for several reasons. The purchasers were confined to the Apothecaries Company and not more than three or four of the principal wholesale druggists.⁷ The demand fluctuated greatly, nor could the article be forced on the market, as very little of it sufficed to satisfy the demand. Moreover, it suffered from the competition of oil of Cassia, which sold at 10d. per oz., and the annual consumption of which was about 15,000 ozs.⁸ It also faced a duty of 1s. per oz.⁹

In 1832, Howard had in hand, 389 bottles, 258 quarts, and 131 pints of cinnamon oil, which was estimated to be worth £6,470.¹⁰

1. Cordinier i 417.

2. C.O. 54. i. North to Court of Directors, 4th March, 1799.

3. C.O. 54. 9. Hobart to North, 7th May, 1803.

4. C.O. 54. 119. Howard to Stewart, 13th February, 1832.

5. Ibid. 6. Ibid. 7. Ibid. 8. Ibid. 9. Ibid. 10. Ibid.

The Monopolist Controversy.

During the closing years of our period, a great controversy arose over the cinnamon monopoly. The two opposing parties may be termed the Monopolists and the Abolitionists. The Monopolists recognised the need of reforming the system, but not of changing the principles on which it was based. The Abolitionists were a root and branch school. They were competitive free-traders, and champions of *laissez-faire*. The source of their inspiration was Adam Smith. The chief protagonists in the controversy were Horton and Colebrooke. Horton held strong convictions on the subject, and in a series of unusually outspoken despatches expressed himself in no light terms.

The arguments and proposals of the Monopolists were summarized in the Colombo Journal of 19th May, 1832.

“The points of the argument that we have sustained upon the important subject of the production and trade of Cinnamon may be thus shortly recapitulated.”

“First. That the revenue obtained from the sale of Cinnamon under the present system must be considered as a substitute for the proceeds of some other mode of taxation, which must be devised were that revenue to cease.

“Secondly. That an export duty of 3s. per lb. that is, of 600%, were it a practicable measure, would be pro tanto a monopoly, that is, it would raise the price 600% above the natural price, as measured by the cost of production; but that it would be found to be an impracticable substitute for the present system, in consequence of the facilities which it would present to the smuggler, were the trade thrown open, and every proprietor allowed to grow and sell Cinnamon without restriction.

“Thirdly. That the present system ought to be, and we believe is, founded on a careful adjustment of the supply to the demand of the consumers of Cinnamon in the markets of the world, so as to avoid any material diminution of money return for the quantity sold in each succeeding year, at the same time progressively enlarging the market and cheapening the commodity.

“Fourthly. That the real state of the demand is ascertained by the variations of price which the merchants who purchase for the purpose of supplying consumers in all parts of the world, are prepared to offer for cinnamon at the periodical sales, which take place of that commodity.

“Fifthly. That the system above described could, *after due preparation and notice*, be carried on with increased advantage, were the sale of cinnamon transferred from London to Colombo, or any port of Ceylon, inasmuch as, in addition to the money-revenue received from such sale, and which would be obtained on the same principles as the present revenue, the exporting merchants would have an interest in filling up their cargoes with *other* articles of Ceylon produce, which would tend to stimulate and increase its capabilities at an early period.

“Sixthly. That it would however be most undesirable that the transfer described in the preceding article should take place, or any alteration of the present system, unless the British Parliament were entirely consentient to the transfer, and prepared to supply, without remonstrance, any temporary defalcation of the revenue, which might take place in the early period of the change, with whatever degree of caution and management it might be conducted; the British Parliament, of course, taking as their security for such advances the certainty of improved revenue in succeeding years, and the consequent certainty of repayment.

“Seventhly. That should the time ever arrive, when foreign countries shall successfully compete upon an extensive scale with Ceylon in the growth of Cinnamon, the only sound policy will be to do away altogether with the restrictive system, to allow individuals to produce and sell Cinnamon, as they would coffee or rice, at a remunerating price, to permit its export free of duty; and to trust that quantity at a low price instead of quality at a high one, will so increase the wealth of individuals as to present, in that increased wealth, the means of carrying into effect some new system of taxation.

“Eighthly. That until the restrictive system be absolutely done away with, it ought to be maintained with strictness, and that the fewer cinnamon plants upon the estates of private individuals the better; it being more beneficial to all parties that this spice, furnishing such an exemption from taxation to the population generally, should be produced and exported under the direct management of the Government.”

The Author of this summary was Horton himself,

The Abolitionist Case.

The criticisms and counter arguments of the Abolitionists fell broadly into two groups. They condemned the system of production. They criticised the manner in which the trade was conducted. The system of production was assailed along three main lines.

“ One of the strongest objections to the monopoly as now conducted is that a whole race of people is fettered to a particular profession, in which no more than the wages of a day-labourer can be earned.”¹ This statement summarises the first main line of criticism. In essence, it is an attack on the system of forced labour. The severe regulations enforcing Chaliya obligations have already been outlined. Concurrently with the tightening of the administration of these laws, the compensating privileges of the Chaliyas had been whittled away to nothingness. Simultaneously the quantity and the quality of the cinnamon required to be produced by them had been raised. A peeler, whose period of service was nominally about 5½ months in the year, had now to serve at least eight months to produce his quota.² Moreover, they had to endure great hardships. The dangers from Kandyan hostility were indeed gone; but the wild animals and the endemic fevers of the Kandyan jungles remained. Since the occupation of the Kandyan Provinces, their employment in that quarter had been greatly extended.³ In 1827 alone, of some 2,100 peelers employed, over 300 had died of fever in the Kandyan jungles.⁴ Native medical attendance in sickness, and small pensions to families in case of death on duty, were certainly provided.⁵ But the one was inefficient and the other insufficient. And there were no pensions for those who grew old and debilitated in the service.⁶ The peelers had to go far into the jungles to collect cinnamon, and they had to deliver it at certain appointed spots. Cases were not infrequent where peelers purchased cinnamon from Kandyans at higher rates than they received themselves, in order to escape the long sojourn in the Kandyan jungles.⁷ Those who could afford it, employed other peelers to cut their share, paying

1. Colombo Journal, 21st April, 1832, Liber's letter.
2. C. O. 416. 5. B3. Gregory De Zoysa on Chaliya Grievances.
3. C. O. 416. 5. B5. p 11
4. C. O. 416. 5. B3. Chaliya Grievances.
5. C. O. 416. 5. B5. p. 11.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.

higher rates than Government.¹ The rate of pay was poor, and caused debt and destitution. Few men earned more than seven Rix Dollars a month.² Peelers often returned empty-handed after ten months' work, having sometimes sold, mortgaged or pawned their personal belongings.³ Also, in many of the processes of peeling, their wives and children had to help.⁴

The labourers were in no better condition. Compelled to attend for four months in the year at Colombo, to work in the preserved plantations which stretched a distance of thirty six miles between Chilaw and Moratto, they had to neglect their own occupations. As many Chaliyas were traders, weavers, fishermen, and landowners, this was a severe blow to them. Moreover, as many of them had to come from a long distance, they took over a week to get to and from work.⁵ A further week or so was generally spent in the endeavour to recover arrears of pay from their headmen.⁶ As they were never employed for more than a month at a time, at least one half, instead of one third, of a man's time was thus spent on the Government service. The punishments in all cases were corporal, or, as was more usual, the exaction of a greater quantity of work.⁷

Chaliyas also complained of being employed in work not pertaining to their caste, nor in accordance with their obligations.⁸ Walbeoff mentions the employment of a number of these men in felling and dragging timber for the use of the Quarter Master General's Department.⁹ Further, they suffered from the petty oppressions and exactions of their headmen, who forced them to do their private work unpaid — "to which undue impositions the poor wretches are as punctual as to their regular duties, as they are sure that the consequence of a refusal will subject them to greater harm."¹⁰ Bribery, to avoid being molested or unjustly called out, was common.¹¹ The slightest omission of respect

1. Ibid.
2. Ibid. p. 10.
3. C. O. 416. 5. B3. Chaliya Grievances
4. C. O. 416. 5. B6. p. 18.
5. C. O. 416. 5. B3.
6. Ibid.
7. C. O. 416. 5. B5. p. 16.
8. C. O. 416. 5. B3.
9. C. O. 416. 5. B6. p. 4.
10. C. O. 416. 5. B3.
11. Ibid.

to, or discrimination between headmen, would not go unavenged.¹ Men could seldom draw their full pay, as the headmen retained a portion or forced them to give presents.² The desire to win the encomiums of their superiors and the anxiety for personal profit coincided to produce further abuses. Chaliyas were liable to employment between the ages of fourteen and fifty years.³ "Headmen, being paid by the number of men they employ, have no regard for age, disease, or other disabilities, or any calamity which renders a man's presence so absolutely necessary to manage his affairs, but compel persons of all conditions from boys of sixteen to persons tottering with age to attend,"⁴ Things were the worse in that headmen enjoyed the exercise of a wide discretion.

The Chaliyas, remarked J. W. Maitland in 1814, were neither lazy nor intractable, as had so often been represented. The Korle Mudliyas had industriously fostered this opinion for personal ends. "I fear their false representations and something of a like feeling, operating upon the judgment of some of the Civil Servants, have led them to give weight to these unfounded aspersions of the Chaliya character."⁵ He sums up the whole matter thus: "Since I had the honour to be at the head of the Department, it has been not only a painful and disagreeable, but disgusting part of my duty to punish individuals for disobedience or neglecting to perform a task imposed on them against their inclination; agreeable to immemorial custom, this particular caste was, and still is, liable to this employment; not being their fault but their misfortune, I feel for them and pity them, and would be most happy were it in my power to render their service more easy, or to ameliorate their condition."⁶ According to their evidence before the Commission of Enquiry, the officials of the Department in 1830 seem to have concurred in this opinion.⁷

The second line of criticism was directed against the severities of the Cinnamon Code. Its detrimental effect on agriculture and land-values was thus summarized by Anstruther, the Chief Secretary. "The Regulations for the protection of cinnamon unquestionably had

1. Ibid.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

5. C. O. 416. 5. Bii. p. 33. 24th August, 1814.

6. C. O. 416. 5. B3. Maitland to Deputy Secretary.

7. cf. C. O. 416. 5. B5. and B6.

to diminish the value of lands on which the plant spontaneously grows, because every cinnamon plant that springs up becomes the property of the Crown, protected by heavy penalties. Instances have been known of gardens in the neighbourhood of preserved cinnamon plantations becoming wholly useless to the proprietors, from being overrun with cinnamon. Landowners are also afraid to destroy the jungle on such lands, lest they should unintentionally injure a cinnamon plant, or at least be accused of it.”¹ The rearing of live-stock in the neighbourhood of the preserved plantations was well-nigh an impossibility.² Other vexatious restrictions have already been outlined. Above all the system was liable to great abuses. Chaliyas entering private grounds on legitimate duties were often guilty of depredations on the property of individuals.³ False accusations were not unknown. Chaliyas were charged with secretly uprooting plants in the grounds of enemies or of those against whom they bore some grudge, and of then accusing them before the Courts.⁴ Rewards to informers were so high, that they constituted a direct incitement to false accusation. To escape was difficult, and the punishment heavy. The following summary of a case speaks for itself, and needs no comment:—

“Moonewiregey Dines Fernando of Paiyagala, Plaintiff—
Fottebadduwa Silvestry Cangan, a Chaliya, Defendant—accused of destroying cinnamon—sentenced to pay a fine of ten Rix Dollars, and in failure of such payment, to be imprisoned at hard labour for a period of twenty weeks, and then discharged.”⁵

Finally, the system was not even economical. The number of superintendents, and the network so often superfluous and sometimes redundant, native officials, rendered costs of management too heavy. £7,000 out of a total expenditure of £25,000 was spent on this item alone.⁶ Colebrooke pointed out the uneconomical nature of the arrangements of separate superintendents for each plantation, all subordinate to another Superintendent at the head of the Department.⁷ The Collectors in the districts, with a

1. C. O. 416. 5. B13.

2. Bertolacci. 130.

3. e.g. C. O. 416. 4, A15. Answer 8.

4. Colebrooke's Report 40.

5. C. O. 416. 14. F. 28.

6. Colebrooke's Report 40. cf. Appendix for an abstract of all expenses incurred by Government on cinnamon.

7. Ibid.

small additional staff, could easily have managed the business.¹ The system was expensive, and the cultivation careless.² Forced labourers, brought from distant districts, took no interest in the work they performed. The plantations were too extensive for particular superintendence.³ The plants often failed, and those growing in private gardens were frequently more healthy.⁴ Private management could not but be cheaper and more efficient. As things were, the people of Ceylon were deprived of a share either in the production or the sale of the one product, natural to Ceylon, which was proving highly remunerative.

Criticism of the Sales System.

The sales system was also criticised along three main lines. Ceylon had riveted her attention too exclusively on the European market. The prohibition of sales in Ceylon, and the confinement of them to London alone, had resulted in the entire loss of the valuable Eastern market.⁵ Some means of recovering this trade was essential, and it could only be regained by the resumption of sales to the East from Ceylon.

Secondly, the severe competition from Cassia was undermining the position of Ceylon cinnamon. Cassia was neither more nor less than an inferior type of cinnamon, which, along with Cassia buds, was used as a cheap and not unsatisfactory substitute. Everywhere, it was ousting Ceylon cinnamon from the market. For its price varied from 6d. to 1s. 6d., which was far below the price of even third quality Ceylon cinnamon. In the period 1804-1808, the East India Company's sales of Cassia in London for the European market amounted to 228,771 lbs. per year, at an average price of 1s. 5½d. per lb.⁶ In the period 1814-1821, this had increased to 382,763 lbs. a year.⁷ In 1830, imports of the article to London had risen to 837,589 lbs. of which 797,642 lbs. were re-exported.⁸ There could be no doubt, argued

1. Ibid.

2. C. O. 54. 128. Horton to Goderich, 20th May, 1833. Encl. Answer to Question I.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

5. Colebrooke's Report 42.

6. C. O. 54. 20. Brownrigg to Bathurst 1815 Encl. Marshall's Report.

7. C. O. 54. 80. Barnes to Bathurst. 27th December, 1820.

8. C. G. G. 27th June 1835. Table of Exports and Imports.

Colebrooke, that Cassia at 1s. 4d. and 1s. 6d. was taking the place of cinnamon at 6s. and 6s. 6d.¹ It was the same tale in the East, Cassia imports to India, in 1810, amounted to 402,525 lbs. A further 199,977 lbs. were exported from China in American bottoms.² At that period, Ceylon sold over 150,000 lbs. of low thirds to the East. Now that market was lost to Cassia, and Bombay was doing a considerable entrepot trade in the article. Ceylon cinnamon, at a comparable price, could here find an indefinite market.

Lastly monopoly prices had limited consumption. The system was based on the erroneous assumption that cinnamon was a luxury for which the demand, though steady, was strictly limited. Hence it had been assumed that a reduction in price would not lead to increased sales, while overstocking the market would only cause a fall in prices. The latter contention was certainly correct; but the premise was equally not the case. "I must be permitted to assume," Barnes had argued as early as 1821, "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."³ Colebrooke held a similar opinion.⁴ A reduction in the British duty from 2s. 6d. to 6d. per lb. in 1829, had resulted in an immediate increase of home consumption from an average of 15,000 lbs. a year to 45,921 lbs. in the same year.⁵ Cinnamon was used both as a condiment and as a drug or medicine. In the East itself, the coarser and cheaper sorts were extensively used in both forms. The cheap sale of Ceylon cinnamon in the bazaars of the East, contended Colebrooke, would instantly increase its consumption.⁶ Nor was the Monopolist argument true of the West. Even under the existing system of management, sales had increased from the 325,843 lbs. in the period 1804-1814 to over 500,000 lbs. in 1830.

Moreover, high prices were inducing the cultivation of cinnamon in other lands. Cinnamon was not a "natural monopoly" of Ceylon. True, Ceylon cinnamon was unrivalled. But inferior cinnamon was grown on the Malabar Coast, and in the Nicobar Islands; in Sumatra,

1. Colebrooke's Report 41.

2. *Op. cit.* Marshall's Report. December, 1821.

3. C. O. 54. 80 Barnes to Bathurst, 27th

4. Report.

5. Colombo Journal, 18th April, 1832. Philo Liber's letter.

6. C. O. 54. 54. East India Company to Bathurst, 7 October, 1814.

Java, Borneo and Timor, in the Malay Archipelago; in the Sooloo Archipelago and the Philippine Islands; and in Tonkin, Canton and Cochin China; besides several other places in the torrid zone. Horton himself had pointed out in 1831 that Java and Travancore had entered the market with cinnamon of good quality, to the cultivation of which they had been attracted by the prevailing prices.¹ Guiana, Mauritius, Martinique, and Brazil had followed suit;² places which had formerly been supplied from Ceylon. If prices were reduced, Ceylon cinnamon could drive these numerous competitors from the market. For Ceylon, with her natural advantages, could still make a profit at a price level which would be unremunerative to her competitors.

(To be continued).

1. C. O. 54. 114. Horton to Goderich, 9 November, 1831
2. Tenent 11. 153.

Ancient Geography of Ceylon

BY

EUGENE BURNOUF

(Translated from the French)

Contd. from p. 324.

Thus it appears to me quite legitimate to conclude from the absence of any designation like *Palaisimondou* in the Sinhalese chronicles, that either the ancients were mistaken in applying it to Taprobane or that they by some mistake applied to the whole island the name of a locality evidently of some importance. I am aware, indeed, that to give weight to the first alternative one should show that there was in fact an island bearing that name which the Greeks transferred to Taprobane. This is as difficult as to prove that the name *Palaisimoundou* was known to the Sinhalese, and Dodwell has been justly blamed by Dr. Vincent¹ for trying to find a *Palaisimoundou* other than Taprobane on the west coast of the peninsula. But the second alternative has great plausibility, for it is noticeable that the four authorities for the statement that ancient Taprobane was called *Palaisimoundou* or *Simoundou* can be reduced to one, namely to Ptolemy, since Marcion is evidently only transcribing the text of his predecessor, and Agathemerus as well as Stephanus Byzantius are only quoting an extract from it. The name *Palaisimoundou* is also given by Pliny it is true, but only as the name of a town at the mouth of a river of the same name. Thus all that antiquity tells us about *Palaisimoundou* is that it is, according to Pliny, the name of a celebrated town of his time, and according to Ptolemy, who is followed by Agathemerus, Marcion and Stephanus Byzantius, the name of the whole of Taprobane. This circumstance justifies the supposition that the name of a town called *Palaisimoundou* has been transferred by some Western voyagers to the island of Taprobane during the time that elapsed between Pliny and Ptolemy.

1. The Commerce and Navigation of the Ancients in the Indian Ocean II 57 in the edition of 1807.

I must avow, however, that a town bearing such a name is no longer found in Ceylon and that the last syllable of *Palaisimoundou* can, as suggested by Vossius, be translated island, which makes it a name ill adapted to a town and a river. Of all the difficulties arising from this name by far the most difficult is that of finding a meaning to assign to it. One might perhaps find in the languages of that part of Asia the means of recomposing that name; and restricting ourselves to Ceylon only, the words *palal-Sumana-Diva* 'the island of the vast mountain Saman,' might perhaps appear to be not too remote from *Palaisimoundou*. One might also add that it would be very natural to designate Ceylon from the name of the lofty mountain to which that island owes some part of its celebrity; but I repeat that this term 'Island of the mountain Samana' or Adam's Peak, is not met with in any Sinhalese book that I am able to consult, and till it is found we must renounce any attempt to use it in explaining *Palaisimoundou*. It is one thing to explain the terms applied to oriental countries by classical authorities by those which are now in use in the countries or are found in oriental books; it is quite another thing to make use of the languages of Asia to explain the names handed down to us by the ancients. The latter attempt may sometimes turn out successful; but it seems to me rarely legitimate, and if I may express my mind quite freely the informations of Western voyagers do not all equally deserve such importance to be attached to their statements as to lead us to expect that we shall be able to explain them by reference to the languages of the countries concerned.

The last of the ancient names of Ceylon that we have still to examine is *Salike*, which Ptolemy gives as used in his days. The same authorities, excepting Pliny and the author of *Periplus*, mention that designation, that is to say Agathemerus, Marcion and Stephanus Byzantius, who can all be reduced in fact to one, namely to Ptolemy. Thus with *Salike* it is exactly the same as with *Palaisimoundou*: both names are more modern than Taprobane, and are mentioned by a far lesser number of authors. There is, however, one important difference between *Salike* and *Palaisimoundou*, for the former is not isolated but is connected with *Salae*, a name which according to Ptolemy was borne by the inhabitants of the island. Practically all geographers, and among them d'Anville and Mannert, have pointed out the connection between *Salae* and *Salike*, and they regarded the latter as derived from

the former, but derived, as we must add with Dr. Vincent,¹ according to the genius of the Greek language, a circumstance which the other authors we named do not mention. That is what seems an evident result of the connection between *Salai* and *Salike*. But if this opinion is admitted, with the limitation which we hope to add to it, we must conclude that the name *Salike*, which Ptolemy gives as the name by which Taprobane was known in his time, must have been used by Greek navigators and not known to the Sinhalese. From which it also follows that we must not expect to find the name *Salike* in Sinhalese texts where it is not to be found. But that is not the same with *Salai*; if Western voyagers have used it to designate the inhabitants of Ceylon, there must be really some name, either identical or at least analogous to *Salai*, in use in that island towards the second century of our era. The question thus is only transferred; for if the question is not about *Salike*, which we regard as a name imposed on Ceylon by Greek navigators, it rises about *Salai*, from which *Salike* is derived.

This conclusion receives some support from the fact that among the names of Ceylon used by the Sinhalese, one does not find *Salike*. It is true indeed that if one could be satisfied with a similarity of form, there is room to believe that *Salike* is a kind of metathesis of *Srilaka* 'the happy Lanka', the Greeks making a slight change in the beginning of the word. This explanation, if it could be supported by more solid reason, would have the advantage of showing us *Lanka* a name which does not appear to have been known to the ancients, but it cannot explain *Salai*, for it cannot be supposed that it was the Greeks who called the people *Salae*, from *Salike* the name of the island, as such a derivation is contrary to all probability. But if the contrary is true, namely that *Salike* is derived from *Salai*, then *Salike* cannot be derived from *Srilaka*. This objection holds likewise against the etymology of de Bohlen, who thinks that *Salike* of Ptolemy is derived from *Sinhalaka* a synonym for *Sinhaladvipa*. Besides that *Sinhalaka* does not, as far as I am aware, exist in any Sinhalese writing, and that it seems prudent to abstain from forming theoretically in such matters, however accurately it may appear, the words we are in need of, the suggested explanation would leave *Salai*, so closely connected with *Salike*, without explanation. We shall show presently how much of de Bohlen's conjecture might be admissible: at present it is enough to point out that *Salike* cannot be from *Sinhalaka*, a word which does not

1. Ib. 494.

exist. The explanation of Wilford who thinks that *Salike* comes from *Shāla* or *Shāli*, of neither of which he gives a translation, is too obscure to need dwelling upon. Wilford is perhaps only reproducing an explanation suggested, as we shall presently show, by a Sinhalese tradition; but his laconism prevents us from making any affirmation in the matter. Finally the explanation of Th. Hyde evades the difficulty too arbitrarily, for he changes *Salike* into *Salini* to connect it with the modern name of Ceylon: there is absolutely no justification for the reading *Salini*.

While some attempted in vain to trace the name *Salike* without first inquiring into *Salai*, others tried to solve the question as it was propounded by the majority of geographers. Thus Vossius thought that the *Salai* of Ptolemy were the people now called *Gale*. I am afraid this savant, or rather the voyagers whose narrations he consulted, have confused *Haly* or *Saleas*, the name of a well known caste in Ceylon, with the name of the district of *Gale* where they are numerous, for I am not aware that the word *Gale*, which in Sinhalese is *Gala* and means 'rock', has ever been used to designate a tribe of people in Ceylon, and there is no mention of any such name in the long and apparently correct list of the divisions of the Sinhalese people given by Valentyn. At the beginning of this century another explanation of the *Salai* of Ptolemy was put forward by Joinville in India and by Wahl in Europe. It is at first blush a very satisfactory explanation and only needed for its adoption the testimony of texts that may perhaps exist in Ceylon but which we have not in France. According to these authors the *Salai* of Ptolemy are probably the *Salea* or *Chalias* of modern times, who form a powerful caste whose occupation now is the collection of the cinnamon bark, but who are descended from a Brahman tribe of weavers known in Ceylon as *Pēskara*. This caste which contends with the fishermen for the second place in the Sinhalese hierarchy possess books, one of which bears the title of *Saliegesoutre* (perhaps *Sālyaya sutra*) axioms of the *Sālyaya* or *Chalia*. In the memoir of Joinville, from which we take these details as well as in the third volume of the collection of Upham, there is a short history of this tribe to which is attached a number of curious facts. Without attempting to enter into an examination of the documents relating to this caste, an examination which we shall make when we come to treat of the ancient and modern people of Ceylon, we may state that the *Pēskara* have come at three different epochs separated by long intervals, from the extremity of the Indian

peninsula, first in the days of Vijaya, afterwards under Deveni Paetissa about the third century before our era according to the reckoning of the Sinhalese, finally at an epoch very near our own at the beginning of the thirteenth century. Now at each migration, the repetition of which is explained by the small progress which the art of weaving made in Ceylon, the *Pēskara* retained their name. It is only after the last establishment in the neighbourhood of the modern town of Chilaw that their descendants took the name of *Saleasgame* according to Joinville or *Hāllagama* according to Upham, a term which in Pali should be written *Sālāgama* or 'village of halls', which was given them on account of the *sālā* or halls in which they exercised their craft.

From this narrative it appears that the descendants of the *peskara* of the twelfth century, or the *Pēskara* themselves brought to Ceylon the name of *Chalia*, written in various ways, *Challia*, *Chiallia*, *Salea*, *Saleagame*, *Hally*, *Hallagama*. But one cannot conclude that this name has been the name of the earlier *Pēskara* of the time of Deveni Paetissa or Vijaya or in the year 77 of our era according to the Siamese. That however is the point about which one must be certain in order to hold that the *Salai* of Ptolemy are the *Chalia* of modern times. If Joinville did not state, the question in the same way as we, it was because when he made the statement he had some reason to think that the name *Chalia* was well known since the beginning of our era. But we do not find the same grounds for conviction, either in the history of the *Chalia* given by Adrian Raja Paksa, chief of that caste, or in the short account found at the end of the third volume of Upham. But until it can be positively established that the *Chalia* existed before the twelfth century of our era, we must renounce the use of that word in explaining the *Salai* of Ptolemy. We shall also have to inquire whether there has not been some connection between this tribe and that of *Shalay* who are weavers on the Coromandel coast and are believed to be Telingas by origin. I could not find in the Tamil dictionaries existing in the Imperial Library the word *Shālay* applied to a caste; but I must remark that in Tamil *Shālay* is the regular orthography of the Sanskrit *sālā*, which in its Pali and Sinhalese form is *Sālā* or *Sālāva* and gave rise to the name *Chalia*.

(To be continued)

The Kandyan State Trial.

EDITED BY
FATHER S. G. PERERA, S.J.

(Continued from page 335)

Fifth Witness—Dullaiwe¹ Adigar—*The First Adigar came to my house; those who went with him and those who collected on the road. When the Adigar was coming to my house, I went a little distance to meet him. I know Welagedere Rate Adikareme. I am on bad terms with him; he came with the Adigar on that day. He and a number of others came. I told them generally 'you can now return to your villages.'* It was at the door outside that I told them so—*He did not come into the house.* I said 'every one that came from Matele, you can now return to your villages.' Know Haincombore Mohottale; when His Excellency went to Anooradhapoorra, I sent for that person and many others to build a bungalow at Nalande where I entertained His Excellency and his suite; I had the usual conversation with the people of the province; never had a private conversation with Welagedere.

Cross-examined by Mr. Carr. I am on bad terms with Welagedere. He took leave of me in the hall; I, Molligoda, and Dunuwille (1st and 2nd Prisoners) and many others were in the hall. I did not call him into the inner hall. No others came. As it was evening, about five hours before nightfall, they were permitted to go. I know of no buildings in the jungle near my house having been built. After I had been arrested and returned, the Assistant Agent told me that a Pansale² was built in the village Weregama in the Province of Matele; he showed me a plan of that Pansale, and asked me if I knew it. It was one Cingalese mile from my house. I don't know what the house in the centre was lined with white cloth for. A plan of it was shown me by the Assistant Agent and I said I knew nothing of it. I asked the Agent

1. Dulleywe Nawaratna Wickramsinha Samarakon Jayatillaka Pandita Mudianse, Second Adigar, afterwards Diwa Nilame of the Dalada Maligawa. In the Matala Rebellion of 1848, he was 80 years old, but was nevertheless seized and imprisoned, though afterwards set free on the advice of the Queen's Advocate. He died 1 June, 1849.

2. Residence of Buddhist Priests.

if I might not also go and see it ; there are different forms in which cities are built. I did not see how it had been built; I told him that I did not know what it was for. I told him unless I made enquiries I could say nothing about it. Two days after this I came to Kandy, and did not return. I made no enquiries about it. I sent Aloomwihare Gantuna Raterale and Godapusse Raterale to whom the plan was shown. I said 'I can give you no account of it ; I must make enquiry.' The Assistant Agent told me there was a large collection of rice. Gantuna and Godapusse Raterales having examined the plan, came and told me they were going to perform the ceremony of *waas*;¹ they don't ask our permission to hold *pinkamas*;² at that time I was in Owille. I gave three apartments to those Chiefs who came to my house; there are two divisions in my house which I furnished and gave to those Chiefs, and occupied another myself. *I don't recollect having offered to give information against them. I gave a writing to Mr. Turnour, I don't recollect anything else.* One day I went to the First Adigar's house; several priests came and spoke about their affairs; that the low country people used to come to Kandy for Upasampada³ ordination from the low country, and now the people went from Kandy for it. *I do not recollect writing to Mr. Turnour that the First Adigar once used words which deserved justly to be regarded with suspicion.* Many *olas*⁴ were sent to Welagedere on Government service. I always mentioned the subject in those writings; except in one instance. I think this was thirty days before my arrest; that *ola* which I allude to, was that he should come with such and such people to erect the buildings at Nalande. I think more than thirty days before my arrest which was in June or July. He being the headman of that division, whom else could I apply to? I wrote in that *ola* His Excellency was coming to Nalande; there may be more than one which did not mention the subject. I think in that *ola* I said 'I was going to Nālnade myself, you must collect the people of such and such stations and come to Nalande because it was my intention to give an entertainment to His Excellency and to build a bungalow for his accommodation'. I don't recollect any other *olas*; if I see them, I could say; I can't answer exactly unless I see them; there are various writings which I have sent. Under present circumstances I thought it

1. "A period of four months in which monks who are occupied with preaching do not leave the Monastery or place selected, and are fed by the people."

2. "Religious ceremony or festival".

3. "Ceremony of a monk's profession".

4. A letter written on palm-leaf, talpat, or puskola.

was not proper to give the people the order to assemble as in former times to build bungalows; therefore I did not express the reason. I am not nearly related to the prisoners.

(*The first Prisoner's testimonials were this day produced to the Jury, at the closing of the Court*)

Seventh Day—Monday, January 19th.

Sixth Witness—Narangammame, Mohandiram—I accompanied first Prisoner and others. I was with them when they went to 2nd Adigar's house; did not hear him address the people; there were many Headmen present; Welagedere came to the Second Adigar's house with 1st Prisoner; I know when he went away; because we all left the Second Adigar's house at the same time. I can't state European time precisely; it was 2 or 3 Cingalese hours before dark; there were others who went with me; after we went to the Rate Adikareme's house he presented me with food and I went and slept in the maddoo;¹ it was five English miles distant from the 2nd Adigar's house; no petty headmen went into the house. They took leave of them in the hall.

Cross-examined by Mr. Carr—I took leave with Welagedere; know Ellapate and Hanguranketa Basnaike Nilemes; they were in another direction when Welagedere took his leave; I can't say if they saw us when we took leave or not. They were at the large gate when we took our leave. I did not take much notice when we took leave of the 2nd Adigar. I only saw them entering the hall door; we were on a pilgrimage; several shot were discharged at Anooradhapoor. Two first prisoners had not their fowling-pieces. If any others saw them I did not; one Kooda Banda (Tikiry Banda) fired his gun at different things; the second Prisoner remonstrated with him against it; and threatened to beat him. I did not see any shooting at game; it was also at the temple the guns were discharged to obtain merit; 2nd Prisoner told him, 'you are only to fire the gun when there is any ceremony going on.' I did not see any drinking going on. There were priests present. I did not see them drinking; nor the priests object to it; when Welagedere and I went away there were others with us, Rattoo Kohogedere Mohottale and Tallywelle Gebanarale; only we four. After we had proceeded on, Tallywelle parted with us at Yatawatte, the place where his village is as well as the others. Welagedere

1. Sin. "Shed," "hall".

and I went on; when they parted it was in the dusk of the evening. The two Chiefs dined there; where they take their food we are not allowed to be present; there was no other dinner that I know of. I took leave and did not stay to take rice; there was rice ready for the Chiefs' attendants. I did not see Welagedere take rice. I did not see who took the rice with him. I can only say I did not see who took rice with him. I saw Ellapate with the Chiefs, and before in Kandy. I knew Hanguranketa also in Kandy. I did not tell any one of this matter. I should have told it if I had been asked by any one. This is the first time I have told it. I mention it here because I am asked here—I was not desired by any one to mention it—*I can swear I have not told any one until now.*

Cross-examined by Mr. Carr—I went to Mr. Staples' house yesterday. I told him what evidence I had to give. I am sure that no person of our country asked me about this until the enquiry was made of me yesterday by Mr. Staples.

Seventh Witness—Parapey¹ Vidan,² sworn.—I am Vidan of the first Prisoner's Walauwa.³ I was never sent by the first Prisoner to call Watterantenne Rate Mahatmeya.

Eighth Witness—Wellimone⁴ Korale —I know first Prisoner; I am in the habit of going to his house; he has several houses. I don't know which you mean. I recollect having been at first Prisoner's house in 4 Korles some days before his arrest. I have not been in his house at Kandy for a long time; not for two years. I cannot speak with accuracy as to the frequency of my visiting him in the 4 Korles; every 7 or 8 days. I am quite sure I have not been at his house at Kandy for two years. I know Watterantenne Rate Mahatmeya; have never seen him at the first Prisoner's house; not on any occasion.

• *Cross-examined by Mr. Perring—I live in Four Korles; 4 or 5 Cingalese miles from Kandy. I come to Kandy frequently. I was in Kandy during the last session. I was to be tried in the Supreme Court. I have known the Adigar a long time; from his infancy. I live near*

1. A village in the Four Korales, Kinigoda.
2. Headman of a village.
3. The Residence of a chief.
4. Velimanna, in Tumpalata of Paranakuru Korale.

the Walauwe of the first Prisoner; on occasions when asked I have performed services for him. There was something like an imputation thrown on me by the First Adigar. I was appointed Korale in a certain division; and the Adigar threatened to get me dismissed. If I had been a bad character, he would have dismissed me, but as I was not, he did not. Though there were some imputations against me, my neither being tried nor dismissed are in my favour. I did not tell him of this. I did not go to Anooradhapoorā. I met him on his return to the Walauwe at the Court House at Ootuankandy.¹ I did not come to Kandy to meet him. I did not come to Kandy with him when he went; if any one said so it must be false. When the Supreme Court came to Kandy the first time, I had held an inquest and came on that subject. I did not go to the Walauwe then. I don't come to Kandy without the permission of our Agent.² I have been to Colombo lately. I went to see about the first Prisoner, and other things. I went to the Supreme Court, I did not distinctly understand what I heard about the Jury. I did not go to see about that, I did not speak about the Jury, but when the trial was to take place. I might have asked about that, but can't recollect if I did exactly. I don't recollect having spoken to any one about the Jury. It was partly about this case that I went to see the Maha Nilleme. He is not a great friend of mine but being our Chief I thought it proper to see him. I did not say that I would give any evidence; when I received orders I said I would tell what I knew; I did not say what evidence. Mr. Staples asked what I knew and I told him that I would state what I had to state in Court. It is all the same to me whether he is acquitted or not; if he has committed any offence and the Government punishes him, I can't help it. How could the last witness see me at the Walauwe when I did not go there? I did not see the last witness at the Walauwe when I went there. How can I say if I saw the last witness at the Adigar's house? I might have seen the man at his Walauwe in Kandy at his house in the Four Korles. I can't say if he saw me or not at the Walauwe. I have not been there, I can only say what I have seen; it is doubtful, I don't recollect having been at the Walauwe within one year. I passed the Walauwe gate yesterday and the day before; on the first occasion I came to the Supreme Court I must have passed by the Walauwe and the last witness must have seen me there.

1. The District Court sat at Utuwankanda.

2. Accredited Agent of Government for the Four Korales.

Ninth Witness—Weerabahoagedere Aratchie—I know Mahawalatenne Dessave ; did not know him previously ; went to his house ten or fifteen days after the Prisoners went to Colombo ; when I was going in the street, the Vidahn attached to his house called me in ; the Dessave spoke to me. He asked me ‘of what village are you?’ if I saw the Government Agent before I went there. He (the Dessave) asked me if I knew anything about what happened to the Chiefs.

The witness was stopped and the following discussion respecting his further evidence then took place.

The Counsel for the Prisoners contended that as Mahawalatenne Dessave was the acknowledged Agent in collecting information for the Crown, any witnesses he might call to prove that unlawful means had been resorted to by that individual, were admissible evidence to throw suspicion or discredit on those witnesses whose evidence had been obtained through his instrumentality.

The King’s Advocate contended it was not evidence, but said he had no objection whatever to the Counsel for the Prisoners examining this, and any other witness, on the subject.

The learned Judge remarked, that unless the Counsel for the Prisoners could prove that the witnesses already examined for the Crown had been tampered with by the Dessave, and that he had received instructions to that effect from those who employed him, (which no one would believe who was acquainted with Mr. Turnour’s character), a conversation which the Dessave might have had with a person who was not a witness for the Crown, certainly could not be admitted as evidence.

The King’s Advocate again stated that the Counsel for the Prisoners was welcome to examine witnesses on that point ; but it was overruled by the Judge as an improper course.

Tenth Witness—Tanipperepattowe Mohandiram—I know Mahalle and Ratnapalle Unnanses, the former for ten or fifteen years, the latter some time ; the first well, the last not very well. I have heard bad of his (Mahalle Unnanse’s) character generally ; I could not believe him, though he was to say anything on oath. Ratnapalle Unnanse is, I have heard, a pupil of the other.

Cross-examined by Mr. Perring—I have heard of Mahalle's character, I have witnessed myself one act and I have heard many things from others; *it is all hearsay except that about a writing.* I have heard of some representations having been made to the Maha Nileme (1st Prisoner). I have heard of some quarrels about lands. He (Mahalle) is very quarrelsome about lands; these are the faults I have heard about him. It is particularly wrong of priests to do this. I have not heard of a quarrel with the Maha Nileme, but with Wellimoone Korale who is Madigey¹ Nileme (8th witness). It is equally bad to quarrel with him. I know nothing bad in my character. I don't know how you have heard anything bad of mine, there is nothing defective in my character. *The reason I think him a bad character is because he quarrels about lands.* I live in Four Korles, he in Kandy; he goes to our fort² on account of law-suits. He goes on other people's account. I know Mr. Staples; after I came this time to Kandy I happened to know him; I do not cultivate any of his (1st Prisoner's) lands; we cultivate our own lands. I don't recollect his being concerned in a case about any lands with one Wattoopola Unnanse.

Re-examined by Mr. Staples—Adduelle Unnanse instituted a case for the same land, that *ola* was filed in the court of Four Korles; the *ola* was lost and a second was filed. I did not see the second *ola* filed. I was told so by Wattoopola Unnanse, a party in the case; these are the things I alluded to as having heard.

Wellimoone Korale *recalled*: *I know Mahalle and Ratnapalle Unnanses, ten or fifteen years, and very well; I know them myself, I would not believe them on their oath, both from my own knowledge of their character and from what I have heard and witnessed. They (Mahalle and Ratnapalle) were on good terms formerly with the second Prisoner but not latterly, and on somewhat bad terms with first Prisoner.*

Eleventh Witness—Bambaragame Korale—*I know Mahalle and Ratnapalle Unnanses but not Embilmeegama. I knew the character of the two first well, and for many years. They are not Priests who conduct themselves well. I would not believe them now on their oath; those two are on bad terms with first Prisoner.*

1. " Bullock carriage Department ".
2. Fort King, Attapitiya.

Twelfth Witness—Weycumbure Korale:—*I know Mahalle and Ratnapalle, but not Embilmeegama; Mahalle Unnanse for twenty-five years; I have seen one thing of him myself and would not believe him on his oath; my impression of Ratnapalle is the same.*

Cross-examined by Mr. Carr—I live in Weycumbure of Four Korles; have been in Kandy and have seen Mahalle Unnanse at the temple; I have seen Ratnapalle at the fort of the Four Korles, in the temple also. *I am an attendant of the First Adigar*: no one told me to say this; I saw an oath taken at Attapitiya. As to Ratnapalle, I saw him also at the fort of Attapitiya; they were both there about a case, not of mine. I came to pay some tax; they came there with a layman.

Thirteenth Witness—Christoffel Petrus de Saram,¹ Modeliar: *I have known 1st and 2nd Prisoners for the last ten years; always knew them speak as loyal subjects, without a single instance to the contrary. I went to meet them returning from Anooradhapoorra. I did not speak to them. Bambaradeniya was a great enemy of 2nd Prisoner's. I know nothing about his intimacy with the 1st Prisoner. I know Hetteagedere Korale of Harispattoo: he is much addicted to liquor. It was generally reported that he was in the habit of assaulting people. I know him to be a drunkard but not a cattle stealer. I cannot say I would not believe that man on his oath. He is a doubtful character. In the early part when I came to this country, they, the 1st and 2nd Prisoners, were not on good terms. I recollect Mahalle and Ratnapalle, for they had complaints about certain lands with the 2nd Prisoner. I knew Embilmeegame Unnanse: until a year and a half ago I knew nothing against him. He had a very good character until about two years ago, I think his character bad for a priest. I have heard of 2nd Prisoner speaking to different persons about adopting English customs. I do not know if it gave any offence but they were not adopted.*

Cross-examined by Mr. Perring—Have been unemployed since last January. I was formerly Translator to the Judicial Commissioner in Kandy. *I receive my full pay from Government. If the 1st and 2nd Prisoners had any treasonable design they would not have mentioned it to me: they have been friends lately. No occasion to think that 3rd Adigar² and*

1. Christoffel Petrus Gerrardus, de Saram Wanigasekera Ekanayaka, Mudaliyar of the Governor's Gate, retired Translator of the Judicial Commissioner's Court at Kandy.

2. Mullagamme Herat Dawunda Wickramasinha Ekanayaka Abeyakon Pandita Rajapaksa Mudianse, Senior, Third Adigar since 1832.

2nd Prisoner have not lately been friends: also 1st Prisoner and 3rd Adigar have been friends. Embilmeegama is not a man of good family. Meegastenne, who was a man of good family, and his wife adopted him; don't know if he is a man of property, Mahalle Unnanse is a stipended priest, he receives a few parrahs ¹ of paddy from Government. I have known instances of it being given to those who are not of good character. Until very lately, previous to their arrest, they (Mahalle and 2nd Prisoner) were on very bad terms.

By Mr. Staples—I never knew them to be on good terms: only knew them to be on bad terms.

*Fourteenth Witness—Doonooville Vidahn of Harispattoo—I know Mahalle and Ratnapalle. I know of a dispute between 2nd Prisoner and those two Priests. They wanted to build a dam and he opposed it. Ratnapalle said: "You come to dispute with us because several of you have learned the language"² and added "when I do a certain business, you will not raise up your head." There were several persons present at the time and I desired them to bear it in their minds: this happened about two years ago: 2nd Prisoner was in Kandy at that time; don't recollect any dispute which passed in presence of 2nd Prisoner. Those words must have been applied to some one else but him: Mahalle and Ratnapalle Unnanse were present when these words were said to the latter. They have had frequent disputes about lands: that Priest Mahalle used to employ people to cultivate *chenas* ³ and take the produce.*

Cross-examined by Mr. Perring—. I am a tenant and was very angry at this: not with the Priests, but that they should try to get the lands which we ought to have. I could not believe men of that character. Those lands being ours though they were to state about those lands on oath, I would not believe them. I did not see anything else. I don't know of their being stipended Priests, I had been appointed to a certain office over those lands at the time the Dessave (2nd Prisoner) went to Colombo. I don't hold them in lease but they are the property of the Walauwe, and I can be turned out whenever he likes: have no interest in coming here. I did not instigate these quarrels. I mentioned the

1. A measure of capacity.
2. English.
3. "High lands cultivated at intervals with grain or vegetables, after felling, and burning the jungle".

words used by the Priest to the Dessave (2nd Prisoner). No one was present. As the lands were under the Dessave I went and mentioned it to him.

C. de Saram, Modliar, *recalled* by Mr. Staples: I have seen the ornament *Muttoocoodo*¹ at the Temple; not at the house of the 1st Prisoner. I only visited his house once. The Temple belongs to him.

Fifteenth-Witness—Wattegedera Annu Naike² Unnanse. I have known Mahalle and Ratnapalle for a length of time. Embilmeegama lives in a different village. *Ratnapalle and Mahalle have been on bad terms with me for long time, Their character is not good.* As Embilmeegama lives at a distant Temple I can't speak as to his character. Budhoo has directed what kind of oaths are to be administered. *I would not believe Mahalle and Ratnapalle on their oaths.* I have heard that they have a case about some land with the 2nd Prisoner.

Cross-examined by Mr. Carr: *Mahalle and Ratnapalle calumniated me and got me dismissed from my office; also from a Temple village which I had got from Government, and have also got me deprived of my monthly allowance and yearly allowance of robes, which I have received from the King's time, and also of my turn at the Maligawe. I was examined before Council; cannot recollect it at full length. I have also heard of others being examined. Mahalle and Ratnapalle having given some evidence came and complained of me that I had prevented them from giving evidence to Government. I did not prevent them from hearing Banna.*³ After the arrest took place there were no Priests to perform the ceremony for one and a half months. I said that no Priest did perform the ceremony. After Mahalle and Ratnapalle made the complaint they produced a pupil and friend who gave evidence against me. It is not proper for me to say that it is wrong to give evidence to Government. I was dismissed on that account.

Cross-examined by Mr. Staples: No witness was examined against me in a Court of Justice. This was about six months ago: they were examined on oath, but not in my presence. I was informed afterwards of the evidence given against me.

(To be continued.)

1. "Silver ceremonial umbrella".
2. "Subordinate Chief Priest under the Nayaka Unnanse".
3. "Preaching of the Buddhist Dharma".

Notes and Queries

CEYLON DOCUMENTS IN THE TORRE DO TOMBO, LISBON.

In the Torre do Tombo of Lisbon there is a series of documents known as *Livros das Moncoes*, so called because they contain the official correspondence sent to Goa from Lisbon each succeeding monsoon. In 1777 the *Livros das Moncoes*, consisting of sixty volumes, were sent to Portugal and placed in the Torre do Tombo where they were called 'Documentos Remettidos da India.' When the Academia Real das Sciencias of Lisbon published *Decada* 13 of Antonio Bocarro, it was found that between the *Decads* of Couto, which had brought the history of India to 1600, and the *Decada* 13 of Bocarro which began with 1612, there was a gap of twelve years. To fill this gap the Academia Real published four volumes of *Documentos Remettidos da India* giving the official correspondence between 1605 and 1618, that is the *Livros das Moncoes* I to XI. These volumes contain many documents relating to Ceylon.

The following is a list of the documents in the succeeding volumes.

Livro XII das Moncoes-1619.

- D 2 About the fortification of Baticalou and Triquilimale, and about the Conquista¹ of Ceylon and about the introduction of the Christians of S. Thome² into the island. 26th February, 1619. folio 4.
- 17 About the fortification of Triquilimale and Baticalou: 23 March. folio 49.
- 37 That the Superior of the Order of St. Francis should sit in the Junta da Fazenda that was ordered to be established in Ceylon: 7 March. f. 113.
- 39 About Antao Vaz remaining as Provedor-Mor of the Exchequer and about the despatch of the Books of the Tombo of the island of Ceylon: 7 March; f. 119.
- 44 About the possession of the titles to the villages which the Chamber of Columbo enjoys; and that the Viceroy should take information and report on their value and rents: 7 March. f. 134.
- 51 About the observance and fulfilment of the orders sent to the State regarding the Junta da Fazenda established in Ceylon: 7 March. f. 175.

1. The word 'Conquista' literally 'conquest' has here and in similar phrases the concrete meaning of a country governed by a military Governor or Captain-General.

2. The Syrian Christians of Malabar,

- 73 About not letting the Moors into Ceylon and about sending a report to the Court of the outcome of the informations of Nuno de Albuquerque in their regard: 26 February 1619. f. 241.
- 86 About not carrying out the order given by the Viceroy Dom Jeronimo de Azevedo to Dom Nuno Alvares (Pereira) General of the Conquista of Ceylon as going counter to the subsequent orders. 7 March. f. 282.
- 89 About the precious stones of Ceylon to be sent by the Vedor da Fazenda of Ceylon to those of Cochin and Goa. 7 March. f. 291.
- 105 About the erection of various Colleges of the Religious of St. Francis in the island of Ceylon. 7 March. f. 341.
- 106 That the Viceroy should inform the Court about the receipt and despatch of cinnamon from Ceylon and of the elephants embarked at Jaffna; 7 March. f. 344.
- 107 Proposing to deliberate in Council the best means for the preservation of the villages of the island of Ceylon, and for the avoidance of the evils that resulted from the practices of their owners. 7 March. f. 363.
- 126 In which the Viceroy is directed to give his opinion with regard to the confirmation which the Jesuits asked of their villages in Ceylon: 7 March f. 400.
- 127 About not paying salaries to the Religious to whom villages are assigned in the island of Ceylon; and about the said salaries ceasing as soon as the aforesaid property is given. 7 March. f. 403.
- 130 In which the Viceroy is directed to send an account of the Donations and Titles by which the Jesuits possess the revenues of the pagodes of the island of Cardiva between Putalaō and Chilaō. 7 March. f. 414.
- 133 In which the Viceroy is directed to send his opinion regarding the withdrawal of the villages which the Viceroy Dom Jeronimo de Azevedo had given power to the Governors to grant. 7 March. f. 423.
- 142 In which the senior Inquisitor of India is ordered to hold an inquiry regarding what the Chamber of Columbo had pointed out about the island of Ceylon. 26 February, 1619. f. 452.
- 150 That the Viceroy should give an account to Court about the person entrusted with the government of the Conquista of Ceylon; 4 March. f. 481.
- 153 About filling the post of Provedor-Mor dos Contos of India and the Comptroller of Revenue of Ceylon. 4 March. f. 490.
- 168 That the Viceroy should take information about the request of Antonio de Moura who seeks confirmation of [the grant] of the port of Beligao in the manner it was granted to him by the Junta, of the island. 22 March. f. 535.
- 187 *Alvara* in which a close inquiry is directed to be held regarding the fulfilment of the Order to make a monopoly of cinnamon in the island of Ceylon regarding the levying of certain royal dues in the same island; these inquires to be made in the Residences of the General. 1 March. f. 599.

THE THRONE OF THE KINGS OF KANDY,

By a gracious act of our Sovereign the Chair of State or Throne of the Kings of Kandy is soon to be brought back to these shores to be preserved in what remains of the old Palace of Kandy as a venerable and authentic relic of antiquity. In that palace it was found by the English on that eventful 14th of February, 1815, when Robert Brownrigg made the abandoned palace of Kandy the headquarters of the British forces. Thence it was soon removed to Colombo, later to London and finally to Windsor. In Windsor Castle it once held pride of place in the Throne Room as the Sovereign's throne-chair at the royal investitures of the Order of the Garter. It was so used at the investitures of Victor Emmanuel, King of Italy, Haakon, King of Norway, Manoel, King of Portugal, and of the present Prince of Wales. But some years ago the grand old Kandyan throne was abandoned for a gilt throne-chair of twentieth century English design.

But time has not tarnished the lustre or magnificence of the Sinhalese Throne. Even in the Grand Vestibule of Windsor Castle it was a prominent object of admiration. "It was" according to Charles Pridham's glowing description, "about five feet high in the back, three in breadth and two in depth; the frame was all of wood entirely covered with thin gold sheeting (studded with precious stones), the exquisite taste and workmanship of which did not constitute the least of its beauties, and vied with the best specimens of the works of the goldsmith. The most prominent features in this curious relic were two golden lions or sphinxes, forming the arms of the throne or chair, of very uncouth appearance, but beautifully wrought, the heads of the animals being turned outwards in a peculiarly graceful manner. The eyes were formed of entire amethysts, each rather larger than a musket ball. Inside the back near the top, was a large golden sun, from which the founder of the Kandyan monarchy was supposed to have derived his origin. Beneath, and immense amethyst, about the size of a large walnut; on either side there was a figure of a female deity supposed to be the wife of Vishnu, or Buddha, in a sitting posture, of admirable design and workmanship; the whole encompassed by a moulding formed of bunches of cut crystal, set in gold; there was a space round the back (without moulding) studded with three large amethysts on each side, and six more at the top. The seat inside the arms, and half way up the back, was lined with red velvet."

In Ceylon this throne served at least six Kings of Kandy at the solemn ceremonies of the reception of foreign ambassadors, whom the ancient Kings loved to impress by a show of magnificence and by the exaction of disconcerting prostrations. Oriental potentates do not as a rule sit on chairs on state occasions but on a cushion which in India is called *masnad* whence comes the Anglo-Indian term "Musnud" to mean a throne corresponding to the *asana* or rather *sinhasana* which is the classic word for a throne. But at a certain time the Kings of Kandy began to use a chair of state as we know from the recorded accounts of foreign embassies. Beginning with the last audience given by the last King of Kandy to the last foreign ambassador and going backward till we find the first mention of the throne, we shall be able to compile a short history of its long career.

On the 9th of April, 1800, Sri Vikrama Rajasinha gave his last recorded audience to Major-General Hay Macdowall in the Audience Hall of Kandy. We learn from the Diary of Embassy kept by Captain William Macpherson, Secretary of the Embassy, that the Sovereign of Kandy on that occasion was seated "on his throne in a recess at the further end" of the hall. The throne itself he describes as "a large chair placed upon a platform, three or four steps high: it seemed to be plated with gold, set with precious stones, and to be, like his attire, very rich and magnificent."

It was on this same throne that the preceding King, Rajadhi Rajasinha, sat a few years before his deposition, to receive the two successive embassies of Robert Andrews. On the 11th of August, 1796, as Lieutenant Dennis Mahoney tells us, the English ambassador was received by the King, "seated on his throne in all the pomp, magnificence and lustre, that is possible to conceive. The throne appeared of solid gold, variously worked, and resembling in form a large size arm-chair of gold, rising to a peak in the centre of the back, on which was placed a large knob of gold, worked into an oval form: this part as well as the whole of the throne was studded with precious stones of every description and size." In his account of the previous embassy on 29th September, 1795, Andrews himself tells us that the King "arrayed in all his glory" was "seated on a throne of solid gold richly studded with precious stones of various colours."

Fourteen years earlier this same Rajadhi Rajasinha, soon after his unexpected accession, received an English ambassador from Madras, Hugh Boyd, Private Secretary to Governor Macartney. In the Journal of his embassy Boyd narrates that at the audience given to him on 6th March, 1782, there was "a very high throne" and "His Majesty seated on it with much solemnity." The throne is described as "very high", because, as we know from other narratives, it is placed on a platform rising by three steps above the level of the floor. That the throne used at Boyd's reception is the one we are concerned with is quite clear from the detailed description of the previous English ambassador, John Pybus. He was a member of the Council of Madras sent on an embassy to Kirtisri Rajasinha. On the 12th of May, 1762, the King received him "seated on a throne, which was a large chair handsomely carved and gilt, raised about three feet from the floor." Thus it was on this throne that the three last monarchs of Kandy were seated when they gave audience on five occasions to the English ambassadors Pybus, Boyd, Andrews (twice) and Macdowall.

That this same throne was used in Dutch times we know from the record of the embassy of Daniel Agreen, Disawa of Colombo, in December 1736. An account of the audience given to Agreen was published by the German corporal who accompanied the embassy. There we are told that Sirivira Narendrasinha was seated on that occasion on "a chair placed two or three steps high" and we are informed that it was a chair "which the Company had sent to the King along with other gifts and which was used for a throne." Although there is no description of the chair, we have, what is better, an illustration of it, which leaves no room for doubt that the throne on which Narendrasinha sat is the one which is soon to be brought back to Ceylon.

The important statement of this diarist that the throne was a gift from the Dutch Company has hitherto remained unnoticed, possibly because the publication in which it occurs is an old German book of the middle or the eighteenth century, copies of which are now extremely rare. At any rate that statement was unknown to Dr. Joseph Pearson who wrote on "European chairs in Ceylon of the 17th and 18th Centuries" and also published a note on "the throne of the Kings of Kandy." He was persuaded solely on considerations of style, design and decorations, that the chair was "an interesting adaptation of a European design to conform with Eastern conception" and that "the basic style was undoubtedly Louis XIV, but the decoration *motif* Eastern." At his suggestion the Dutch Archivist looked up the records under his care and came upon a passage in the Proceedings of the Council of Colombo, October 1662, which stated:

"The question of sending the gifts lying in the warehouse here for the King of Kandy having been resumed, it was resolved to select such of them as may make up a regalia for His Majesty, as those noted below. "Heading the list 'noted below' is the item: "1 Throne with its accessories." The accessories here spoken of are probably the canopy or rather "the tapestries, embroidered with figures' which overhung the chair at the audience granted to Agreeen.

Nothing further has yet come to light about the actual presentation of the throne to Vimala Dharmasuriya II., but the statement of the diarist of Agreeen, justifies the identification of the throne intended to be presented to the King with the one actually presented and used in all subsequent audiences. The diarist aforesaid received most of his information about the Kandyan Court from the "First Interpreter to the Embassy," "an old hoary headed Mudaliyar," "a faithful servant to the Company" who had accompanied a score - he actually says one score and four - of the regular annual Dutch embassies to the Court of Kandy.

The actual origin of the throne, however, still remains doubtful. "It is probable" wrote Pearson "that the chair was made either in Colombo by Sinhalese workmen under Dutch supervision or in one of the Dutch settlements in India. The decoration does not help us to decide this point, as the carving might be either South Indian or Sinhalese." But there is no doubt of its authentic history since 1692, a history of over 240 years linking it with the Dutch regime, with the Sinhalese Kings of Kandy, with all the Nayakkar Kings, and with four Sovereigns of Great Britain. That circumstance makes this chair most venerable for its historical associations as it certainly is the grandest, the most sumptuous and antique piece of furniture in the Island,—*Young Lanka*.