

CEYLON

HISTORICAL

JOURNAL

TENTH ANNIVERSARY NUMBER

VOLUME TEN



$\frac{E/RT}{C}$

$\frac{1}{2}$

Q3

THE CEYLON HISTORICAL JOURNAL

Tenth Anniversary Number

**Volume X Numbers 1 to 4
July 1960 to April 1961**

NO. 1000

1910

1910

**To the
Memory
of**

Professor H. C. Ray

M.A. (CALCUTTA), PH.D. (LOND), D.LITT. (LOND).

Professor of History

University of Ceylon 1943 - 1957

Professor of History

Vidyalankara University of Ceylon 1959 - 1964

The Copyright and all rights of
reproduction and translation of articles
in this book are strictly reserved.

Printed at the

TISARA PRESS

Dutugemunu Street, Dehiwala, Ceylon.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Note by the Editor	v
The Grāmaṇi (Gāmaṇi) in Ancient India Professor S. Paranavitana ..	1
Greek and Roman Contacts with Ceylon. Rt. Rev. Dr. Edmund Peiris O.M.I. ..	8
A Chronicle of The Buddha's Six Hair Relics Dr. B. C. Law ..	31
An Inscription of Gajabahu II K. D. Swaminathan ..	43
Slavery in Ceylon during the Period of the Anuradhapura Kingdom P. A. T. Gunasinghe ..	47
Some Political Trends in the Late Anuradhapura and Polonnaruwa Period B. J. Perera ..	60
A Note on Portuguese Missionary Methods in the East Professor C. R. Boxer ..	77
Buddhism and the British Government in Ceylon 1840-55 Dr. K. M. de Silva ..	91
The Evolution of the British Commonwealth A Historical Retrospect Sir Frederick Rees ..	160
Writings on Ceylon Epigraphy H. A. I. Goonetilleke ..	171

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

- Professor S. PARANAVITANA, C.B.E., Ph.D., D.LITT., retired Archaeological Commissioner of Ceylon, author of *Sigiri Grafitti*, *Shrine of Upulvan*, and sometime editor of *Epigraphia Zeylanica*, *Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of Ceylon*, etc. Ceylon's best known historian and archaeologist. Former Professor of Archaeology at the University of Ceylon.
- Rt. Rev. Dr. EDMUND PEIRIS, O.M.I., B.A., D.D. (ROME), Bishop of Chilaw. Former President of the Royal Asiatic Society, Ceylon Branch and author of a number of articles and books on Ceylon history.
- B. C. LAW, M.A., LL.B., Ph.D., D.LITT., F.R.A.S. (Hony). Author of *Kshatriya Tribes of Northern India* and other well known works on Indology.
- K. D. SWAMINATHAN, M.A. Epigraphist, Epigraphical Survey of India.
- P. A. T. GUNASINGHE, B.A. (Hons.) Ceylon. Member of the Ceylon Administrative Service, presently serving as Government Agent, Galle. Former Assistant Lecturer in History at the University of Ceylon.
- B. J. PERERA, B.A. A graduate in Sinhalese of the University of Ceylon, author of a number of articles on Ceylon history.
- C. R. BOXER, Hon. D.LITT. et. PHIL., (UTRECHT) Camoens Professor of Portuguese, King's College, University of London. Author of *Salvador de Sa and the Struggle for Brazil and Angola 1602-86*.
- KINGSLEY de SILVA, B.A. (Ceylon,) Ph.D. (London) Senior Lecturer in History, University of Ceylon.
- Sir FREDERICK REES, M.A. (OXON), M.COM., HON. LL.D. (Birmingham), Formerly Vice Chancellor of the University of Wales, Member of the Ceylon Commission on Constitutional Reform 1944, Author of *Short Fiscal and Financial History of England 1815-1918*.
- IAN GOONETILLEKE, B.A. (London) Senior Assistant Librarian of the University of Ceylon. Author of a number of Bibliographies on subjects pertaining to Ceylon.

NOTE

It is with pleasure that I write this brief note to the Tenth Anniversary Number of the *Ceylon Historical Journal*. This journal was first published in July 1951 and in spite of many adversities continued regular publication till 1960 when Volume Nine was issued. Originally it was a quarterly publication in its first year and subsequently a half yearly. The last volumes were annuals which took the form of Monographs rather than collections of articles. The adversities the *Ceylon Historical Journal* had to face in its first nine years was as much due to the lack of contributors of articles and of regular subscribers as the difficulties experienced by the publishers.

Volume Ten of the *Ceylon Historical Journal* was titled the Tenth Anniversary Number and was planned several years ago, but due to difficulties, most of which were financial, was delayed on several occasions. It is however with great pleasure that we offer this volume to the reading public in spite of the long delays and the inconveniences our contributors as well as our subscribers have had to suffer.

We are happy also to announce here that simultaneously with Volume Ten we are also publishing Volumes Eleven, Twelve, Thirteen, Fourteen and Fifteen of the Journal. Volumes Sixteen and Seventeen are in the press and will be published before the year is out. These seven volumes will make the publication of the *Ceylon Historical Journal* continuous till the year 1967.

From volume Eighteen onwards it is proposed to revert to the publication as an Annual Journal consisting of articles while the Monographs such as the ones which have been published by us in the recent past will constitute volumes in a separate Monograph Series of the *Ceylon Historical Journal* the first volume of which being the *History of the Ceylon Civil Service 1802 - 1832* by Dr. P. D. Kannangara was published by us in 1966.

We trust that this arrangement for the continued publication of the *Ceylon Historical Journal* will meet with the acceptance of our readers and that we will get from them as well as from our learned contributors the support without which a venture of this nature cannot continue.

EDITOR

The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It emphasizes that every entry should be clearly documented and supported by appropriate evidence. The text further explains that this practice is essential for ensuring transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

In addition, the document highlights the need for regular audits and reviews to identify any discrepancies or errors. It suggests that a systematic approach to record-keeping can help prevent fraud and mismanagement of funds. The author also notes that proper documentation is crucial for legal compliance and for providing a clear audit trail.

The second part of the document focuses on the practical aspects of record-keeping. It provides detailed instructions on how to organize and maintain financial records, including the use of ledgers and journals. The text also discusses the importance of keeping records secure and accessible, as well as the need for regular backups and archiving.

Finally, the document concludes by reiterating the significance of accurate record-keeping for the overall health and success of an organization. It encourages all stakeholders to take responsibility for their financial reporting and to adhere to the highest standards of integrity and transparency.

THE GRĀMAṆĪ (GAMAṆĪ) IN ANCIENT INDIA

BY

PROFESSOR S. PARANAVITANA

In an article contributed to the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* over twenty-five years ago,¹ I have examined the significance of the title *Gāmaṇī* (used in the chronicles in the form *Gāmaṇī* as a proper name) borne by the early kings of Ceylon, in the investigation of the origin of kingship in the Island. I have briefly referred there to the status of the personages who bore this title (Skt. *Grāmaṇī* P. *Gāmaṇī*) in ancient India. I now give in greater detail the evidence on which my conclusions on this point were based.

The evidence supplied by the Vedic literature on the connotation of the word *Grāmaṇī* has been admirably summarised by Professors Macdonell and Keith in their *Vedic Index*: 'At the head of the village was the *Grāmaṇī* or "the leader of the village" who is referred to in the Rgveda and often in the later *Samhitās* and in the *Brāhmaṇas*. The exact meaning of the title is not certain. By Zimmer the *Grāmaṇī* is regarded as having had military functions only, and he is certainly often connected with the *Senānī* or "leader of an army". But there is no reason so to restrict the sense: presumably the *Grāmaṇī* was the head of the village both for civil purposes and for military operations. He is ranked in the *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa* as inferior to the *Sūta* or "charioteer" with whom, however, he is associated as one of the *Ratnins*, the jewels of the royal establishment. The post was especially valuable to a *Vaiśya* who, if he attained it, was at the summit of prosperity (*gatasrī*). The *Grāmaṇī*'s connexion with the royal person seems to point to his having been a nominee of the king rather than a popularly elected officer. But the post may have been sometimes hereditary, and sometimes nominated or elective: there is no decisive evidence available. The use of the singular presents difficulties: possibly the *Grāmaṇī* of the village or city where the royal residence was situated was specially honoured and influential'.²

Grassman³ interprets the word *grāmaṇī* as 'the leader or head of the corporation or community' (die Gemeinde leitend; Vorsteher der Gemeinde). As has already been stated, the *Grāmaṇī* was one of the twelve *ratnins* of a Vedic prince's court and took

1. 'Two Royal Titles of the Early Sinhalese, and the Origin of Kingship in Ancient Ceylon', *JRAS* for 1936, pp. 440-462.
2. Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index*, Vol. I, p. 247.
3. *Wörterbuch zum Rgveda*, s.v.

A

an important part in the *rājasūya* ceremony (the consecration of a king). The *Grāmaṇī* was also one of the eight *viras* (heroes or friends of the king) in Vedic times, the others to whom this epithet was given including such important personages as the royal chaplain, the queen, the charioteer, the chamberlain and the collector-general.¹ It is evident from these facts that the *Grāmaṇī* in Vedic times was not the ordinary village headman, as is inferred from the meaning usually attached to the word. This conclusion is also confirmed by the fact, noted by Professors Macdonell and Keith, that the word *grāmaṇī* always occurs in the singular in the Vedic texts, whereas, in the territories of a prince in those times, there must have been numerous villages with a headman for each. The general conclusions that we can arrive at, from a study of the references to the *Grāmaṇī*² in Vedic literature, are that he was a *Vaiśya* by caste, that he took conspicuous part in the election and the consecration of a king and that he was an important functionary of the state, probably with duties of a military character. The title, however, was never used in Vedic times, as it was done in early Ceylon, by the king. Therefore, it is clear that the significance of this title had undergone considerable change from the Vedic times up to the period—about the third century B.C.—when we come across it in ancient Ceylon.

This title, in the form *gāmaṇī*, occurs frequently in the Pali literature. Having no such lucid summary of what we can learn about the status of the *gāmaṇī* in Pali literature, as we have for *Grāmaṇī* in *Vedic Index*, we are constrained to examine the references themselves.

In the *Cullavagga* of the *Vinaya Piṭaka*,³ a *gāmaṇī* named *Maṇicūlaka* is mentioned. He is represented there as taking a part, in fact the leading part, in a discussion which arose in the Council of the Inner Palace of the king of *Rājagaha* about the question whether it is proper for the disciples of the Buddha to accept gold and silver as presents. This discussion arose when the Buddha was staying at *Rājagaha*, and the Master Himself approved the position taken up by *Maṇicūlaka* on this question, namely, that it is improper for Buddhist monks to accept gold and silver. This reference, however, does not help us to determine the exact position of a *Gāmaṇī* in the Buddha's time, beyond the fact that he had access to the Inner Councils of the king, as also had the Vedic *Grāmaṇī*.

-
1. For further details regarding the *ratnins* or *ratnahavis* and the *viras*, see N.N. Law, *Aspects of Ancient Indian Polity*, pp. 169-170 and 87.
 2. For the status of the *Gramani* in Vedic times, see also N.N. Law, *op. cit.* p. 88; and R. C. Majumdar, *Corporate Life in Ancient India*, p. 133.
 3. Oldenberg's edition, Vol. II, pp. 296-297.

In the *Anguttara Nikāya*,¹ we have the following passage, containing a list of the functionaries of state, apparently arranged in a descending order of importance, in which two classes of Gāmaṇīs are mentioned.

Yadi vā rañño khattiyassa muddhābhisittassa, yadi vā ratthikassa pettanikassa, yadi vā senāya senāpatikassa yadi vā gāmakāmikassa (or gāmaṇikassa) yadi vā pūga-gāmaṇikassa, ye vā pana kulesu paccekādhipaccaṃ kārenti. The dignitaries mentioned in this list are:—an anointed king, the hereditary ruler of a province,² the commander-in-chief of the army, the headman of a village (*gāma-gāmaṇika*), the head of a corporation (*pūga-gāmaṇika*), and the head of a family. The *gāma-gāmaṇika* mentioned here is obviously the headman of a village or the alderman of a township. The *pūga-gāmaṇika* was evidently the president of a *pūga* which is synonymous with *gaṇa*, 'a corporation'. In this connexion, it may be mentioned that the existence of corporate bodies called *pūgas* in ancient Ceylon is attested by early Brāhmī inscriptions³ and their leaders must have, as in India of the Buddha's days, sometimes been styled *gāmaṇīs*.

In the *Sāmyutta Nikāya*,⁴ there is a complete section called the *Gāmaṇī Sāmyutta*, consisting of discourses delivered by the Buddha to various persons who hold the title *gāmaṇī*. In the second *sutta* of this section, the interlocutor is a person named Talapuṭa, called also a *naṭagāmaṇī*. He questions the Buddha about a tradition, handed down by the succession of his teachers, that actors who, by their art, entertains people, would be re-born after death in a heaven called Pahāsana ('Laughter'). The subject of his discussion and the word *naṭa* prefixed to his title leave us in no doubt that Talapuṭa was an actor by profession. This shows that in the Buddha's times, actors formed themselves into companies at the head of which was a person to whom the title *gāmaṇī* was given. In the *sutta* which follows, figures a person called Yodhājīvo *Gāmaṇī*. The word *yodhājīva* connotes a person who obtains his livelihood by following the profession of arms. This individual questions the Buddha about the belief, which was prevalent in military circles, that those who distinguish themselves in battle and slay their enemies have a heaven called *Sāraṇajita* reserved for them after their death. Thus it would seem that captains of bands of soldiers had also the right to the title *gāmaṇī*.

1. P.T.S. Edition, Vol. III, p. 76.

2. For this meaning of the term *ratthika-pattanika*, see D. R. Bhandarkar's *Asoka*, pp. 32-33.

3. See the *Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of Ceylon* for the year 1931-32, p. 9, for the Ganekanda Vihara inscription. An unpublished cave inscription at Bovattelgala in the Panama Pattu, also mentions a *puga* named Kabodiya (*Kabodiya-maha-pugiyana lene*).

4. P.T.S. edition, Vol. IV, pp. 305 ff.

In the next two *suttas* are discourses delivered, respectively, to two persons called Hatthāroho Gāmaṇī and Assaroḥo Gāmaṇī. They also question the Buddha about beliefs similar to that held by Yodhājivo Gāmaṇī; and their very names suggest that they were captains of bands of elephant-riders and horsemen, respectively. In the sixth and the following *suttas* of this section, the interlocutor was named Asibandhakaputto Gāmaṇī, suggesting that he was a swordsman by profession. These examples show us that at the time when the Pali canon was redacted, the title *gāmaṇī* could be appropriately used for various classes of military leaders. The other Gāmaṇīs mentioned in this section are those to whom the title is used after their personal names; we cannot therefore say what exactly was their status in society.

In the *Thera-Gāthā*,¹ a captain of a company of bandits is addressed as Gāmaṇī, by a monk who had fallen into their hands and whom they wanted to put to death. It may be said that the monk addressed the bandit-chief by a title to which he was not entitled, in order to flatter him and escape from his murderous designs. But the whole trend of the story and the speech attributed to the monk is against such a supposition. The bandits were astonished at the calm demeanour of the monk in face of death, and questioned him as to the source of such unusual courage; the monk's speech, in which he addressed the leader of the bandits as Gāmaṇī, explained at length how one who is liberated is equally indifferent to life as well as to death.

In the Mahāvāṇija Jātaka, which appears to be an ancient ballad appropriated by the early Buddhist preachers, for the whole story is in the original verses of the canon, and not elaborated by the commentators as in almost all of the Jātaka tales, we read:

Vāṇijā samitīm katvā nānāraṭṭhāto āgatā
*Dhana-hārāya pakkamsu ekam katvāna gāmaṇim*²

'Merchants from many a kingdom came, and all together met
Chose them a chief, and straight set out a treasure for to
get'.³

Here the Gāmaṇī was the elected leader of a band of merchants. The scholiast explains the word as *sathavāha* (Skt. *sārvavāha*), 'leader of a caravan'.

In a verse passage of the Vessantara Jātaka, in which the Sivi king addresses his army to get ready to go and escort his son

1. P.T.S. Edition, p. 71.

2. *Jataka*, IV, p. 351.

3. Rouse's translation, p. 222.

back from the hermitage of Vaṅkagiri, the warriors who ride on the backs of elephants and cavalrymen are referred to as *gāmaṇīyas*, a derivating form of *gāmaṇī*. The verses are:—

*Tato nāgasahassāni yojayantu catuddasa
Suvannakacchā mātaṅgā hemakappanavāsasā
Arulhā gāmaṇīyehi tomarāṅkusapāṇīhi
Khippam āyantu sannaddhā hatthikkandhehi dassita*

*Tato assasahassāni yojayantu catuddasa
Ajāṇīyā va jāṇīyā sindhavā sīghavāhaṇā
Arulha gāmaṇīyehi illiyācāpadhārihi
Kippam āyantu sannaddhā assapittheh'*

alamkatā ¹

‘Then let the fourteen thousand elephants be yoked—elephants wearing golden neck-ornaments and trappings decorated with gold, ridden by *Gāmaṇīyas* holding lances and elephant goads. Let (the *Gāmaṇīyas*) come quickly, clad in armour and showing themselves on the backs of elephants. Then, let the fourteen thousand horses be yoked,—(horses) of the *ājāṇīya* breed of the Sindhu country, swift-footed and ridden by *Gāmaṇīyas* bearing scimitars and bows. Let (the *Gāmaṇīyas*) come quickly on horseback clad in armour and adorned’.² The commentator, in his explanation of the first two of the above verses, supplies the information that the warriors who rode on elephants were the *hatthi-gāmaṇī*, which title may be compared with the *hatthāroho gāmaṇī* occurring in the *Samyutta Nikāya*.

The four verses quoted above also occur, with variations to suit the different context, in the *Soṇaka Jataka*.³ In this instance, the word *gāmaṇīya*, occurring in the verse describing the royal elephants, is explained by the commentators as *hatthācariya* (elephant-rider). The same word which occurs in the verse describing the cavalry is interpreted as *assācariya* (horseman). In addition to the four verses occurring in the *Vessantara Jātaka*, we find here two others describing the chariots of the king, in which the word *gāmaṇīya* occurs. They are:—

*Satthi rathasahassāni sannaddhā ussitaddhajā
Dīpā atho pi veyyaḅghā sabbālamkarabhūsitā
Arulhā gāmaṇīyaehi cāpahattehi vammīhi
Te putta paṭipajjassu rajjam niyyādayāmi te.*

1. *Jataka*, VI, p. 579.

2. The translation is mine. The metrical rendering given in the English translation of the *Jataka* is too free a version to suit our present purpose.

3. *Jataka* II, p. 259.

'The sixty thousand chariots, armoured and with banners raised aloft, covered with leopards' skins and tigers' skins, adorned with all kinds of ornaments and driven by *Gāmaṇīyas*, bearing bows in their hands, and clad in armour,—those, my son, may thou enjoy, I give over the kingdom to thee'. The word *gāmaṇīya* occurring in the above verses is explained by the commentator as *rathika* (charioteer).

The references to this word in the Vessantara and Soṇaka Jātakas clearly prove that it was a title used of warriors who rode on elephants, of cavalymen and of those who fought in chariots. Perhaps it was a title of the leaders of those various classes of military men. This is in keeping with the fact that we also learn from the Vedic literature, that the *Grāmaṇī* had military functions.

In the *Gāmaṇī-Caṇḍa Jātaka*,¹ a *pādamūlika* (courtier or servant) of a king is also given this title.

All the references quoted above show that at the time when the Pāli canon was being redacted, which was about the same time as when Aryan immigrants from North India were colonising Ceylon, the word *gāmaṇī* or *gāmaṇīya* was applicable, not only to the headman of a village, but also to the leader of any kind of association or corporation, whether political, military, mercantile or otherwise. The title, it is clear, had extended its application since the Vedic times; and it appears that the rendering of it by 'leader' suits the various contexts in which it occurs. In none of the above references has the word *gāmaṇī* been used of a king. In fact the persons of whom the title was used, were several degrees below the rank of a prince.

There is, however, one reference in the whole range of the Pāli literature, in which *Gāmaṇī* is the name of a king. This is the *Gāmaṇī Jātaka*, in which the youngest among the hundred sons of a king, having managed, by the advice of the Bodhisattva, to set aside the claims of all his older brothers, ascended the throne, gives vent to his exultant feelings in a verse in which he addresses himself as *Gāmaṇī*. It should, however, be remembered that the story, as we read it today, has been written in Ceylon in the fifth century and it is the verse alone which belongs to the original canon. In the verse itself, there is nothing to show that it was addressed

1. Jataka II, p. 300.

to a king, or in the circumstance as related in the story. Translated, it reads:

'Their heart's desire they reap, who hurry not;
Know, Gāmanī, ripe excellence is thine.'¹

This might quite possibly have been used in a context quite different from what it now occupies in the *Jātakatthakathā*. In fact, the commentator in order to suit the verse to the circumstances related in the story, twists the meaning of certain words occurring in it. The explanation of the word *brahmacariya* as *catu-saṅghavattu* 'the four ways in which a king ought to please his subjects' is hardly convincing. The story itself is not related in the place where the verse occurs but the commentator simply says that it was also uttered by the king whose story is given very much later in the book. It is also significant that in this story, the Saṃvara *Jātaka*², the king is not called Gāmanī but Saṃvara. All these circumstances lead to the supposition that there was no suitable story attached to this verse when the commentator wrote, and he simply fathered it to a person to whom he thought it would be appropriate. The attribution of the verse to a king might have even been influenced by the fact that, in Ceylon, Gāmanī was a royal title. The way that the commentator explains the word *gāmanī* to suit a king is also interesting. He says: *Gāmanīti kattha ci gāmikapuriso pi gāmajetthako pi gāmanī, idha pana sabbajana-jetthakam attanam sandhāya*.³ (Sometimes the overseer of a parish or the headman of a village is called *gāmanī*; here it is said of himself, the chief of all men).

In the *Mahābhārata*, the powerful Grāmaṇeyas who lived on the banks of the Sindhu are mentioned as having been subdued by Nakula in the course of his conquest of the Western regions.⁴ The Grāmaṇeyas appear to have been a people with an oligarchic form of government.

-
1. *Jātaka*, Vol. I, translation by Lord Chalmers, p. 30.
 2. *Jātaka*, Translation, Vol. IV, p. 82.
 3. *Jātaka*, Text, edited by V. Fausboll, Vol. I, p. 137.
 4. *Mahabharata*, Sabhaparva, Chapter 29, vv. 7-8.

GREEK AND ROMAN CONTACTS WITH CEYLON

BY

RT. REV. DR. EDMUND PEIRIS, O.M.I., B.A.

“There is no island in the world, Great Britain not excepted, that has attracted the attention of authors in so many distant ages and so many different countries, as Ceylon. There is no nation in the ancient or modern times possessed of a language and a literature, the writers of which have not at some time made it their theme. Its aspect, its religion, its antiquities and productions, have been described as well by classic Greeks, as well by those of the Lower Empire; by the Romans; by the writers of China, Burmah, India and Kashmir; by the geographers of Arabia and Persia; by the Mediaeval voyagers of Italy and France; by the annalists of Portugal and Spain; by the merchant adventurers of Holland, and by the topographers and travellers of Great Britain.” So wrote Sir Emerson Tennent in the introduction to his famous work on Ceylon (*Ceylon* by Tennent Vol. I, p xxiii). As our present interest is in Greek and Roman contacts with Ceylon, we shall confine ourselves to these two great Western nations.

Greece consisted of several City-states, which sometimes federated for war or for peace. Its physical features show how its ridged headland, broken by a great sea rift, and how the heights of Olympus, Ossa and Pelion, and those of Euboea and the island chain beyond, and how again Epirus and Peloponesus, gave the land its mountain barriers. But finally it was the sea that decided the fate of the people; they were fairly driven to seek their outlet and their defence on its waters; and the decisive factor was the Aegean sea, which became, in a sense, the fluid axis of Greek conquest, commerce and colonial life.

Although the Trojan and the Persian wars brought them into contact with the Near East, its people, their manners and customs, their wealth and commerce, the ancient Greeks, till even a comparatively late period in their history, possessed little, if any, real knowledge of India. They imagined it to be an Eastern Ethiopia, which stretched away to the uttermost verge of the world. Thus, for instance, Homer (10th century B.C.) wrote in his *Odyssey*: “Poseidon, however, was now gone on a visit to the distant Ethiopians, the farthest outposts of mankind, half of whom live where the Sun goes down, and half where he rises.” (*Odyssey*, I, 23. 24); *Atlas of Ancient and Classical Geography*, p. I). Herodotus (5th century B.C.) speaks of Eastern Ethiopians, but distinguishes

them from the Indians. "Eastward of India" he says, "lies a desert of sand; indeed of all inhabitants of Asia of whom we have any reliable information, the Indians are the most easterly—beyond them the country is uninhabitable desert . . . Their country is a long way from Persia towards the south." (*The Histories* by Herodotus, Bk. 3, pp. 216, 217). A little later, Ktesias, who lived for many years in Persia as private physician of Artaxerxes Mnemon, gathered material and wrote a book on India, the first work on the subject in the Greek language. But, from the fragments which are extant, it is clear that his information was not altogether first-hand, and that he accepted a great deal of fable as facts.

It was left to the followers of Alexander to give to the Western world for the first time fairly accurate accounts of the country and its inhabitants. The great conqueror, it is well known, carried scientific men with him to chronicle his achievements, and describe the countries to which he might carry his arms. Some of his officers were also men of literary culture, who could wield their pen as well as their sword. Hence, the expedition produced quite a crop of narratives and memoirs relating to India, such as those of Baeto, Diogenetos, Nearchus, Onesikritos, Aristobulos, Kallisthenes and others. These works are all lost, but their substance is to be found condensed in Strabo, Pliny and Arrian.

Subsequent to these writers were others, who made considerable additions to the stock of information regarding India, among whom may be mentioned Deimachos, who resided a long time at Palibothra (or Pataliputra, modern Patna), whither he had been sent on an embassy by Seleukos to Allitrochades or Amithrocades, who was none other than Bindusara, called Amitragatha, the "slayer of foes", the father of Asoka. (cf. *An Advanced History of India*, p. 102). Seleukos was Alexander's general, who, after his master's death, ruled over the territory from the Mediterranean to the Indus.

Another important writer was Megasthenes, who being sent about 302 B.C. by Seleukos, then on the threshold of his career, on an embassy to Sandrakottos (or Chandragupta, the predecessor of Bindusara), whose capital was Palibothra (Patna), gathered information, kept diaries and wrote a work on India of such acknowledged worth that it formed the principal source whence subsequent authors drew their accounts of the country. This work, which appears to have been called *TA INDIKA*, no longer exists. But it has been so often quoted by ancient writers that Dr. E. A. Schwanbeck of Bonn, with great industry, has collected all the fragments that have been preserved, and published the collection in 1846. So, we have now a valuable portion of Megasthenes'

work. Dr. Schwanbeck's compilation was translated into English by J. W. Mc Crindle and published in 1877, under the title "Ancient India", from which are taken the following quotations:

"Taprobane" says Megasthenes, "is separated from the mainland by a river; the inhabitants are called Palaiogoni and their country is more productive of gold and large pearls than India . . . Taprobane is separated from India by a river flowing between: for one part of it abounds with wild beasts and elephants much larger than India breeds, and man claims the other part . . . In the sea . . . they say there is a very large island, of which, I hear, the name is Taprobane. From what I can learn, it appears to be a very long and mountainous island, having a length of 7,000 stadia and a breadth of 5,000. It has not, however, any cities, but only villages, of which the number amounts to 750. The houses in which the inhabitants lodge themselves are made of wood and sometimes also of reeds . . . It has also herds of elephants which are there very numerous and of the largest size. These island elephants are more powerful than those of the mainland, and in appearance larger, and may be pronounced to be in every possible way more intelligent. The islanders export them to the mainland opposite in boats, which they construct expressly for the traffic from wood supplied by the thickets of the island, and they dispose of their cargoes to the king of Kalingai." (*Ancient India*, pp. 62, 63, 169-173).

With this, there is a good deal of mariners' tales about sea monsters and dolphins and magic herbs.

Many an ancient writer exaggerated the size of the island owing to the lack of sufficient data about its exact position and distance from India. The days taken for navigation were considered the basis for calculating distances. Even Ptolemy in A.D. 150, made Taprobane as big as *cis Ganges*, the whole of India to the south of the Ganges. (rf. *Ceylon* by Tennent, Vol. I, pp. 8, 9; *Atlas*, p. 5).

Palaiogoni may either be a descriptive term for ancient people, the aborigines, (from Greek *palaios*=ancient, and *gonos*=race), or a Hellenized form of an Indian proper name. In any case, it has here to do with some people who lived in Ceylon before the 3rd century B.C. (rf. *Ancient India*, p. 62). Mudaliyar Rasana-yagam maintains that "Palaigoni (sic) is undoubtedly a corruption of Palai Nagoi (Tamil Palaya Nagar, ancient Naga^s)" (*Ancient Jaffna*, p. 105). But, one wonders whether it is not better to take it as a straightforward Greek word, meaning the old population or

aborigines, as the new Aryan settlers would have called their predecessors, just as they called the descendants of Kuveni the *Pulinda*, the barbarous tribes. (rf. *Mahavamsa*, VII, 68; *History of Ceylon*, pp. 101, 105).

Tennent, on the authority of Aelian, a Greek writer on natural history in the 3rd century A.D., and Cosmos Indicopleustes, a well known Christian traveller of the 6th, states that "from time immemorial . . . the export of elephants from Ceylon to India has been going on without interruption from the period of the first Punic war" (*Ceylon*, Vol. 2, p. 272). Megasthenes refers to a much earlier stage in the traffic. Kalinga, with which Ceylon carried on the traffic in elephants, was on the east coast of India, stretching from the Vaitarani in Orissa to the neighbourhood of the Godavari. (rf. *An Advanced History of India*, p. 56).

Alexandria in Egypt founded in the 4th century B.C., by Alexander the Great, became in time not only a great trade centre but also a powerful influence of Hellenistic culture. Under the Ptolemies, there was built up there a famous library, which brought together a formidable collection of books. When Julius Caesar captured the city, a good part of this library perished by flames. Seneca says that during the wars 40,000 volumes were destroyed by accident. But, Aulus Gellius (about 117-180) assures us that in his time the number of volumes in it amounted to nearly 70,000. Domitian himself sent thither scribes to copy out some of the volumes. (Suetonius' *Lives of the Caesars*, Domitian, XX).

At the fall of the 1st century B.C., Strabo, the Greek geographer (about 63 B.C.-24 A.D.) worked at Alexandria, amassing a great deal of information which brought him under the influence of Eratosthenes (274-194 B.C.), Poseidonius (about 130-50 B.C.) and Polybius (about 201-120 B.C.): all of them Greek writers. He has something to say about Taprobane:

"Let us then transport ourselves to the land opposite the Cinnamon Country, (*i.e.*, the large area of Africa to the south of the Gulf of Aden), and lying to the east under the same parallel of latitude; we shall there find the country named Taprobane. This Taprobane is universally believed to be a large island situated in the high seas, and lying to the south, opposite India. Its length in the direction of Ethiopia is above 5,000 stadia, as they say. There are brought from thence to the Indian markets ivory, tortoise-shells and other wares in large quantities." (Bk. 2, ch. 1, pt. 14 in C.L.R. 3rd Series, Vol. I, p. 114).

“They inform us that the island called Taprobana is much to the south of India, but that it is nevertheless inhabited, and is situated opposite to the island of the Egyptians and the Cinnamon Country, as the temperature of their atmospheres is similar” (ib. ch. 5, pt. 14).

“The parallel of the Cinnamon Country on the one side (the East) passes a little south of Taprobana, or perhaps over the most southern extremity, and on the other side (the West) over the most southern part of Libya” (ib. pt. 35).

“Taprobana is said to be an island lying out at sea, distant from the most southerly parts of India, which are opposite the Koriaki, seven days’ sail towards the south. Its length is about 8,000 stadia in the direction of Ethiopia. It produces elephants.” (Bk. 15, ch. 1, pt. 14).

Many of the ancient geographers exaggerated the size of Taprobane, by doubling its length. Africa was considered much shorter southwards than it really is, and Taprobane was made to point towards Africa. Much of this confusion arose because their informants were mariners or sea-faring traders, who calculated distances by the time taken to navigate. Strabo was not unaware of the possibility of such an error, for he says:

“Onesicritus, for example, says of Taprobane, that its magnitude is 5,000 stadia, without distinction of length and breadth, and it is distant twenty days’ sail from the continent, but it was a voyage performed with difficulty and danger by vessels with sails ill-constructed, and built with prows at each end, but without holds and keels; that there are other islands between this and India, but that Taprobane lies furthest to the south; that there are found in the sea, about the island, animals of the cetaceous kind, in form like oxen, horses, and other land-animals.” (ib. pt. 15).

Greek contacts with Ceylon are very slight, if any at all. Two Greek coins have been found in Ceylon, although the site is not known. One is of Acarnania, Leucas (about B.C. 350-250), with the head of Apollo on the obverse and prow of a galley on the reverse; the other, of Seleukos IV (about B.C. 187-175) with diademed head on the obverse, and the legend *BASILEOS SELEUKOU* on the reverse. This does not, however, yield any evidence that the Greeks were in Ceylon. (cf. *Ceylon Coins and Currency* by Codrington, p. 49). As the *Milindaprasnaya*, the Sinhalese translation of the Pali *Milindapanha* has held an honoured place in the

Buddhist literature of Ceylon, it may not be out of place to point out here its Greek connection, real or legendary. It is said to be the record of a controversy between King Milinda or Menandros, the seventh and last but one of the kings who succeeded Demetrios, the Greco-Bactrian ruler of Kashmir, and Nagasena, a learned Buddhist monk. Menandros or Menander, had his capital at Sagala (modern Sialkot in the Punjab) was a Greek (Yonaka) and came to meet Nagasena with 500 *yonnu*. (rf. *Milindaprasnaya* pp. 2, 3, 7). "It has been justly said" remarks Mrs. Rhys Davids, "that there are no *patent* traces of Greek influence in the book, even in the king's first mental attitude. But that influence may have been telling on the Indian mind more as a solvent than in a constructive way." (*The Milinda Questions*. p. 21).

"In the latter half of the first century A.D., an anonymous Roman subject from Egypt, sailed the Red Sea, the Arabian and the Indian ocean in merchant ships, and, for the instruction of his kind, set down in unscholastic Greek a factual and remarkable account of the busy trafficking of those parts. His book, the *Periplus of the Erythrean Sea*, is a social and geographical landmark of the first order." (*Rome beyond the Imperial Frontiers* by Wheeler, ch. 8, p. 138). *Periplus* in Greek means a sailing round, or account of a coasting voyage; and *Erythre Thalassa* means the Erythrean Sea, literally the Red Sea, but in fact our Indian Ocean, with the adjacent Persian Gulf and Arabian Sea. The author begins by describing the ports of the Red Sea (in the modern sense), then the Persian Gulf, the Indo-Pakistan coast and the Western coast of India. Musiris (identified with Cranganore), Nelycynda (not identified) and Cape Comari (evidently Cape Comorin) are noted. Ceylon is referred to as "the island of Palaesimundu, called by the ancients Taprobane", but was clearly unknown to him. Other Indian ports which receive the author's attention are Camara (probably Kaveri or Kaveripattanam), Poduke (Puduchcheri or Pondichchery) and Sopatana (Sopattinam of Tamil literature, modern Markanam). The *Periplus* ends with a picturesque description of Mongoloid traders. (rf. *ib.* ch. 8, *passim*).

A little earlier than the *Periplus*, an important discovery was made, which rendered navigation in the Indian seas quicker and more sure; this was the prevalence of the monsoons. "Hippalus" says the *Periplus*, "was the pilot who, by observing the location of the ports and the condition of the sea, first discovered how to lay his course straight across the ocean." Without his discovery, or at least his popularization of the monsoons as a dependable aid to deep-sea voyaging, regular trade with India would have been impossible. He lived some very considerable time before the

third quarter of the first century A.D. In fact, after this discovery, knowledge about India and Ceylon and their commercial possibilities greatly increased. This is seen in the works of Pliny and subsequent writers of Rome. (rf. ib. ch. 10).

Gaius Plinius Secundus, the "elder Pliny", was born in Como in Cis-Alpine Gaul in A.D. 24. During the reign of Claudius he served in Germany, but returned to Rome in A.D. 52 to devote himself to the study of Greek and Roman literature. After amassing a great amount of information, he wrote his "Natural History" about the year A.D. 69. This work was based on facts gathered by him from 146 Latin authors and 327 other authors. He left to his nephew, Pliny, the Younger, 160 volumes of extracts. His death took place in A.D. 79, during the great eruption of Vesuvius (rf. *Lives of the Caesars*, TITUS, p. 475). In his *Natural History*, Bk. VI, ch. 22, he gives an interesting account of Taprobane:

"It has been of long time thought by men of ancient days, that Taprobane was a second world, in such sort that many have taken it to be the place of the Antipodes, calling it the Antichthonos world. But after the time of Alexander, the Great, and the voyage of his army into those parts, it was discovered and known for a truth, both that it was an Island, and what compass it bears, Onesicrates, the Admiral of his fleet, has written, that the elephants bred in this Island are bigger, more fierce and furious for war service than those of India. Megasthenes says there is a great river which parts it in twain, and that the people thereof dwelling along the river are called Palaeogonoi, adding moreover that it affords more gold and bigger pearls by far than India does. Eratosthenes also took its measure, and says that in length it is 7,000 stadia, and in breadth 5,000; that in it there are no cities or great towns, but villages to the number 700. It begins at the Levant sea of Oriental Indians, from which it stretches and extends between the East and West of India; and was taken at times past to lie out into the sea from the Prasians country 20 days' sailing. But afterwards, because the boats and vessels used upon this sea in the passage thither, were made and wound of paper reeds like those of the river Nilus, and furnished with the same kind of tackling, the voyage thither from the aforesaid country was gauged within a less time; and well known it was, that according to the sail of our ships and galleys, a man might arrive there in 7 days. All the sea lying between is very ebb, full of shallows and shelves, no more than 3 fathoms deep . . . As for the North pole they never see it; but they carry ever with them certain birds in their ships, which they send out often when they seek the land, ever observing their

flight for knowing well that they will fly to the land, they accompany them, bending their course accordingly; neither use they to sail more than one quarter of a year; and for 100 days after the sun enters into Cancer, they take most heed and never make sail; for during that time it is winter with them. And thus much we come to know by relation of ancient writers."

"But we came to far better intelligence, and more notable information by certain Ambassadors that came out of that Island, in the time of Claudius Caesar, the Emperor; which happened upon this occasion and after this manner. It happened that a free slave of Annius Plocamus (who had farmed of the Exchequer the customs for impost of the Red Sea) as he made sail about the coasts of Arabia, was in such wise driven by the North winds besides the realms of Carmania, and that for the space of 15 days, that in the end he fell with a harbour thereof called Hippuros, and there arrived. When he was set on land, he found the King of that country so courteous that he gave him entertainment for six months, and entreated him with all kindness that could be devised. And as he used to discourse and question with him about the Romans and their Emperor, he recounted him at large of all things.

"But among many other reports that he heard, he wondered most of all at their justice in all their dealings, and was much in love therewith, and namely that their Denaries of the money which taken, were always of like weight, notwithstanding that the sundry stamps and images upon the pieces showed plainly that they were made by diverse persons, and hereupon especially was he moved and solicited to seek for the alliance and amity of the people of Rome; and so despatched 4 Ambassadors of purpose, of whom the *Rachias* was the chief and principal personage.

"By these ambassadors we are informed of the state of the Island, namely, that it contained five hundred great towns in it; and that there was a haven therein regarding the South coast, lying under Palesimundum, the principal city of all that realm, and the King's seat and palace; that there were by just account 200,000 commoners and citizens; moreover, that within this Island there was a lake 270 miles in circuit, containing in it certain islands good for nothing else but pasturage, wherein they were fruitful; out of which lake there issued 2 rivers, the one Palesimundas, passing near the city abovesaid of that name, and running into the haven with three streams, whereof the narrowest is five stadia broad, and the largest 15; the other Northward in India side, named Cydara; also that the next cape of this country to India is called

Colaicum, from which the nearest port of India is counted four days' sailing; in the midst of which passage, there lieth in the way, the Island of the Sun

“Furthermore they related, that the front of that Island of theirs which looked towards India, contained 10,000 stadia, and reached from the South-East beyond the mountains Enodi. Also that the *Seres* were within their kenning, whom they might easily discover from out of their Island; with whom they had acquaintance by means of traffic and merchandise; and that *Rachias* his father used many times to travel thither. Affirming moreover, that if any strangers came thither, they were encountered and assailed by wild and savage beasts; and that the inhabitants themselves were giants of stature, exceeding the ordinary stature of men, having red hair, eyes of bluish colour, their voice for sound horrible, for speech not distinct nor intelligible for any use of traffic and commerce. In all things else their practice is the same that our merchants and occupiers do use; for on the further side of the river, when wares and commodities are laid down, if they list to make exchange they have them away and leave other merchandise in lieu therefore, to content the foreign merchant

“Moreover these ambassadors would say, that they had more riches in their Island than we in Rome, but we more use than they. They affirmed also, that no man with them had any slaves to command; neither slept they in the morning after daylight nor at all in the daytime. That the manner of building their houses was low, somewhat raised above the ground, and no more ado; that their markets were never dear, nor price of victuals raised. As for courts, pleading of causes, and going to law, they knew not what it meant. *Hercules* was the only god they worshipped.

“Their king was always chosen by the voices of the people: wherein they had these regards; that he be aged, mild and childless: but in case he should beget children afterwards then he was deposed from his regal dignity, to the end that the kingdom should not in process of time be hereditary and held by succession, but by election only. This king being thus chosen and invested, hath thirty other governors assigned unto him by the people: neither can any person be condemned to death unless he be cast by the majority of them, and plurality of voices: and thus condemned as he is, yet may he appeal unto the people. Then are there 70 judges deputed to sit upon his cause; and if it happen that they assail and quit this party condemned: then those 30 who condemned him are displaced from their state and dignity, with a most bitter and sharp rebuke, and

for ever after, as disgraced person. live in shame and infamy. As for the king, arrayed he is in apparel as prince Bacchus went in old time: but the subjects and common people are clad in the habit of the Arabians. If it happen that the king offend, death is his punishment: howbeit, no man take in hand to do execution. All men turn away their faces from him, and deign him not a look nor a word. But to do him to death in the end, they appoint a solemn day of hunting, right pleasant and agreeable, unto Tigers and Elephants, before which wild beasts they expose their king, and so he is presently by them devoured.

“Moreover, in that Island good husbands they are for the soil, and till the same most diligently. Vines have they no use of at all: for all sorts of fruits otherwise they have abundance. They take also a great pleasure and delight in fishing, and especially in taking of tortoises; and so great they are found there, that one of their shells will serve to cover a house: and so the inhabitants do employ them instead of roofs. They count a hundred years no long life there: that is the ordinary time of their age.

“Thus much we have learned and known as touching Taprobane”. (*C.L.R.*, 3rd Series, Vol I, No. 4, pp. 179-182).

As Pliny's sources of information were the narratives of his predecessors, and whatever could be gathered from the Ceylon ambassadors, whose language was unknown to the Romans, his description of the Island and its inhabitants cannot be considered altogether reliable. With the ancients he exaggerated the size of Taprobane; and, the quaint account of the election of the king and the administration of justice, was probably due to misinterpretation or misunderstanding of the words of the ambassadors. There are, however, some very interesting items of information in his account.

The “Prasian Country” in the text is the land of Prachyas, Magadha, and the neighbouring provinces. (cf. *Advanced History of India*, ch. 5, p. 55). According to Pliny, the freedman of Annius Plocamus, who in the reign of Claudius (A.D. 41-54) had farmed the collection of the Red Sea taxes, was driven by storms to a forced-landing off Hippuros, modern Kudiramalai. From there he went to the port, which was probably Mahatittha (Mantai). The result of his long stay as the guest of the king of the country was the embassy from Ceylon to Rome. Professor Mortimer Wheeler gives us an important detail about this freedman. “Dr. David Meredith” he says, “in studying the ancient inscriptions of the Eastern desert of Egypt, has drawn attention to an extremely interesting rock inscription, a graffito, duplicated in Latin and Greek, in a sheltered spot besides the old road from Coptos to Berenice, at a distance of about 68 miles from Coptos. The Latin version reads: LYSA P. ANNI PLOCAMI VENI

ANNO XXXV III. NON IVL . . . The meaning is clear enough the graffito is a casual record of one Lysas, a slave of Publius Annius Plocamus, who came that way and presumably sheltered from the midday sun in the thirty-fifth year of the Emperor's reign (*Kaisaros* is added in the Greek version). This Emperor can only have been Augustus, and the date is, therefore, July 5th, A.D. 6." (*Rome Beyond the Imperial Frontier*, ch. X, pp. 155, 156). Although the identity of this Annius Plocamus with Pliny's is not conclusively proved, the coincidence of the name in so appropriate a geographical setting amounts to near-proof in respect of Plocamus, and it would be wise to consider the date of his freedman in Ceylon as likely to have been appreciably earlier than the reign of Claudius." (ib.)

Evidence of an earlier date for the Ceylon Embassy to Rome is provided by the *Vamsatthappakasini* or *Mahavamsa Tika*, the commentary on the *Mahavamsa*, written about the year 670 A.D. or later. The *Mahavamsa* says that Bhatikabhaya, King of Anuradhapura (B.C. 22-A.D. 7), "had a net of coral prepared and cast over the *cetiya*", the Great Thupa (XXXIV, 47). The *Tika* comments: "He had a net of coral prepared: that is, he sent (some one) to the country of Romanukha across the sea, and got down red coral, and had a perfect net of coral made, suitable enough to be cast over (the *cetiya*)." (*Vams*, XXXIV, 13-16, p. 630).

Coral, especially red coral, "was, and is, a well known product of the Mediterranean; and, the name *Romanukha* can easily be explained as formed by the addition of the pleonastic suffix *ka* to the Latin *Romanus*" (*History of Ceylon*, I, i, p. 225). Bhatikabhaya's period falls within the principate of Augustus, and the inscription mentioned above.

The *Carmen Seculare* of Horace alludes to embassies from India to the Court of Augustus:

Jam mari terrique manus potentes
Medus Albanasque timet secures;
Jam Scythae responsa petunt, superbi
Nuper et Indi.

Awed by our arms and by the Alban lictors,
Now the Mede owns our power on land and ocean
Now Ind and Scythia, she of late so haughty,
To Rome for pardon sue.

(Lytton's translation, p. 339)

Queyroz, too, refers to the Ceylon embassy: "Pliny relates that a freedman of Anneus Proclamus, while sailing along the coast of Arabia was carried away by a North Breeze, and after 15 days he came upon the island of Taprobane, and being well received by the King thereof, was by him, after some months, sent back with his ambassador to Rome, where was made an agreement about

dealings and trade; of which some find a confirmation in that, as Laguna relates in the time of Pope Paul III (1534-49) there was found in Rome a piece of cinnamon wood kept there from the time of Arcadius, the son of Theodosius, 261 years after Claudius." (*Conquest*, p. 14).

What can we make out of *Rachias* and *Palesimundum* in Pliny's account? "The inscriptions of the early centuries A.C., refer to district chieftains styled *ratiya* or *ratika*" (*History of Ceylon*, I, i, p. 13). The *Labuatabandigala* inscription of the 5th century speaks of *Ratiya Sumanaya*. "*Ratiya*" says Dr. Paranavitana, "occurs in other records of about the same period; for instance, an inscription at Kaballalena, in the Devamadi Hatpattuva of the Kurunegala district, mentions a Ratika named Naka, and an unpublished rock inscription at a place named Burutakanda, in the Hambantota district, has the words *Ratiya Makayaha puta Ratiya Sivayaha*. The word *Ratiya* is derived from the Pali *rattika* (Skt. *rastrika*), which occurs in the *Anguttara Nikaya* in a list of high dignitaries of the State" (E.Z., III, pp. 252 and 247). Pliny's *Rachias* must have belonged to this class of district rulers.

The *Periplus* refers to Ceylon "as the island of Palaesimundu, called by the ancients Taprobane." According to Pliny, Palaesimundum is the principal city of the realm, and Palaesimundas a river passing near the city. "In Indian literature" says C. W. Nicholas, "the earliest reference to Ceylon is in Kautaliya's *Arthashastra*, in which the Island is mentioned under the name Parasamudra ('beyond the ocean'), the forerunner of Palaesimundu and Simondu of some Greek writers". (*History of Ceylon*, I, i, p. 16). Unfortunately, the exact reference is not given. The *Arthashastra* has "Parasamudaka, that which is found beyond the ocean, are several varieties of gems." It also speaks of a species of resin of aloe called Parasamudraka, which is "of variegated colour and smells like cascus or like Navamalika (jasminum)" (pp. 77, 79). But, there is no mention of Ceylon. A contributor to the Indian Antiquary notes that according to the commentator of *Arthashastra* the gems from Ceylon were called *parasamudra* (rf. *Ancient Jaffna*, p. 102, note). But Battaswami's commentary in Shamasastri's translation of *Arthashastra* says that the resin called Parasamudraka was "obtained in the country of Kamarupa", in Western Assam. (*Arth*, p. 19, note 7). Reference to "the Island of Simhala (Ceylon)" occurs in connection with Kula and Asokagramika, places of origin of certain gems (rf. *ib.* pp. 76, 80). Mudaliyar Rasanayagam maintains that "the word obviously represented the Tamil 'Palaisilamandalam'. Ceylon was known to the ancient Tamils as Ilam and Ilamandalam; and it has continued to be so known to the present day." (*Ancient Jaffna*, p. 102). For further discussion on this subject, the reader is referred to *C.L.R.*, 3rd Series, III, pp. 321 ff).

The mission from Ceylon to Rome "is said to have originated from the curiosity aroused there by the castaway freedman of

Plocamus . . . It obviously did not understate the wealth of the Island; certainly Roman trade was shortly afterwards extended to it, and, Ptolemy, in the following century, was able for the first time to give an adequate description of it." (*Rome Beyond* ch. XI, p. 162).

Claudius Ptolemaeus enriched the West with much information about Asia by his geographical researches. He was born in Egypt at Ptolemais Hermii, a Grecian city at the Thebaid. His first astronomical observation was in A.D. 127, and his last in 151. He died at the age of 78. There were maps accompanying his Guide to Geography, but the map now known as his may be the original or a later edition. His works, *Cosmographia* and *De Locis Mirabilibus*, were printed in 1486, 1511, 1525, 1535, 1541, 1552, etc., some with additional material. In 1932, was printed at New York, the Geography of Ptolemy, translated and edited by N.L. Stevenson, based upon Greek and Latin manuscripts, and 15th and 16th century printed editions, with reproduction of maps from Ebner Manuscripts, circa 1,460. The following extracts are from the 1552 printed edition: *Geographiae Claudii Ptolemaei Alexandrini, Philosophi ac Mathematici praestantissimi, Libri VIII, partim a Bilibaldo Pirckheymero translati ac commentario illustrati, partim etiam Graecorum antiquissimorum ac exempliorum collatione emendati atque in integrum restituti*. The 8 books of the Geography of Claudius Ptolemaeus of Alexandria, the pre-eminent philosopher and mathematician, partly translated and adorned with a commentary by Bilibald Pirckheymer, and partly corrected and restored to its integrity by collating copies of ancient Greek texts.

"Opposite Cape Cory, which is in India, is the projecting point of the Island of Taprobane which was called formerly Simoundu and now Salike. The inhabitants are commonly called Salai. Their heads are quite enriched with luxuriant locks like those of women. The country produces rice, honey, ginger, beryl, hyacinth and has mines of every sort, of gold and silver and other metals. It breeds at the same time elephants and tigers . . . The mountains in the Island are conspicuous; they are called Galibi, and from them flow the Phasis and Ganges. From the mountains which are called Malea, flow Soanas, and Azanos and Barraces. Below this range upto the sea are the pastures of elephants. From a part of the Island, mostly to the North, the Galibi and the Mudutte live. Below them are Anurogrami and Nagadibi; and below the Anurogrami are the Soani. Below the Nagadibi are the Semni, and below them also, to the West, are the Sandocandi. Further below, upto the pastures of the elephants, the Bumāsani. The Tarachi live towards the East. Below them are the Bocani and the Morduli, and those who are further South, the Rhogadani and Nanigiri. The inland

cities of the Island are these: the royal city of Anurogrami, the metropolis of Magrammi, Adisamum, Poduce, Vlispada and Nacaduma." (pp. 136-7).

Queyroz says that "the Chinese who either conquered it (Ceylon) or traded therein call it Simonda, marvel of the world" (*Conquest*, I, p. 4). The Chinese generally spoke of Ceylon as Sie-lan, the ancient kingdom of Seng-kia-le, but not as Simonda. Salai and Salike represent the Pali *Sihala*, used by the *Dipavamsa* and *Mahavamsa* for Lamka and its people (*Dip.* IX, I; *Mahav.* VII, 42). In *Galibi*, one can recognise the Sinhalese word *gala* (rock), which distinguishes the names of many mountains in Ceylon; and *Malea* was the Malaya-desa or Hill country (rf. *History of Ceylon*, pp. 12). The *Phasis* and the *Ganges* are two rivers rising from the Galibi. The *Mahavamsa* calls the Mahavaliganga, Ganga or the river (X, 44). Codrington has, therefore, identified this river with Ganges of Ptolemy (rf. *Short History of Ceylon*, p. 3). Its source however is not in Galibi, but in Malea, the hills of the Central Province. Others, therefore, think that it is the Kanagarayan Aru, or, perhaps, the river flowing into the Mullaitivu Lagoon. (rf. *Land Maps and Surveys*, p. 23). The *Phasis* is said to represent either the Malvatu Oya, or the Kanagarayan Aru (rf. *Land Maps, etc.*, p. 23; *Ancient Jaffna*, p. 99). The rivers *Soanos*, *Azanos* and *Barraces* were, probably, the Kala Oya, its ancient name being Gona river (rf. *Mahav.* XXV, 13, 113), the Valave Ganga and the Mahavaliganga. The *Barraces* is said to rise from the Malea and flow into the sea near *Bokana*, which sounds very much like Gokanna, the ancient name for Trincomalee (rf. *Mahav.* XLI, 79; LXXI, 18). According to Eratosthenes and Strabo, Taprobane extended towards Africa; and the *Periplus* says that "it extended gradually towards the West till it nearly reaches the opposite coast of Azania", which is Africa. It is quite possible that owing to this misconception the southernmost river of the Island, the Valave Ganga was called the *Azanos* (rf. *Short History, etc.* p. 5). *Muduttou* and *Nagadiba* are Matota or Mahatittha and Nagadipa. (rf. *Ancient Jaffna*, p. 115).

Anugrammon is Anuradhapura, which was called by the ancient-Anuradhagama (A^ograma), "built by a man of that name near the Kadamba river", now Malvatu Oya (*Mahav.* VII, 43, 44). *Magrammon*, the metropolis, is, according to Ptolemy's location, to the South-East of Anuradhapura, and South-West of Nagadipa, which he places to the East of Anuradhapura, when it is actually North. "The corrected position off Magrammon would be to northward of Anuradhapura. Its identification with Magantota or Mahiyangana (as Codrington had done: rf. *Short History, etc.*

pp. 3, 52) cannot be sustained. Magantota was then known as Kahagamtota (Pali Kacchakatittha). The *Dipavamsa* states that Upatissanagara, the capital before Anuradhapura situated 10 to 12 miles to the north of the latter, was a prosperous and large market town. A locality to north-eastward of Anuradhapura was called Utarapura in the first and second centuries. Magrammon probably represents Upatissanagara, which may be synonymous with Utarapura" (*Land Maps*, etc. p. 25). It is possible that Upatissanagara or Up°gama, "which had well arranged markets, which was prosperous, opulent, large, charming and lovely" (*Dip.* IX, 36) had fame enough to pass for a metropolis, a mahagama, or mahagrama.

Other cities mentioned by Ptolemy are *Margana* (Magana, at the mouth of the Modaragam Aru), *Iogana*. (probably Uruvela), *Sindocanda* (in the neighbourhood of Puttalam), *Nubartha* (in the vicinity of Kalutara or Panadura), *Hodoca* (probably a corruption of Godapavata, near the mouth of the Valave), *Dagana*¹; "sacred to the Moon" (a misreading of some such name as Candanagama), the city of *Dionysius* or Bacchus (probably some sacred city in the south-east), *Bocana* (Gokanna, the ancient name for Trincomalee) and *Abaratha* (possibly Abagamiya, a village mentioned in a pre-Christian inscription near Kuccaveli: north of Trincomalee). The text quoted above mentions also *Adisamum* (in the vicinity of Vavuniya or even further north-east), *Poduce* (in the locality of Kala-vava—Kurunagala), *Vlispada* or *Ulipada* (in the region of Buttala) and *Nacaduma* (probably Nagamahathupa, the largest thupa at Mahagama).

Among the harbours and capes mentioned by Ptolemy are: the *North Cape* (Boreum promontorium) identified with Talaimannar (cf. *Short History* etc., p.3), Cape *Galiba* (probably Kudiramalai point), *Anarismundu* Cape (Kalpitiya, possibly from Arasadi, the ancient name for Kalpitiya, and the Tamil word *mundal* which means headland), the harbour of *Priapis* (somewhere near Chilaw), *Anubingara* (a place between Mantai and Pt. Pedro), *Parasodes*

1. *Dagana* is said to be "sacred to the moon", and almost in the same locality is the City of Dionysius or Bacchus, evidently a sacred place; that is to say, two sacred spots in the south-east coastal regions of Ceylon. According to the *Mahavamsa*, two of the eight saplings which sprang from "the great Bodi-tree" were planted, one at Kajaragama (now Kataragama) and the other at Candanagama (not identified). Kshtriya from these two places were accorded a place of distinction at the ceremonial planting of Bodhi-tree at Anuradhapura by Devanampiyatissa in B.C. 246, and the gift of the saplings was a further honour conferred on them. If we take *Dagana* to represent Candanagama which could have been misread as Candagama (the city of the moon), then the city of Dionysius would be Kataragama. Cf. *Mahav.* XIX, 53-67).

harbour (may be Negombo), the *Headland of Zeus* (the promontory of Colombo), the *Orneon Headland* or the *Headland of Birds* (probably Hambantota), *Corcobara* (some port near Mahagama called Sakkharasobbha), the *Whale-Point* (cetaeum promontorium: seems to fit Sangamankanda, the most easterly point of Ceylon), the *Haven of Mardos* (a short distance south of Kuccaveli), and the *Haven of the Sun* (may correspond to the Kokkilai lagoon).¹

Ptolemy also mentions the names of several tribes inhabiting the Island. In the North are the *Galibi* and the *Mudutte*, to the south of them the *Anurogrami* and the *Nagadibi*; these names are associated with the localities where they lived. The *Tarachi*, the *Bocani*, the *Morduli* and the *Semni* may well be clan names of totemistic origin, such as *traccha* (Skt. taraksa) meaning hyena, *Moriya* from *mayura*, a *gokanna*, a large species of deer, and *sunaka*, a dog. (rf. *Mahav.* XIX, 2, note; XXXVIII, 13, note; *Culture of Ceylon*, etc. sect. 20). "Before Taprobane" says Ptolemy, "there lies a multitude of islands, which are said to be 1378." Some of their names are given.

"So far as it is possible to say with any certainty, the earliest extant proof of the insularity of Ceylon dates to the second century A.D., when Ptolemy represented a land-form called Palaesimundu but in his time Salice, which he explains is the Taprobane of the ancients. A basic error in his crude conical projection gave his island an area nearly 12 times the actual size of Ceylon. Despite this, and other defects, Ptolemy's eighteen hundred years old map is in the main remarkable. It reveals the knowledge and ignorance of the men who were responsible for the material which helped to construct the map. For four hundred years thereafter, very little of importance was added to the topographical information of the Island." (*Land Maps*, etc., pp. 4, 5).

Claudius Aelianus (cir. A.D., 146-222), though a Roman wrote a work in Greek on natural history, where accounts of strange animals related by sailors, also find a place. "The island" he wrote, "which they call Taprobane, has palm groves where the trees are planted with wonderful regularity all in a row, in the way we see the keepers of pleasure-parks plant out shady trees in the choicest spots. It has also herds of elephants which are there very numerous and of the largest size. These elephants are more powerful than those of the mainland, and in appearance larger, and may be pronounced to be in every possible way more intelligent. The Islanders export them to the mainland opposite them in boats, which they construct expressly for this traffic from wood supplied by the thickets of the island and they dispose of their cargoes to

1. In the identification of place names in Ptolemy's account, I have generally followed *Land, Maps and Surveys* by Brohier and Paulusz pp. 23-25 and *J.C.B.R.A.S.* (New Series) Vol. VI (1959) Special number.

the king of Kalingai. On account of the great size of the Island, the inhabitants of the interior have never seen the sea, but pass their lives as if resident in a continent, though no doubt they learn from others that they are all around enclosed by the sea. The inhabitants, again, of the coast have no practical acquaintance with elephant-catching, and know of it only by report. All their energy is devoted to catching fish and the monsters of the deep; for the sea encircling the island is reported to breed an incredible number of fish, both of the smaller fry and of the monstrous sort, among the latter being some which have the heads of lions and of panthers and of other wild beasts, and also of rams; and, what is still a greater marvel, there are monsters which in all points of their shape resemble satyrs. Others are in appearance like women, but instead of having locks of hair, are furnished with prickles. It is even solemnly alleged that this sea contains certain strangely formed creatures, to represent which in a picture would baffle all the skill of the artists of the country, even though, with a view to make a profound sensation, they are wont to paint monsters which consist of different parts of different animals pieced together. These have their tails and the parts which are wreathed of great length, and have for feet either claws or fins. I learn further that they are amphibious, and by night graze on the pasture-fields, for they eat grass like cattle and birds that pick up seeds. They have also a great liking for the date when ripe enough to drop from the palms, and accordingly they twist their coils, which are supple, and large enough for the purpose, around these trees, and shake them so violently that the dates come tumbling down, and afford them a welcome repast. Thereafter when the night begins gradually to wane, and before there is yet clear daylight, they disappear by plunging into the sea just as the first flush of morning faintly illuminates its surface. They say whales also frequent this sea, though it is not true that they come near the shore lying in wait for thunnies. The dolphins are reported to be of two sorts—one fierce and armed with sharp-pointed teeth which gives endless trouble to the fishermen, and is of remorselessly cruel disposition, while the other kind is naturally mild and tame, swims about in the friskiest way, and is quite like a fawning dog. It does not run away when any one tries to stroke it, and it takes with pleasure any food it is offered." (C.L.R., 3rd Series, Vol. I, pp. 116, 117).

With better knowledge of the East, its people and their resources, Roman trade developed in the Indian peninsula and spread as far as China. It is recorded in the *Han Annals* of the Chinese that in the time of Emperor Huan-ti (A.D., 166 an embassy from 'An-tun' (Marcus Aurelius Antoninus), king of the 'Ta-ts'in' (Romans) came to the Chinese Court. (cf. *Rome Beyond*, pp. 205, 206). It is likely that the Roman trade in Ceylon was controlled by their emporia in South India, for instance, Kaberis.

Emporium (Kaveripattanam), Poduke Emporium (Puduchcherry) and Muziris (Cranganore). The discovery of extensive Roman remains in Arikamedu, near Puduchcherry (Pondichcherry) reveals the trade activities of the Romans in South India.

In Ceylon, Roman trade centred around Mannar and extended south as well as to the interior. Diogo do Couto says: "We find in Ceilao vestiges of Roman buildings, which shows that they formerly had communication with that island. And we may even say more, that in it were found the same coins that this freedman (of Annius Plocamus) took, when Joao de Mello de Sao Payo was captain of Mannar in Ceilao, in the year of our Lord 1574 or 1575 (or rather 1584 or 1585), in excavating some buildings that stand on the other side in the territories they call Mantota, where even today there appear here and there very large ruins of Roman masonry work: and whilst some workmen were engaged in taking out stone, they came upon the lowest part of a piece of foundation, and on turning it over they found an iron chain of such strange fashion that there was not in the whole of India a craftsman who would undertake to make another like it. And they also found two copper coins, one quite worn, and another of base gold, likewise worn on one side, and on the other could still be made out the figure of a man, from the breast upwards, with a piece of lettering around worn away in some parts but there could still be made out clearly at the beginning this letter C, the following ones being worn away, and the lettering continued around, in which could be seen these other letters RMNR. This chain and the medals were taken to Joao de Mello, who prized them much, and took them to the kingdom to give them to the king, and was lost at sea in the year 1590 . . ." (JCBRAS, No. 60, pp. 83, 84).

Queyroz too alludes to these discoveries. "Joao de Melo de S. Payo, Captain of Mannar, in the year 1575, ordering the destruction of some ancient buildings near the fortalice, there were found in their foundation some coins of gold and copper with the letters C.L.R.M.N., which seem to mean: Claudius Romanorum, according to their wonted abbreviations . . . Some few years ago on digging some foundations near the custom house of Diu, there was found among others a gold coin like the one mentioned by Father Cerda in his Commentary on the Eclogues of Virgil, explaining these nemistics: *Inscripti nomina regum naecuntur flores*. I saw it; it was thicker in the middle with a fleur-de-lis on one side and around it the inscription *Tiberius Caesar Imperator et Pontifex Maximus*, likewise abbreviated" (*Conquest*, p. 14).

Whatever one may think of the assertions of Couto and Queyroz about the discovery of Roman ruins it is a fact that large quantities of Roman coins have been found in various parts of

Ceylon. (rf. *JCBRAS*, No. 60, p. 84, note; No. 58, p. 170). In the time of Claudius, there was hardly any commerce between Rome and Ceylon. From Augustus to Nero (d. A.D. 68), when there arose a great demand for luxury articles, Roman trade with South India increased as evidenced by hoards of Roman coins discovered mostly in the districts of Coimbatore and Madura. Roman coins of this period found in Ceylon are few. After the death of Nero, a revulsion from luxury occurred, and trade declined. About the middle of the fourth century a slight revival set in, and Roman coins of this period and later, especially those of low value were found, sometimes in large numbers, in various parts the Island: in Anuradhapura, Mihintale, Sigiriya, Kurunegala district (Shakerley Estate), Kolugala, Ampitiya, Kandy bazaar, Watapuluwa, Badulla, Mantote, Kalpitiya, Udappuva, Hendala, Colombo, between Veyangoda and Mirigama, Balapitiya, Hikkaduva, Gintota, Boragoda, Matara, Naimana, Kitalagama, Kapuhenvala, Tangalle, Tissamaharama, Batticaloa, Kalmunai, Pandirippu, Valachenai, Jaffna peninsula, Kantarodai, Kalmunai in Punakari, Attikuli (Mannar district) Pidarikulam, Giant's Tank and Hiktetiya.

Hoards were found in Sigiriya, about 1687 mostly small coins, in Watapaluwa 1,500 small bronze, in Mantote 'great numbers of Roman coins of different Emperors, particularly of the Antonines', in Colombo several hundreds, in Balapitiya 'a large quantity', in Hiktetiya about 300, in Na-imana about 3,000, in Kapuhenwala about 384, in Valachenai (Eastern province) 'a large number', in Kantarodai about 150 and in Jaffna peninsula a pot of gold coins "inscribed in ancient Greek characters". (rf. *Ceylon Coins and Currency*, pp. 32, 33; *JCBRAS*, No. 58, pp. 169 ff).

"The finding of so many small bronze coins" "says Codrington, "usually very worn, at almost every petty port, with the noticeable exception of Trincomalee, as well as at various places in the interior, leads to the supposition that they formed the currency of the Island. That this was so is proved by the fact that at Sigiriya out of 1,687 coins all but twelve were small Roman or Indo-Roman bronze. This place was the capital only in the reign of Kassapa I (A.D. 479-497), and on his death was handed over to the monks; we have therefore, a more or less fixed date for this currency. Direct Roman trade came to an end with the fall of Alexandria in A.D. 638, and the use of these coins and of their imitations . . . must have ceased practically before the rise of Pōlonnaruva, where only one has been found; this city is first mentioned in the reign of Aggabodhi III (624-640), and appears to have been used as a royal residence at least as early as the time of the fourth of

the same name (673-689). This gives the first half of the 7th century as the latest probable limit at one end; at the other we have the fact that the greater number of the coins are of the last half of the fourth century. That they were in long use is seen from their very worn state, the majority being quite illegible." (*ib.* p. 33).

Interesting information about Ceylon is found also in the *Topographia Christiana*, written in the 6th century by much travelled Christian monk, named Cosmas Indicopleustes or Cosmas the Navigator of the Indian waters. He was from Alexandria, and, before he became a monk, had travelled the Red Sea, the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean, and visited the lands bordering on them. His work is in 12 books, from the third of which the following extracts are taken:

"Concerning the Island of Taprobane.

This is the great island in the Ocean, lying in the Indian Sea. By the Indians it is called Siedediba, but by the Greeks Taprobane. In it is found the hyacinth stone. It lies on the other side of the Pepper Country. And round about it there are a number of small islands, in all of which you found fresh water and coconuts. And these are almost all set close to one another. The great island, according to what the natives say, has a length of 300 *gaudia* (Sgh. *gavu*), and a breadth of the same number, *i.e.*, 900 miles. There are two kings on the island and they are at enmity with one another. The one possesses the hyacinth, and the other has the other part in which is the great place of commerce and chief harbour. It is a great mart for the people of these parts. The Island has also a church of Persian Christians, who have settled there, and a Presbyter who is appointed from Persia, and a Deacon and all the apparatus of public worship. But the natives and the kings are quite another kind of people. They have many temples on the Island, and on one of these temples, which stands in an elevated position there is a hyacinth, they say, of great size and brilliant ruddy colour, as big as a great pine-cone, and when it is seen flashing from a distance, especially when the sun's rays strike on it, it's a glorious and incomparable spectacle.

"From all India and Persia and Ethiopia many ships come to this Island, and it likewise sends out many of its own, occupying as it does a kind of central position. And from the remoter regions, I speak of Tzinista and other places of export, the import

of Taprobane are silk, aloes wood, cloves, sandal wood and so forth, according to the products of each place. These again are passed from Sieladiba to the marts on this side, such as Male where the pepper is grown and Kalliyana (modern Kalyana, near Bombay), whence are exported brass, and sisam logs, and other wares, such as cloths, for that also is a great place of business; also to Sindu, where you get the musk or castorin, and androstachya; also to Persia, Homerite and Adula, and the Island receives imports again from all these marts, that I have been mentioning, and passes them on to the remoter ports, whilst at the same time it exports its own products, in both directions."

"Sindu is where India begins. Now the Indus, i.e., Phison, the mouths of which discharge into the Persian Gulf is the boundary between Persia and India. And the most notable places of trade are these: Sindu, Orrhotha, Kalliana, Sibor, and then the five marts of Male, from which pepper is exported, to wit, Pati, Mangu-rath, Salopatana, Nalopatana, Pudopatana. Then there is Sieladiba, i.e., Taprobane, which lies hitherward about five days and nights sail from the Continent; and then again on the Continent and further back is Marallo, which exports conchshells; Kaber, which exports alabandinum; then again further off is the Clove Country; and then Tzinista, which produces the silk. Beyond this there is no other country, for the ocean encompasses it on the east. The same Sieladiba then, set, as it were, in the central point of the Indies, and possessing the hyacinth, receiving imports from all the seats of commerce, and exporting to them in return is itself a great seat of commerce . . . But, he (the king) of Sieladiba (owns) both elephants which he has (sc. in his country) and horses. The elephants he sells by cubit measurement; for their height is measured from the ground, and so the price is fixed according to the measurment, ranging from fifty to a hundred numismata or more. But the horses they bring to him from Persia and these he buys, and grants special immunities from duty to those who import them." (*Ceylon Coins and Currency*, pp. 34. 35).

Cosmas, like his predecessors, exaggerated the size of the Island. Three hundred *gavu* make about 600 miles; but the actual size of Ceylon is 271 miles or a little more at its greatest length, and 137 miles at its greatest breadth. The presence of Christians from Persia is attested by the fragment of a rectangular column with a Persian Cross carved on it, found among the ruins of the Citadel of Anuradhapura, and the discovery by the Portuguese of a Cross of St. Thomas at Mutwal, at the mouth of the Kalaniganga. (*Conquest*, p. 719; *A.S.C.*, Vol. I, p. 51; *Short History*, etc., p. 32).

About this period, Persian Christians had gone as far as China. The famous inscription on a monument set up in A.D. 781 in or near Ch'angan, then the capital of China, and represented by the city of Hsianfu, informs us that a Christian from Persia had come to China in 635, won the favour of the Government, and had been generous in the use of his wealth in caring for the poor and helping religious works. The monument had been put up to commemorate his munificence. (rf. *Expansion of Christianity*, Vol. II, pp. 277, 278.)

The brilliant hyacinth, which Cosmas describes, is evidently the bejewelled pinnacle of a stupa, called *vajira-cumbata*. Samghatissa (A.D. 296-300) is said to have "put upon the spire of the thupa (Ruvanvalisaya) a precious ring of crystal" (*Mahav.* XXXVI, 66). The *Dipavamsa* adds that he constructed "of jewels a Thupa of the shape of a flame" on the most excellent Mahastupa (XXII, 49). "The commentary to the *Mahavamsa* explains that this ring of crystal was the setting for a great precious stone, valued at one hundred thousand gold pieces, and served the purpose of averting the danger from lightning." (*The Stupa of Ceylon*, p. 40). King Dathusena (cir. 508-526) "put up a golden umbrella as well as a ring for protection against lightning" on the three big cetiyas of Anuradhapura (*Mahv.* XXXVIII, 74).

With the destruction of the Roman Empire in the West about the end of the 5th century, trade with the east decreased, and finally disappeared. But, the cultural and religious influence of Rome continued and spread in the West, and became the leaven of European civilization. That influence penetrated into Ceylon with the advent of European nations, the Portuguese, the Dutch and the British. The Portuguese brought Roman Catholicism to Ceylon, the Dutch the Roman-Dutch law, and the British the political institutions begotten of Roman administration. Greek and Latin are now among the dead languages; they are neglected by Colleges and even Universities which thrived on them. But their cultural value cannot be held by the silence of the grave.

Absint inani neniac
 Luctusque turpes et quaerimoniae;
 Compesce clamorem, ac sepulchri
 Mitte supervacuos honores.

(Horace, Odes Bk. II, Ode, XX).

Not for me raise the death-dirge, mine urn shall be empty;
 Hush the vain ceremonial of groans that degrade me,
 And waste not the honours ye pay to the dead
 On a tomb in whose silence I shall not repose.

(Lytton's translation)

Bibliography

- An Advanced History of India*, by Majumdar, Raychaudhuri and Datta, 1956.
- Ancient India*, as described by Megasthenes and Arrian: A translation of the fragments of the *Indika* of Megasthenes collected by Dr. Schwanbeck . . . by J. W. McCrindle. London 1877.
- Ancient Jaffna*, by Mudaliyar C. Rasanayagam, C.C.S., Madras, 1926.
- A.C.S., Archeological Survey of Ceylon, Vol. I, Colombo, 1924.
- Arthasastra*, Kautilya's: translated by Dr. R. Shamasastri, Mysore, 1951.
- A Short History of Ceylon*, by H. W. Codrington, London, 1929.
- Atlas of Ancient and Classical Geography* (Everyman's Library), 1933.
- Ceylon Coins and Currency*, by H. W. Codrington, Colombo, 1924.
- C.L.R., Ceylon Literary Register (3rd Series), Vol. I (1931), Vol. 3 (1933).
- Culture of Ceylon in Mediaeval Times* by Wilhelm Geiger, Wiesbaden, 1960.
- Dipavamsa*, edited and translated by Hermann Oldenberg, London, 1879.
- Expansion of Christianity*, by K. S. Latourette, Vol. 2.
- Horace's Odes, Epodes and Carmen Seculare*, translated by Lord Lytton, 1869.
- History of Ceylon*, by the University of Ceylon, Vol. I, pt. I (1959), pt. 2 (1960).
- JCBRAS, Journal of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.
- Land, Maps and Surveys*, by R. L. Brohier and J. H. O. Paulusz, Vol. 2 (1951).
- Lives of the Twelve Caesars*, by Suetonius, translated by Al. Thompson, London, 1926.
- Mahavamsa*, translated by Wilhelm Geiger, Colombo, 1950; *Culavamsa I*, by same, 1929.
- Odyssey of Homer*, translated by E. V. Rieu, (The Penguin Classics).
- Rome Beyond the Imperial Frontiers*, by M. Wheeler (Penguin Books).
- The Stupa in Ceylon* by S. Paranavitana, Colombo, 1947.
- Tennent's Ceylon* Ceylon by Emerson Tennent, London, 1860.
- The Histories of Herodotus*, translated by Aubrey de Selincourt (the Penguin Classics).
- Vamsathappakasini*, Vols. I & 2: edited by G. P. Malalasekera, London, 1935.

A CHRONICLE OF THE BUDDHA'S SIX HAIR RELICS

BY

DR. B. C. LAW.

The *Chakesadhaturvamsa*¹ dealing with the Buddha's six hair relics is included in the *Vamsa* literature of Ceylon. It is a work of a Burmese author of unknown name and date. It contains prose passages and verses. The language is simple and the diction is noteworthy. Like the *Thupavamsa* its treatment of the subject matter is of the same pattern. This text contains an account of the topes built by Sakka, Pajjunna, Manimekhala, travelling sailor,² Varuna the serpent king, and the seven sailors.³ An English rendering of this text is given below.

TEXT

Salutation be to the Blessed One, the Doctrine, and the Order⁴ or Congregation, foremost, pure, and the field of the virtue of the people. For the spread of the Buddha's religion, I relate the chronicle of the tope of the six hair relics.

1. This text has been edited by the late Prof. Minayeff of St. Petersburg in the *Journal of the Pali Text Society* for 1885. The History of the *Vamsa* literature is old. *Vamsa* was taken to mean *tanti* or *anvaya*. The alternation of prose and verse or of verse and prose is a phenomenon which occurs in the history of the *Vamsa* literature of Ceylon. The *Vamsa* literature is mostly based on the succession of kings and the succession of elders (*theras*). *Vamsa* means race, family, lineage, dynasty, tradition, legend chronicle and hereditary custom.
2. *Addhikanavika*.
3. *Sattanavika*.
4. *Buddha*, *Dhamma* and *Sangha* or *Gana*—these are known as *Tiratana*s or three refuges (*Vinaya Mahavagga*, p. 22). Buddha or awakened or enlightened was the epithet which was acquired by Gotama on having obtained omniscience (*Mahaniiddesa*, pp. 142-43; *Paramatthajotika*, I, pp. 107-9). *Dhamma* or the doctrine which is well-expounded, which bears fruit in this life, which is not conditioned by time, which has 'come and see' for its motto, which leads to the destination or the desired end and which is to be experienced by the wise individually (*Digha*, II, 93; Cf. *Majjhima* III, p. 9). The *Dhamma* embodying all the tenets of the Master was to take the place of the Master in his absence. *Sangha* includes *Bhikkhu* and *Bhikkhunisangha*. It really means *Savakasangha* or a fraternity of disciples. A *sangha* is a corporation which is characterised by the uniformity of creed and conduct (*Sumangalavilasini*, I, 230; *Paramatthajotika*, I, p. 20). The unity of action and commonness of goal characterise its external life. *Sangha* literally means *samuha* or group. For a detailed study, the attention of the readers is drawn to my *Concepts of Buddhism*, Chap. I.

(1) Once upon a time our Blessed One was dwelling at Rajagaha in the bamboo grove at Kalandakanivapa.¹ There he preached his doctrine to the four assemblies which was good at the beginning, good in the middle and good at the end, full of meaning, full of words and entirely complete.² At that time Anuruddha,³ Sobhita,⁴ Padumuttara, Gunasagara, Nanapandita and Revata⁵—these six *arhats*⁶ approached the Blessed One where he was with the same desire. Having approached him they saluted him and sat on one side. Seated on one side these monks in whom human passion was extinct said to the Lord thus:

“Reverend Sir, perfections⁷ have not been fulfilled by you for the welfare of beings of one country but they have been fulfilled for the good of all beings. Reverend Sir, those beings who are near can accomplish their object both in this world and in the next by meeting you; but for other creatures who are far away, an object of worship pertaining to the body of the Blessed One should be placed. Not far from the great ocean, Reverend Sir, many people live in a border country. Out of compassion for them it is

1. King Bimbisara of Magadha made a gift of this grove to the Buddha. This grove was situated in the outer area of Rajagriha neither very far, nor very near, and yet at the same time a peaceful retreat most favourably situated (*Vinaya-Mahavagga*, I, 39; Fausboll, *Jat*, I, 85). Here the Buddha once lived (*Ang.*, II, 35, 172, 179; III, 35; IV, 402; *Majjhima*, III, 128). A highly popular music of the day known as the *Giraggasamajja* was played here in the presence of six monks while the Master was here (*Vinaya*, II, 107; IV, 267).
2. *Digha*, I, 62; *Sam.*, I, 105; IV, 315; *Ang.*, II, 147, 208; III, 113 ff., 135, 262; *Digha*, III, 96; *Niddesa*, 316; *Itivuttaka*, 79, etc.
3. Anuruddha was born in the Sakiyan clan. He was one of the most eminent disciples of the Buddha and ranked foremost among those who attained the celestial insight (*Ang.*, I, 23). He showed the great importance of the cultivation of right recollection (*satipatthana*)—*Sam.*, V, 294; *Theragatha*, vs. 892-912.
4. Sobhita belonged to a brahmin family of Savatthi. He was declared by the Buddha to be the foremost among those who could remember past births (*Ang.*, I, 25; *Theragatha*, vs. 165-66).
5. Revata used to visit the Buddha with Sariputta after having obtained arhatship. He instructed his disciples to work out their good by earnestness (*sampadetha appamadena*) *Theragatha* vs. 645 ff.
6. *Khinasava* is translated by some as Cankerwaned. It means an *arhat* in whom human passion is extinct (*Vinaya*, I, 183; *Majjhima*, I, 145; II, 45; *Digha*, III, 97; *Vinaya*, I, 35; *Digha*, I, 84, 177, 203; *Majjhima*, II, 39; *Suttanipata* 16).
7. *Parami* or *Paramita*—It is employed as a synonym of *Buddhakaradhamma*, the virtues or qualities which tend towards a Buddha (Law, *Cariyapitaka*, Intro.; *Cariyapitaka-atthakatha*, p. 8; *Mahavastu*, (*Vanara Jataka* Mahagovindacaritam. *Ayadanakalpalata* (Sivi, sasa, Matsya, Rura, Sutasoma etc.), Kern, *Manual of Indian Buddhism*, pp. 20, 66).

proper to give something to be worshipped." Then the Blessed One, listening to their words, became pleased in mind, out of his great kindness, and he touched his head with his right hand in order to do good to the country folk. When he had touched his head, six hairs shining with the golden rays, stuck to the hand of the Blessed One.

(2) Then the Buddha gave them to the six elect. And they being delighted accepted them on their heads. Then the revered Ananda asked the Blessed One, "Venerable Sir! what shall be the impediment to the beings in that country on account of the relics of the Blessed One?" The Blessed One replied, "I do not see, Ananda, any loss to beings in that country. I only see their prosperity."

He explained thus: "My religion, Ananda, will remain firm for five thousand years from the time of my passing away. These six hair relics will be protected for more than two thousand and five hundred years. Thereafter there will be great worship and honour (for them). Each of the shrines will be constructed by a great being."

Thereafter the revered Anuruddha saluted the Buddha and departed going round him. Those *arhats* (elect) too, after receiving the hairs and saluting the Blessed One, departed with Anuruddha. Departing they rose up in the sky and they came down in that border country. They stayed there for one night; and at the time of the sun-rise they took care of their bodies. Then they entered the village for alms and enjoyed the food as received. Then all the elect proceeded towards the southern direction and when they saw a delightful spot having the colour like that of the sun, and covered with a forest containing branches and sprouts, they became delighted in mind and thought thus: "It is proper to keep one hair-relic in this comfortable place." They thought: "Here how can we get a donor of the relics, friend?" Then Anuruddha while making a resolution uttered this verse with folded hands:

"Formerly you greatly sacrificed your life, wealth and your own son and wife. If you obtained on that account the knowledge of enlightenment, a good attendant (servitor) should appear here today."

At that moment Sakka's throne made up of ornamental stone of light yellow¹ became hot. Sakka, the king of gods,²

1. *Pandukambalasilasana* has been translated by some as the throne of yellow marble (vide G. P. Malalasekera, *Dict. of Pali Proper names*, II, p. 961).
2. Cf. *Dhammapada Commy.* Vol. I, Pt. II, pp. 264 ff.; *Majjhima*, I, 253; *Sam.*, I, 228; *Ang.*, I, 144-45; *Digha*, II, 263, etc. vide also Law, *Heaven and Hell in Buddhist Perspective*, Pt. I, Sec. 1.

reflected and came to know the cause. He thought: "It is indeed a gain to me, it is indeed a good gain to me that I shall become a donor of the greatly powerful hair relic of the excellent conqueror, which is without a donor."

(3) He then came down from the heaven and appeared before the six elect. Anuruddha then uttered this verse:

"Wonderful indeed it is in the world that the thousand-eyed Sakka has reached this secluded place by the power of the relics."

Then the elder seeing him said thus: "The king of gods! You are endowed with great miraculous power; you become a donor of the relics of the best of wise men." Hearing it Sakka said: "Very well, Sir." He took one relic from the elder Anuruddha and placed it on his own head. He being elated with joy built a pit by his miraculous power, and he placed in it the golden images of eighty disciples, the Buddha's parents, and the incomparable ten potentialities.¹ In the middle of it he made seven heaps of seven kinds of jewels. On all sides he placed a golden net, raised a white umbrella and under it made a couch resplendent with various jewels, he took down the relic of one who was endowed with ten potentialities from his head, and bathed it with water from Sakka's jar. He placed it, saying: "Let the revered Blessed One live here for five thousand years for the welfare of all beings."² At that moment this great earth measuring more than four *nahutas*, two hundred thousand *yojanas*³ in extent, shook up to its water boundary. Sineru,⁴ the king of mountains, stooped

1. *Dasabala* is an epithet of the Buddha. Ten powers or potentialities belonging to a Buddha are the ten kinds of knowledge which are as follows:—

- (1) Knowledge of the cause and non-cause.
- (2) Knowledge of the past, present and future *karmas*.
- (3) Knowledge of the way leading to all directions.
- (4) Knowledge of the diverse nature of persons.
- (5) Knowledge of the inclination of other beings.
- (6) Knowledge of the senses of other beings.
- (7) Knowledge of meditation, concentration, emancipation, attainment and freedom from impurities.
- (8) Knowledge of remembering previous births.
- (9) Knowledge of the birth and death of beings.
- (10) Knowledge of the extinction of sins.

Cf. *Dashavamsa*, 2nd Chap; Kern, *Manual of Indian Buddhism*, p. 62; *Vinaya*, I, 38; *Jataka*, I, 84; *Sam.*, II, 27; *Vissuddhimagga*, 193, 391; *Dhammapada Commy.*, I, 14; *Vibhanga*, 317; *Buddhavamsa*, XII, v. 6.

2. *Nahuta* means a great number, myriad.

3. One *yojana*—a distance of about 7 miles.

4. It is the mount Meru (*Therigatha Commy.*, p. 150) which was 68,000 leagues high. Vide *Dhammapada Commy.*, I, 107; *Jat.*, I, 202, etc. It is identical with the Rudra Himalaya in Garhwal near the Badarikasrama. It is probably the same as the mount Meros of Arrian (*Law, Historical Geography of Ancient India*, p. 127).

down. The great ocean was troubled. The gods of the ten thousand world-systems being delighted worshipped the image of the Master with various good things. Then Sakka worshipped the shrine with a jewelled lamp resembling the gem of a universal monarch, and built a jeweled shrine over the relics. In the same manner he caused a golden shrine to be built outside the jewelled shrine, and he caused circles to be made surrounding it, so that there might not arise any hindrance in future. In order to make known that the relic was brought by him, the Venerable Anuruddha placed his own image facing the north.

Sakka, the king of gods, also had one golden cave constructed and worshipped the relic. He placed a treasure near the shrine and caused it to be guarded by a god. All the six elect being full of joy and delight saluted the shrine with the five Rests¹ and sat there. At that moment Sakka making a resolution, uttered this verse:

(4) "Let the excellent tope remain here for a long time, if you belong to the head of the sage. Oh conqueror, let the congregation of people be always given strength by your excellent power." So saying he became elated with joy, went round the shrine, saluted it with the five Rests and departed.

Here ends the account of the tope built by Sakka

All the six arhats (elect) went along a road in the southern direction, not far from that place, at a distance of three *gavutas*.² They saw a place scattered over with heaps of various kinds of sand, the most charming, resembling the Kelasa mountain³ like a white-washed courtyard, free from trees, grass, stone, gravel and pebble, and pleasant to all people and thought thus: "This place, oh friend, is suitable. One hair-relic should be placed here by us." Then the revered Sobhita said: "It is my duty to search for a donor of this relic." He put his upper garment on one

-
1. To prostrate oneself before a superior so completely that the forehead, elbows, waist, knees, and feet rest on the ground.
 2. One *gavuta*—a quarter of a *yojana*—80 *Usabhas*, a little less than 2 miles (*Jat.*, I, 57, 59; II, 209; *Visuddhimagga*, 118, etc.).
 3. *Kelasa mountain*—It is Sanskrit Kailasa which includes Kumaun and Garwal mountains. It is known as Bhutesagiri surrounded by the river Ganga (*Bhagavatapurana*, IV, 5, 22; V, 16, 27). It is also called Hemakuta according to the *Mahabharata* (*Bhishmaparva*, Ch. 6). It runs parallel to the Ladak range, 50 miles behind the latter. It contains a number of gidut peaks. It may be identified with the Vaidyutaparvata. It is the Kangrin-poche of the Tibetans, situated about 25 miles to the north of Manasarovara. Badarikasrama is said to be situated on this mountain (vide *Yoginitantra* 1/1; 1/12; EI, XXV. pt. V., *Kalikap.* Ch. 13, 23; *Mahabharata* Vanap. Ch. 144, 156; Law, *Mountains of India.*, p. 7.

shoulder, kept his knees on the earth, raised his folded hands and saluted the excellent relic of the Conqueror. While praying he uttered this verse:

“Oh Leader! Let a donor appear to-day through your power, if the island will remain here for the good of all beings.”

While he was praying and rendering great service in this way, a god named Pajjunna surrounded by a big retinue came down from his own celestial abode, adorned with many kinds of beautiful ornaments, and appeared before him from the cloud. Then the Venerable Sobhita saw him and said: “Oh lay devotee! you are of great power. Be a donor of the relic of Angirasa, the incomparable Blessed One.” The great king Pajjunna too, listening to his word, said: “Very well, Sir, I shall be a donor of it.” He said: “Oh lay devotee! You select a place, therefore, for erecting the tope. At that moment the great king Pajjunna made a pit by his miraculous power, built a relic-chamber there, prepared a seven-jewelled seat in it, repaired the golden images of the eighty great disciples of the Buddha and of the Buddha’s parents, as said before, placed the relic-casket made of seven jewels in the midst of the seat, bathed with the celestial scented water the excellent relic of the Conqueror, shining with six kinds of rays, and said: “Reverend Sir! Let the relic remain here for the good of all people.”

He got the opinion of the six elect and placed it in that casket. At that moment there occurred, as said before, wonders such as an earthquake. Then the great king Pajjunna having obtained love for the excellent relic, uttered this verse:

“Thus I am the donor of the relic of the greatly powerful and incomparable great sage. Oh, the accumulation of my merit!”

So saying he saluted the hair-relic of the Blessed One with five Rests, removed the covering of his own body and said: “To see you is indeed a rarity.” He worshipped the relic. All the gods also worshipped it in the manner befitting themselves. Thereafter the great king Pajjunna caused the shrine to be built with bricks adorned with many kinds of jewels. He also caused the courtyard of the shrine to be cleaned and encircled by a wall on all sides. Not far from it he dug a pond, buried the treasure in the four directions, and worshipped the relic. All the elect explained: “In future this shrine will be one hundred fathoms in extent. A righteous king also will be here.” The shrine made a noise on all sides. It was subsequently known as *Sobhandaya-cetiya*, considering the arrangement of paths, etc. of the tope.

Here ends the account of the tope built by Pajjunna

Then all the elect came back from that place. On the seashore there was a place full of asoka trees¹ on all sides.

On the eastern aids it was encircled by caves. Seeing it the elect thought: "Friend, how shall we search for an attendant of the relic in this country?"

(5) Then the Venerable Padumuttara said to the five arhats (elect) thus: "I should search for a donor of the relic." So saying he while making a resolution in verse in connection with the quantities of the Buddha, uttered this verse:

"Oh, the best of the whole world! If you are an ascetic helping the people to overcome the flood in this world, let my prayer be fulfilled by your power. Oh, that which grows on the head of the Conqueror! To-day I should get a donor of the tope."

As he was thus praying a goddess² named Manimekhala, the female protector of the sea, being adorned with all kinds of ornaments and accompanied by a big retinue, appeared, making herself known from the sea, as if she was seen by the power of the Buddha. Then the elders said thus: "Oh, female lay-devotee! Are you fit to build a tope for the relic? If you are able, you become a donor of the relic of the unrivalled One, the bull among men." Then she thought thus: "I am a woman. How am I to give donations³ towards the construction of a tope?" She said: "How shall I, Venerable Sir, do it?" He said: "If you, Oh female lay devotee, are able to give wages to the inhabitants of the border country, they will quickly build the shrine." She consented, saying: "Very well." She went in disguise, gave them wages and caused the shrine to be built again.⁴ Those people built in that place the relic-chamber, eighty cubits in depth. Then the goddess made heaps of gems on all sides that was brought by her miraculous power, and in the centre of the jewelled relic-chamber she placed a gem-case shining like a lamp resembling the

-
1. *Saraca Indica*, Linn—handsome trees, flowers at the beginning of the hot season, flowers pretty large in clusters. *Asoka* is a medicinal plant. Its bark is very useful as well as its seeds. (Cf. *Jat. V.* 188; *Visuddhimagga*, 625; *Apadana*, 345; *Vimanavatthu*, 35; *Vimanavatthu-attakatha*, 173; *Buddhacarita*, IV. 45.)
 2. Daughter of a God.
 3. *Pariccayana*. The P.T.S. Dictionary mentions *Pariccayana* meaning 'making a donation.'
 4. *Patisamkharapesi* means restored, 'repaired, rebuilt.'

gem of a universal monarch (brought) from the mountain Vepula.¹ On it she made a relic-casket and placed it. As soon as it was placed, the great earth quaked, and an untimely lightning brought about a pleasant rainfall. All the gods applauded. Thereafter Manimekhala greatly honoured the relic of the Blessed One and caused the shrine to be built. Building it and finishing the construction of the shrine, she, while making a resolution, uttered this verse:

“Let the chamber of the Conqueror last for five thousand years, and let these beings know the immortal state² through your power.”

(6) So saying the goddess Manimekhala became delighted and having caused the hair-tope of him (the Buddha) to be placed, she raised the banner on all sides. The goddess then saluted the feet of the elect. With a cheerful mind she departed and entered her own abode.

Here ends the account of the tope built by Manimekhala

Thereafter all the elect went towards the northern direction. A deity who lived on a banyan tree adorned with branches and sprouts, in a cool shade, saw them coming and asked: “Sirs, why have you come here?” They then answered: “Friend, this place is suitable. We have come to keep an excellent hair-relic of the Conqueror in this place.” The deity said: “Very well, Sirs, I should also approve with you.”

The Venerable Gunasagara said: “It is my duty to search for a servitor of the relic.” He, while making a resolution for an attendant of the relic by stretching forth his folded hands, uttered this verse:

“Let a donor be easily obtained, if you belong to the head of the sage. He will always remain here for the good of all beings.”

1. The Vepula or Vepulla mountain was known as the Pacinavamsa in a very remote age. It was later changed to Vankaka. It then received the name of Supassa and afterwards it became known as Vepulla (*Sam.*, II, 190 ff.). It was one of the five hills encircling Rajagriha. It runs for some length towards the south-east leading to the northern range of hills extending up to the village called Giriyeek on the Beharsharif-Nwadah road. It has been described as the best among the hills of Rajagriha (*Sam.*, I, 67). It lay to the north of the Gijjhakuta and stood in the midst of the girdle of the Magadhan hills (Vide also *Vinayapitaka*, II, 191-92; Watters, *On Yuan Chwang*, II, pp. 153-54; Law, *India as described in early texts of Buddhism and Jainism*, pp. 29-30; Law, *Historical Geography of Ancient India*, p. 270.

2. i.e., nirvana.

So saying he sat down saluting the relic. At that moment, through the power of the relic of the Conqueror, by the strength of the resolution of the elder, and by the influence of the Master and others, a boat brought by the wind already blowing, and full of merchants who knew the doctrine, reached that region. Then the merchants saw the congregation of monks and thought thus: "We who undertake sea voyages, should go near the six rare *arhats* (elect) and see the Order," and they informed the sailor accordingly. The sailor, too, hearing it, having faith in the Order, came down from the great boat with the merchants, ascended a small boat, came near those six elect, saluted the congregation of monks and asked: "What business have these gentlemen got here?" (They replied:) "We have come here, O lay disciple, for placing one bodily relic of the Master for the welfare of the world."

(7) Hearing it the sailor being delighted, addressed the merchants thus: "It is indeed a gain and indeed a good gain to us that we see the bodily relic of the Master which is of miraculous power and which leads to the good of the people. Such gain was not formerly obtained by those long moving about in the great sea." "You are my friend; I should build a *tope*," said he. Those merchants consented by saying "Very well." The tree-deity taking the human form said: "I should also be your friend." All of them approached the elders, and they making gifts worthy of them and saluting the elders, sat down. Then the sailor prayed: "Venerable sir, should I show zeal for the sake of a relic *tope*?" The elders answered: "Very well, O lay disciple, do it." The sailor ordered his men and built a relic-chamber by spending much wealth. He filled the chamber with the seven kinds of jewels and in the midst of the chamber he prepared a seat worthy of the Buddha. He placed the relic taking it from the hand of the elder Gunasagara. As soon as it was placed, all wonders appeared. Then the sailor, being elated with joy, uttered this verse:

"I am the donor of the relic of the incomparable great sage, who is the teacher of the world. It is indeed a gain to me, Sirs."

So saying he saluted the shrine with five rests, raised various kinds of flags and banners, went round the shrine, saluted the feet of the elect, ascended the boat, being surrounded by the merchants, and proceeded to his own town. The tree-deity being pleased, protects the shrine even now, being long-lived.

Here ends the account of the *tope* built by the travelling sailor.

To the eastern direction from that place, on the bank of the Ganges, there existed a pleasant spot. All the elect, going there (thought thus): "Friend, this place is shady and it has plenty of

water. It is proper to put a relic at this place." The elder Nana-pandita said: "It is my duty to search for a donor." He laying down one of his knees on the earth, placing his folded hands on his head, uttered this verse: "If the relic belongs to one who is wise, a leader of the world, incomparable, and a bull among men, I should get its donor."

(8) As he was speaking in this way with proper respect, a serpent-king named Varuna¹ came from the abode of serpents with his retinue and appeared before the elder. At that time the serpent-king saluted the elder, and enquired about the reason of his coming. Being told (by the elder), "We have come here for placing one bodily relic of the Blessed One, O lay devotee," he prayed thus: "Therefore Oh Sir, put me in charge of (the construction of) the relic-shrine." When he was permitted by them, he called his own retinue, and being delighted, he caused the earth to be cleaned for the relic-chamber, had a pit dug, and had the relic-chamber built like a celestial abode. He made one jewelled couch in the midst of it, and caused a white umbrella to be raised. He received the relic-casket on his head, made one valuable gem-casket and with great reverence placed it according to the wishes of the elders. As told before, all the wonders appeared at that time. The serpent-king being elated with joy, removed from his neck another gem not previously used by him, resembling the gem of a universal monarch, which is invaluable and which fulfils all desires. He worshipped the relic of the Blessed One by offering it. The whole assembly of serpents danced, sang, played all musical instruments and made a great noise. All the gods praised in various ways. At that time the serpent-king got the relic-tope beautifully built. The tope being finished, the serpent-king went round it and saluted it lowering his head. He uttered this verse: "I, being the well-wisher, became the donor of the relic of the Buddha, who is difficult to be found by the immortals even in a crore of *kalpas*."

Saying thus the serpent-king Varuna of great miraculous power became elated with joy and departed surrounded by the serpents.

Here ends the account of the tope built by the serpent-king Varuna

Going therefrom towards the northern direction the monks who were elect finding a spot, neither too near nor too far and frequented by wanderers, said thus: "Friend, this spot is suitable. The remaining one hair-relic should be kept in this spot." Thus it occurred to the venerable Revata:

1. Cf. *Apadana*, I, 31.

(9) "The wishes of all the five elect have been fulfilled by obtaining the relic's donor. Similarly I should obtain a donor in this country. I should, therefore, pray for a donor of the relic-tope." Then the elder Revata cherished the highest regard for the Master and said thus: "If you, Oh Venerable Sir, have obtained Buddhahood after fulfilling the perfections for more than hundreds of thousands of *kalpas*¹ and four *asankheyyas* (countless ages), making five great sacrifices and performing difficult acts for gods and men, let a donor of the tope be here to-day by your influence." He uttered this verse making a resolution;

"If for the welfare of the world, the leader permits here, I should get a donor of the relic-tope by your power."

While praying thus, the Damila² merchants full of faith in the Buddha being unable to go to any other country, reached that place in seven great boats, as if they were brought by the influence of the Conqueror's relic. Those merchants seeing the congregation of monks from a distance and being desirous of the relic, informed the senior-most sailor. Hearing it the sailor said: "Therefore I shall go." Surrounded by other sailors he went near them, gave something to the elect, served them and asked the elect thus: "Venerable Sirs, why have you come here?" They replied: "We have come to place the hair-relic of the Blessed One, possessed of ten potentialities and famous among men, for the welfare of beings" Then it occurred to the seven sailors and the merchants: "While seeing the Blessed One in the past, we saw his body miraculous in every way, shining with the six-coloured rays. How powerful is the hair-relic of the Blessed One now?" While thinking thus doubt arose in them. To remove their doubt the hair-relic showed a miracle. Therefore it was said, "In that relic the twin miracle is shown, like the (miracle) of the eye-ball of the world at the foot of the Kandamba tree."³ Then those sailors and merchants, seeing the miracle and having obtained faith, worshipped and honoured (the relic), worthy of them.

1. *Kalpa* or *Kappa* means a cycle lasting many millions of years as pointed out by Geiger (*Mahavamsa* Tr. p. 100, f.n. 1). There are three principal cycles: *Maha*, *Asankheyya* and *Antara*. Each *Maha* consists of four *asankheyya kalpas*. The four *asankheyyas* are: *samvatta*, *samvattatthayi*, *vivatta*, *vivattatthayi*. Cf. *Anguttara*, II, 142.

2. The Damilas commonly known as the Tamils were a powerful south-Indian tribe. They were a warlike people. The Pali chronicles point out that they had two settlements on both sides of the Ganges. For further details vide Law, *Geographical Essays*, 76 ff.

3. It should be Gandamba tree where the Buddha went to destroy the heretics (Cf. *Dathavamsa*, Chap. V, verse 54).

(10) Honouring the relic they went near the elect and asked their permission to build the tope. Permitted by the elect those sailors and merchants caused the relic-chamber to be built as told by them. They accumulated all gems in it, prepared a seat worthy of the Buddha, and burnt an oil-lamp. They made an image of the Buddha and those of the eighty disciples, placed a golden casket in the centre, accepted the incomparable hair-relic from the hand of the elder Revata, bathed it with scented water and decorated it with flowers and lamps made up of gold and silver, and placed it in the casket. At that moment there appeared wonders, such as earthquake and the like, as said before. The gods of the ten thousand world-systems praised. The sailors built the shrine. When the construction of the shrine was finished, they caused many kinds of flags and banners to be raised. Saluting the shrine they said thus: "Venerable Sir, we, the Damila disciples, who have not seen another of its kind, do like this, putting faith in the hair-relic." Since then as the shrine was built out of faith, it was called the Faith-shrine; as it was built by the Damilas, it was called the Damila-shrine. The sailors and merchants building the shrine and offering gifts to the elect ascended their respective boats and departed. The six *arhats* (elect) had their wishes fulfilled¹.

Here ends the account of the tope built by the seven sailors

That country was called Kesavati on account of the hair-relics being kept there.

Here ends the chronicle of the six hair-relics

1. *Sankappa* means wish, intention, determination, resolve, etc.

AN INSCRIPTION OF GAJABAHU II

(One Plate)

By

K. D. SWAMINATHAN, M.A.

Ootacamund

The subjoined inscription¹ was discovered by Mr. C. A. Smith, an Officer of the Land Development Department of Ceylon, who has a keen interest in antiquarian studies, in the course of his notice of the existence of a number of sites with ruins in the area irrigated by the waters of the Kantalai Tank. This inscribed pillar is now kept at the Archaeological Museum at Anuradhapura. I am grateful to the Archaeological Commissioner of Ceylon for kindly sending a photograph of the inscription for my study.

There are ten lines of writing and the writing covers a space of 4-1/2' by 1-3/4'. The average size of the letters is about 1/4" each. The surface of the pillar is dressed and the letters are neatly engraved between horizontal lines.

The language of the inscription is *Tamil* and the *script* is also *Tamil* with an admixture of *Grantha*. *Grantha* script is used in the following cases:—'Svasti Sri Lamkesvara' (lines 1-2), 'Gajabahu de' (lines 2-3) 'Brahmadeyam' (line 4) and 'bhumi' (lines 4-5). The characters of the record may be assigned to the 12th century A.D. In point of palaeography the present epigraph may be compared to the Slab Inscription of the Velaikkaras at Polonnaruwa² as also the fragmentary inscription from Trincomalee in Tamil.³ The orthographical peculiarities do not call for any specific remarks.

The inscription is undated but belongs to the reign of *Gajabahu II*,⁴ who is known to have ruled between 1137 and 1153 A.D. The inscription records that the pillar was erected during the reign of Gajabahu, the Lord of Lanka, as a boundary mark for the *Brahmadeya*, village Kantalai.

-
1. It is briefly noticed in the Report of Archaeological Survey of Ceylon, for 1954, p. G9 and G38.
 2. *Epigraphia Zeylanica*, Vol. II, p. 252 ff. and pl. 35.
 3. *Ibid*, V, p. 170 ff., pl. 7.
 4. Dr. A. L. Basham is of the opinion that inscriptions of Gajabahu II are dated in the regnal years of Jayabahu, since Gaja Bahu was never properly crowned. Unfortunately he has not cited any authority to substantiate his view. (See: *Ceylon Historical Journal*, Vol. IV, p. 20, f.n. 14). But the present inscription does not however mention Jayabahu at all or quote his regnal year.

The expression '*pidi-nadanda*' occurring in lines 5-6 of the inscription is noteworthy. It connotes the procedure of taking round a she-elephant, mounted by officers of State, through all the boundaries of the gift village or land, by periodically announcing to the public, the boundaries of the village or land in question. This practice of taking round a she-elephant obtained in South India right from the time of the Cholas and probably this extended to Ceylon, as a result of the close contacts between South India and Ceylon. The Tiruvalangadu Plates of Rajendra Chola I (1012-1044 A.D.) state that the wise and illustrious Araneri, the son of Mayana, took round the female elephant, under the orders of Jananatha, through the village of Mangalavayil.¹ The detached Tamil portion of the Tiruvalangadu plates also refers to the same practice in the expression '*pidi sulndu pidagai nadandu*'.² Another stone inscription³ engraved on the south wall of the *antarala* in the Devanathasvami temple at Tiruvendipuram, in the Cuddalore Taluk of the South Arcot District, in characters of the eleventh century A.D., belonging to the reign of Tribhuvanachakravartin Konerinmaikondan also mentions this procedure of taking round the female-elephant. The inscription records the gift of land purchased for the purpose, as *Kudininga-devadana* to the god Mahavishnu 'in the standing posture' (*ninraruliya*) at Tirvayindrapuram, by (Trai) lokyamahadevi, who is probably identical with Trailokyamahadevi, the queen of Rajadhiraja I, also known as Vijayarajendra.

Very few inscriptions of Gajabahu II are known to exist, although he ruled for a period of 15 years. Barring the Samgamu Vihara Rock Inscription⁴ dealing with an alliance between Gajabahu II and Parakramabahu, the inscription at Polonnaruwa dated in the 15th regnal year of Gajabahu II,⁵ and the Kapuru Vedu Oya inscription⁶ the present 'epigraph is the only other one known. As very few Tamil inscriptions from Ceylon have been published with full texts, the present inscription from Kantalai deserves publication, although it does not add much to our historical knowledge of the period.

1. *SHI*, Vol. III, p. 401, Text Lines 263-64.

2. *Ibid*, p. 404; Lines 119 and 129; also p. 429.

3. *ARIE*, 1955-56, No. 243.

4. *Ep. Zeylanica*, Vol. IV, p. 2 ff. and plate.

5. *ARE*, 1911, p. 68, para 25. This inscription does not seem to have been noticed in the Annual Reports of the Archaeological Survey of Ceylon.

6. *Journal of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol., XXVI, No. 71, part 1.

A few facts connected with the reign of Gajabahu II, may be usefully given here. Gajabahu II was the son of Vikkama Bahu who ruled between 1116 and 1137 A.D. Queen Sundari of the Kalinga race was his mother. He had his capital at Polonnaruwa. Gajabahu had a spouse called Bhaddavati¹ The *Mahavamsa*² states that Gajabahu II had neither a son nor any brother. It is rather difficult to rely on this statement as Vijaya Bahu II, who ruled in 1186-1187, is known to be the son of Bhaddavati.³

A major period of Gajabahu's reign was engrossed with wars. Siri Vallabha and Kittu Sirimegha, sons-in-law of Vijaya-bahu I (1055-1110 A.D.) who held the Dolasdahas ratha (Southern province of Ceylon) Atadahas rata, Uva and most of the Eastern provinces invaded the territories, (*i.e.* Madhya desa) of Gajabahu, but they failed in their attempt. Prakramabahu, who had grown up, was very ambitious and he intrigued with Gajabahu's general at a place called Kalavewa. He also managed to reach Polonnaruwa and stay with Gajabahu II unknowingly spying on his country. Later, after stabilising himself in his own territories he surprisingly attacked Gajabahu, initially wresting Dumbara from him. In the battle that ensued at Matale, he was able to defeat Gajabahu and storm his capital Polonnaruwa as also to capture him as prisoner. It was perhaps during this war, that Bhaddavati, queen of Gajabahu II fled to India for safety.⁴ Soon after, fortunately, a kinsman of Gajabahu II, Manabharana, by name, came to his rescue, defeated Parakramabahu and liberated Gajabahu. This happy event was not to last long and there was trouble again between Gajabahu and Manabharana, and Gajabahu not knowing what to do appealed to Parakramabahu again for help. In the war which ensued, Gajabahu escaped while his officers fought with Manabharana. Finally finding that he could not establish himself on secure grounds again, he seems to have abdicated in favour of Parakrama bahu.⁵ It was possibly at this juncture that Prakramabahu entered into an alliance with Gajabahu II, to the effect that they will not wage war against each other till the end of their lives; as is evidenced by the Samgamu vihara

1. *Ep. Zeylanica*, Vol. II, p. 180.

2. LXX, 333.

3. See *Ep. Zeylanica*, Vol. II, Genealogical table facing p. 59; also *Ep. Zeylanica*, Vol. III, p. 22.

4. *Ep. Zeylanica*, Vol. II, p. 80.

5. H. W. Codrington—A short History of Ceylon, p. 59.

Rock-Inscription.¹ Although Gajabahu's ministers supported Manabharana, Parakramabahu was able to defeat them and finally strengthening himself, was crowned. The Sinhalese Chronicle *Nikaya Sangraha* confirms that Parakramabahu ascended the throne in 1153 A.D.²

The *Mahavamsa*³ charges Gajabahu II of being an anti-Buddhist and as confiscating the revenues of villages granted to Buddhist institutions and adds that he stationed troops in the monasteries. This seems to be probable because Gajabahu, in his calamitous circumstances, may have taken such a course, in his desperate attempt to stabilise himself. After abdicating in favour of Parakramabahu, Gajabahu II seems to have died at Kantalai.

Reverting to the present inscription the geographical division *Kantalay* may be identified with *Kantalai*,⁴ in the Trincomalee District of Ceylon.

Text

1. Svasti Śrī (I*) La-
2. m̄kēśvaran Ga-
3. jabāhudēvar-
4. kantalay-bra-
5. hmadēyam pidi
6. naḍanda bhū-
7. mi idaiyar-
8. kallil ū (r)-
9. (pā)dikku nāṭṭi-
10. na ellai-kkal (II*)

1. *Ep. Zeylanica*, IV, p. 2 ff.

2. *Ibid*, I, p. 123.

3. LXXI, 48-62.

4. Kantalai was known as Vijayaraja-chaturvedimangalam in inscriptions of the 12th century from Ceylon and was an important centre of Hinduism during the period. A beautiful stone image of Vishnu 3' 6" high datable to 12th century A.D., was discovered here in 1932-33. See *Ceylon Journal of Science*, Vol. II, pp. 156-57; also plate LXXXIII.



Inscription of Gaja Bahu II

SLAVERY IN CEYLON DURING THE PERIOD OF THE ANURADHAPURA KINGDOM

BY

P. A. T. GUNASINGHE

Slavery was known to the Aryan tribes who entered India and Europe in the second millenium B.C. The Iliad has a reference to prisoners being used as slaves.¹ The Odyssey shows victims of kidnapping by pirates being used as slaves. These are the earliest references to the society of the Aryans who entered Europe. However we have an even earlier reference to the Aryan speaking peoples, i.e. the Rigveda of India. There is no direct reference to slaves as part of society. But we have a reference to the family of a gambler denying knowledge of him, saying "We know him not. Take him away bound".² This shows, in the context, the enslavement of a debtor. That there was probably this type of slavery in this early society of the Aryans is supported by the fact that in Greece till the time of Solon, the insolvent debtor became the creditor's slave.³

With the gradual expansion of the Aryans in India, the institution also began to develop. *Dāsa*, the Sanskrit word for slave, is used in the Rigveda synonymously with *Dasyu*, in the sense of enemies of the Aryans. The latter were coming into contact with tribes different from them in language, colour and religion and in the process enslaved them, so that the word used for the indigenous population came to mean slave. That captivity in war was one of the original, and probably one of the main sources of slavery is seen from the above reference in the Iliad, which shows slaves from this source in the Aryan society of a somewhat later age.

With the gradual development of society in India slavery also became more complex and varied. The Vinaya Pitaka, the oldest of the Buddhist texts, mentions three kinds of slaves.⁴ The Jataka stories came into final form in the period between the third and the first centuries B.C. But the internal evidence of these stories, such as the frequent mention of an independent *Kāsi*, which we know was absorbed into Kosala by the time of the Buddha in the sixth century B.C. suggests that the society portrayed is somewhat earlier. Of these the *Vidura Jātaka* classifies slaves into four kinds.⁵ The *Manu Dharma Sāstra*, which according to Buhler

1. Iliad—XXIV. 752

2. Rigveda—X 34. 2

3. Encyclopedia Britannica—vol 20—p. 773

4. Book of the Discipline (Sacred Books of the East Series)

5. Jatakas (Fausboll)—Vol VI—p. 285

reflects a period between the second century B.C., and the second century A.D. mentions seven classes of slaves.¹ The Nārada Dharma Sāstra, which according to its Editor, is of around the fourth or the fifth centuries A.D. mentions fifteen kinds of slaves.²

This digression into the development of slavery in India has been made for the purpose of showing that slavery existed among the Aryans in India at the time that the group that colonised Ceylon separated from the main body. The traditional date for this event is the sixth century B.C., by which time, as has been shown, the institution was well developed in India. Even if we take the colonisation as having taken place somewhat earlier, the evidence of the Rigveda shows that slavery probably existed even at this time, the earliest that we know of any Aryan society.

Inscriptional evidence shows that slaves were found in the Sinhalese society of the beginning of the Christian era. An inscription at Ilukvāva, assignable on paleographical grounds to this period, is the record of the grant of a cave by a male slave and a female slave. (DASI ANULA DINI DASA KALA CA).³ But we cannot say with certainty that the varieties of slaves known in later times were known in this period as well. However it is reasonable to assume that development of the institution in Ceylon was to some extent parallel to that of India, i.e. that as society grew more complex slavery also came to have more varied forms.

By the fifth century A.D. slavery seems to have become a definite feature of the society of Ceylon. The Commentaries of Buddhaghosha mentions several sources by which enslavement occurred. What period of history is reflected by these commentaries is not certain. Buddhaghosha translated existing Sinhalese Commentaries which had come into final form by the end of the second century A.D.⁴ Thus it is possible that the society reflected by these works is of this period. On the other hand it is possible that the great Commentator, in the process of editing, incorporated facts which reflected the society of his own time, i.e. the fifth century A.D. A third possibility that should make us exercise care as regards the use of these works alone as sources for social facts like slavery also exists. The Culavamsa says that the Commentaries were originally brought by Mahinda. Thus though a good part of the Commentaries grew in Ceylon, it is possible that some parts at least reflect the society of India at the time of Mahinda, i.e. the

1. Laws of Manu—VIII.415 (Translated—G. Buhler)

2. Nārada —V 2 (Translated—Jolly)

3. A. S. C. A. R.—1896 E.Z. IV—135

4. The Pali Literature of Ceylon—by G. P. Malalasekera pp. 92-93

third century B.C.¹ Thus the Commentaries cannot be used as sole evidence, unless they are supported by the evidence of other sources as well.

Both the *Samantapāsādikā*² and the *Sumangalavilāsini*³ mention four kinds of slaves. The classification is based not on the types of work done by slaves but on the method by which they had become enslaved. These classes were *Anto-jatā*, *dhanakkītā*, *karamaranitā*, and *sāmam dāsabyam upagātānam*. Of these we have shown that the third variety, "captured by war" were probably the earliest of slaves. In Ceylon too it is probable that these were among the earliest slaves that appeared in society. The *Rājāvaliya* mentions that *Gajabāhu* (114-136 A.D.) brought Tamil prisoners from south India as interest and as retaliation for the forcible removal of Sinhalese from Ceylon by the Cola King in the preceding reign.⁴ *Silāmeghavanna* (C. 619 A.D.) defeated a rival who had brought Tamil troops, imprisoned the latter, and distributed them to various monasteries as slaves.⁵ Nor were such prisoners confined to males alone. The *Sarathappakāsini* mentions *dhajāhatā*, as among varieties of female slaves.⁶ This seems to be a mistaken reading, as the term "beaten flag", the literal translation of this would be meaningless. More probably the reading is *dhajahatā*, "brought", i.e. captured under the flag, the meaning given to it by Rhys Davids.⁷ If this interpretation is accepted it would mean a female prisoner of war. But even this is not certain. The *Visuddhimagga* defines *Dhajāhatā* as "(one) who boarding a ship, disembarks, having tied the flag (therein)."⁸ If this is accepted, the term would mean a female slave carrying a flag. If we do take it to mean prisoners of war, most probably such prisoners were confined to the women folk of rebels, as raids on foreign countries was not a normal feature of Sinhalese policy. It is also possible that the enslaving of Tamil prisoners died out towards the end of the period, as we find Tamil regiments serving Sinhalese Kings.

Anto-Jata, "born inside" were probably hereditary slaves. There is no definite mention of a hereditary slave class in Ceylon. The *Sumangalavilāsini* describes *Dāsī Putta*, a female slave's son as the offspring of a female house-hold slave.⁹ But there is no

1. The *Culavamsa*—37, 229

2. *Samantapasadika*—p. 747 (Simon Hewawitharana bequest series)

3. *Sumangalavilasini*—p. 168 (Ed. Rhys David & Churpenticer)

4. *Rajavaliya*—p. 53 (Ed. W. Pemananda)

5. *Culavamsa*—44, 82

6. *Sarathappakasini*—vol II, p. 145 (Ed. F. L. Woodward)

7. *Pali English Dictionary* (Rhys-Davids & Stede) under 'dhaja'

8. *Visuddhimagga*—p. 63

9. *Sumangalavilasini*—p. 257

evidence that he himself was a slave. However in India there was apparently a class of hereditary slaves. The Nārada Dharma Sāstra mentions four varieties of slaves who cannot be released from bondage except by their masters, as their slavery is hereditary.¹ Thus the general probability is that there was such a class in Ceylon, though they need not necessarily have been restricted to those who were serving in households.

A third source is the slave bought for wealth (dhanakkitā). Not much information is available as regards this method of enslavement. There is no indication of the mass buying and selling of slaves that was heard of in the U.S.A. of the nineteenth century. But one occasionally hears of parents selling their children to tide over periods of famine.

Several such instances are seen in the Sihalavatthu. This corpus of stories frequently mention King Saddhatissa (137-119 B.C.) in the context of the events narrated. The late Aggamahapandita Polwatte Buddhadatta, nāyaka therō points out that it is from this collection of stories that the Sahassavatthu, the Rasavāhini and the Saddharmālakāraya drew their material from.² It is possible to suggest that the origin of these stories lay in the second century B.C., and that as a whole they represent the social conditions of the Anuradhapura period. The incidental references in these stories to aspects of social life such as slavery is perhaps even more valuable than such facts in a deliberately written social history, as the personal bias and ability of the historian does not enter into them.

The Sihalavatthu mentions a poor farmer selling his daughter for eight kahapanas during a famine.³ One gets two more instances of parents pawning their daughters for slavery during famines.⁴ The Rasavāhini mentions a son as being pawned for eight kahapanas.⁵ Though this work was compiled in the period subsequent to that under discussion, it was based on an earlier collection of stories. From the context of the stories it would seem that this was a temporary bondage from which redemption was possible on payment of the debt. An inscription at Murutaya registers the manumission of all children who were slaves, by a military officer.⁶ It is possible that some of these children were originally sold into bondage by their parents. Some may have been the children of the anto jātā, whom we have suggested above were probably hereditary slaves.

1. Narada—V. 29

2. ඉතා මැරණී සිංහල බස කතා (x පිට, පෙරවදන).

3. Sihalavatthu—Chapter 45 vs.

4. Ibid chapters 56, 62.

5. Rasavahini—II 32

6. E. Z.—vol V—p. 29

The fourth kind mentioned is *Sāmañ dāsabyañ upagātānañ*, 'slaves of their own will'. These can be divided into two categories. One was of those who, for poverty or other *bona fide* reasons sold themselves to slavery. Such instances are available from our sources. The *Rasavāhini* mentions a woman of *Nāgadīpa* who becomes a slave during day time to a rich family on borrowing sixty *kahapanas*. Later she borrows another sixty *kahapanas*, and becomes a *ratti dāsi*, 'slave during night' as well.¹ The same work mentions a man and his wife working in a rich man's house as slaves by way of payment for a debt of sixty *kahapanas*.²

On the other hand there was a class of people who gave themselves for the sake of merit. It will be shown that the giving of slaves was an important aspect of donations to monasteries. Possibly it was considered even more meritorious to give oneself as a slave. King *Mahadāthika Mahānāga* (7-19 A.D.) gave himself to the *Sangha*.³ King *Aggabodhi VIII* (804-815 A.D.) made his mother offer his own person as a gift to the *Bhikkhus*.⁴ In both these cases they redeemed themselves by the payment of money.

Along with this may be discussed another source of slavery, that by gift. Here too this two-fold aspect is seen. The *Samantapāsādika* says "There are in monasteries slaves called monastery slaves granted by kings".⁵ *Silameghavaṇṇa*, as seen, distributed his Tamil captives as slaves to the *viharas*.⁶ *Aggabodhi IV* (667-683 A.D.) placed slaves at the disposal of the community where they were wanted.⁷ There is no inscriptional record of private individuals giving slaves to *viharas*. But the *Samantapāsādika* mentions masters of slaves sometimes giving a slave to a *bhikkhu*, and of relatives and patrons of monks giving a slave to a *bhikkhu*.⁸ The *Culavamsa* (46; 21) records that *Potthakuṭṭha*, a Tamil officer in the service of *Aggabodhi IV* granted the village of *Nitthilavetthi*, together with slaves to the *Māṭambiya vihāra*. The same work says that *Bhadda*, Commander of troops to *Sena I* (833-853 A.D.) built the *Bhaddasenapati pariveṇa*, endowed with slaves and revenues. (*Culavamsa*, 50; 82). Gifts of slaves between private individuals have not been recorded.

On the other hand we find the idea of the donation of slaves to a monastery and their redemption afterwards. The donation

1. *Rasavahini*—II 17 & 18

2. *Rasavahini*—II 32

3. *Mahavamsa*—34, 86-89

4. *Culavamsa*—49, 63

5. *Samantapasadika*—p. 1001 (P. T. S. Edition)

6. *Culavamsa*—44; 32

7. *Culavamsa*—46; 10

8. *Samantapasadika*—p. 1001

of a slave was for the furtherance of the well-being of the Sangha, and was thus a meritorious act by itself. But the liberation of a human being was also an act of merit. The well being of the Sangha could also be furthered by the gift of money to recompense for the loss of a slave, and gifts to the brotherhood were themselves meritorious acts. Thus the idea of the donation of slaves to monasteries and their subsequent liberation was probably that the spiritual welfare of the donor could be furthered thrice over by such a gift.

We find several inscriptions at Vessagiriya, dateable as being of the sixth century A.D. wherein such liberation is recorded. A bricklayer frees his wife from slavery.¹ Another causes his children to be freed from slavery.² Two men free themselves from slavery.³ It is difficult to believe that families of bricklayers were originally slaves in monasteries. The Kudā Ratmale Rock inscription records how an officer (apparently a policeman) freed the friar (Puvijayi) Sidhatha on the payment of a hundred kaha-panas.⁴ If we take this friar to be a member of the Sangha, this would be evidence of the fact that he had originally made himself a slave. As will be shown later a slave could not be admitted to the Order of Monks, and therefore the above ecclesiastic probably became a slave of his own volition after he had become a monk. However there is no evidence that he was a member of the Buddhist order. He may have been a member of another religious sect. But there are other instances that show that the slaves whose manumission is recorded in the above inscriptions were probably offered originally to the monasteries.

King Mahadathika Mahānāga (7-19 A.D.) gave himself, his Queen, his two sons, his state elephant and his horse to the Sangha, and redeemed them afterwards by the payment of money.⁵ As seen above, the mother of Aggabodhi VIII, at the instance of her son, offered him as a gift to the Sangha, and the King afterwards redeemed himself by giving wealth to the Order.⁶ It is said of King Nissanka Malla (1187-1196 A.D.) that "To the Tooth and Bowl relics he offered his son and daughter, and redeemed them by presenting in their stead (a model of) a dagoba in solid gold together with other valuables".⁷ Though Nissanka Malla lived later than the Anuradhapura period religious customs could not have varied much during the two centuries that had elapsed since the

1. Epigraphia Zeylanica—Vol. IV p. 133

2. *Ibid*

3. *Ibid*

4. E. Z.—Vol V. p. 34

5. Mahavamsa Chapter 34, verse 86

6. Culavamsa—49; 63

7. E. Z.—Vol II—p. 107

fall of the Anuradhapura Kingdom. The Sihalavatthu mentions a Lambakanna who, wishing to emulate King Vessantara, offers his children, his wife and finally himself to a Monk who expounds the Doctrine to him. Afterwards he redeems himself and his family by the payment of money.¹ These instances show that the redemption of slaves recorded in the above inscriptions was probably of those who had been originally offered for this purpose.

In this connection it may be mentioned that we have taken as correct the view of Paranavitane that 'vaharala' mentioned in the inscriptions quoted refers to slaves. Wijeratne holds that the word refers to timber or wood.² But the above examples from the Culavamsa and the Sihalavatthu show that apart from the inscriptions there are other sources that confirm Paranavitane's interpretation of the word.³

It is possible that there was slavery by judicial punishment as well. This source of enslavement was known in India at least from the time of the Jatakas, and even possibly from Rigvedic times onwards, as has been shown. In the Kulāvaka Jātaka a gāma-bhojaka is made a slave.⁴ The Manu Samhitā mentions this as one form of slavery in India.⁵ Thus it is possible that Hanāga (33-43 A.D.) sentencing the Lambakannas who had rebelled against him to make a road under Candāla overseers⁶ was an instance of slavery by judicial punishment. This source of slavery is somewhat analogous to the sentencing of criminals to imprisonment with hard labour.

Apart from these main sources of enslavement there must have been others. The Saratthappakasini mentions women serving for clothing, for food, for wealth, wives of slaves, wives of workers, as among female slaves (dāsi).⁷ Some of them were obviously domestic servants who were paid in kind and not in money. Probably they were released on giving up the subsistence.

Thus the evidence shows that there was a large variety of ways by which enslavement occurred in Ceylon during the Anuradhapura period. We could guess, therefore, at a fairly extensive slave population in Ceylon at this time, though it is not possible to state the actual proportion of slaves to freemen. The stories in the Sihalavatthu show that the possession of slaves was a hallmark of

-
1. Sihalavatthu—Story. 71
 2. University of Ceylon Review, (Vol 10-p. 103-120)
 3. E. Z.—Vol IV—pp. 132-133, Vol. V p. 35-65
 4. Jatakas—No 31-p. 200 (Fausboll)
 5. Laws of Manu—VIII 415
 6. Mahavamsa - 35; 16 - 18
 7. Saratthappakasini - Vol II p. 145

wealth, and their conferment a mark of honour. Saddhātissa gives a hundred female slaves and a hundred male slaves to the female devotee Hankalā.¹ Whether this and other instances one gets in these stories actually occurred or not they show that in the minds of the authors the conferment of slaves was an honour and their possession a desirable end. To Nissanka Malla one of the aspects of his good government was that his subjects were enabled to own slaves.² The view would not have differed radically two centuries earlier.

Certainly there seems to have been a numerous slave population in the monasteries, as can be gauged from the donations given for their support. Aggabodhi I (571-604 A.D.) gives the village of Lajjikā for the maintenance of the slaves at the Mugascnāpati vihara.³ Inscriptions at the Burrows pavilion in the Abhayagiri vihara, dateable as being of the sixth or seventh centuries A.D. mention several devotees who had donated money for the maintenance of slaves at the Abhayagiri vihara.⁴ Slaves seem to have been regarded as one of the main groups within the monastery. The Anuradhapura slab inscription of Kassapa V (914-923 A.D.) mentions that villages were to be taken only after the monks and slaves (sangun dasun) had been provided for.⁵ The Mihintale tablets, attributed to Mahinda IV (956-972 A.D.) mention that the rules incorporated therein were intended for the Sangha (Maha bik sanga himiyan), the employees (kāmiyan) and slaves (dasun).⁶ All this indicates a numerous population of slaves within monasteries.

Thus there were three institutions that owned slaves; the State, the Monasteries and private individuals. The last we have taken as an institution in the sense of a collective unit as most probably slavery was restricted to the higher classes of society, and this formed a special segment of the society of the period. Paranavitane points out that the picture of society as gathered from documents of the ninth and tenth centuries A.D. shows a privileged upper class, the sam daru, from which the administrative class was recruited.⁷ They were a land-owning class having pamunu lands (hereditary private estates) or lands held as recompense for services.

It is not clear as to how the slave establishments of these three institutions were administered. Ilanāga, as shown, forced the

-
1. Sihalavatthu—Story 33, conclusion
 2. E. Z. - Vol II - p. 126
 3. Culavamsa—42, 23
 4. E. Z.—Vol IV - p. 139
 5. E. Z. Vol 1 - p. 46, line 53
 6. E. Z.—Vol. 1-p. 99—line 7-9
 7. History of Ceylon—Vol. 1-Part 1-p. 375

Lambakannas to work under Candala overseers, which suggests the division of slaves into groups with overseers at their head. It is possible that there was a chief officer who administered the affairs of the State slaves. A graffito at Sigiriya is by Nakka Madambia, who describes himself as the Superintendent of Slaves to the Pāndyan King.¹ It is possible that a similar office existed in Ceylon. On the other hand it is possible that 'Pāndyan King' in this verse refers to the royal official bearing that title of whom we hear of in documents of the later Anuradhapura period. If so this admirer of Sigiriya may have been in charge of the slaves of a private individual.

Next we may consider the types of work that slaves were used for as distinct from the sources by which enslavement occurred. It is possible that the state slaves were employed in the same manner as modern day criminals under sentence of rigorous imprisonment are employed. In the above example, if it actually refers to slavery, the Lambakannas are employed to make a road. Some slaves may have been used in the royal household, on domestic service. We do not know whether slaves were employed to till the royal lands. A petition of the Sinhalese to the Portuguese Captain General Diego De Melo De Castro, of the seventeenth century, as recorded by Queyroz mentions that in former times, i.e. prior to 1597 A.D. the *areca* in the *gabadā* (royal) villages were cultivated by the King's slaves.² But as to whether slaves were so used for agriculture in the Anuradhapura period is uncertain. In any case the state slaves as a general labour force could not have been large. The state could exact *vrai*, compulsory services from the citizens, and this would have sufficed for the normal needs of the administration such as the building of roads and the repairing of irrigation works.

The particular duties assigned to slaves in monasteries is also unknown. One function carried out by them was the cultivation of land. Codrington has interpreted 'dasun' to mean serfs.³ On the other hand it can be suggested that *dasun* means something more than serfs. The Mihintale tablets say that they are not to hold lands except by the *divel* tenure that had been given them.⁴ Wickremasinghe explains *Divel* as lands granted to persons for their maintenance in consideration of certain services rendered or offices held by them.⁵ It can be suggested therefore that the *dasun* mentioned in the inscriptions did not consist of those who tilled the monastery lands, but were those who had been given lands for the services they rendered to the monastery.

-
1. Sigiriya Graffiti—v. 652 (Ed. Paranavitana)
 2. Queyroz—Conquest of Ceylon - p. 1013
 3. Ancient Land Tenure and Revenue in Ceylon-p. 18
 4. E.Z.—vol. 1- p. 93—Lines 45-46
 5. E. Z.—Vol.—1 p. 105

On the other hand there is nothing contradictory even in this evidence to take the word *dasun* to mean serfs. The *Divel* lands given to them may be in consideration for the service of cultivating the Temple lands. This is roughly analogous to the *mutteṭṭu* lands or the lord's fields in the Temple villages from the sixteenth century onwards. However there is no definite proof that the system known in later times existed in the Anuradhapura period. Secondly we know that there were servants (*kamiyan*) who carried out the various functions of the monastery. The *Mihintale* tablets mention servants who did white-washing, reared calves, procured firewood, and also mention various officials like the almoner and the steward.¹ Thus the normal services within the *vihara* were rendered by servants who were regarded as superior to the *dasun*. The last can be seen from the injunction in the same document that the property of well conducted serfs (slaves or *dasun*) should not be appropriated by the *kamiyan*. It is difficult to see what other major service could have been performed by the *dasun* except the cultivation of the monastery lands. That the word 'serf' might be accurate as regards their status is suggested by the fact that they seem to have been tied to the land. The *Kaludiyapokuna* inscription, attributed to Sena IV (954-956 A.D.) mentions that buffaloes, slaves and men from other villages were not to be used for cultivating *ukas* and *pamunu* lands of other villages.² One could suggest therefore that the royal lands were cultivated in the same manner, though no proof of this exists. The word used in the above petition as recorded by Queyroz is *Escravos* (slaves) which may very well be a translation of the word '*dasun*' in the original Sinhalese petition. However, as pointed out, this is no evidence for the existence of the system in the Anuradhapura period.

In what manner slaves were employed by private owners is not known. The *Sam Daru* owned large estates, on the *Divel* or services tenure and on the *Pamunu* tenure. The last were hereditary private estates. But there is no evidence as to how these were cultivated. Possibly their domestic establishments employed a fair number of slaves.

The balance of evidence shows therefore that in the monastery villages the '*dasun*' were employed to till the land, and that most probably they were so employed in the royal villages also. But this does not mean that the system was in any way analogous to the plantations worked by slaves that existed in the United States of America till the Civil War. The latter consisted of slaves in the strict sense of the word, in that they had no rights of property, no remuneration, and could be bought or sold at the pleasure of the

1. E. Z.—Vol. 1. - p. 99

2. E. Z.—Vol. III, p. 26-, lines 34 & 35

owners. The Ceylon dasun were more analogous to the mediaeval European serf, for which reason probably Codrington used the term. They were tied to the land; but the Kaludiyapokuṇa inscription mentions that their lands were not to be taken from them. The Mihintale tablets have it that the bim sovas, (ground rent) were to be levied from the kudin, but not from the slaves and employees (dasun kamiyan)¹ If the word *dāsa* ever meant in Ceylon a purely subordinate being it is clear that by the end of the ninth and tenth centuries it underwent a change of meaning.

But not very much information is available as regards the social rights and disabilities of slaves. No law book in Ceylon, as they did in India, lay down any rules regarding such matters. The above inscriptions show that they could have possessions. As to whether such possessions could be passed on in hereditary succession is not known. Whether slaves could earn money on their own, and if so, whether they could retain such earnings is also not known. The Indian Law Books themselves hold contradictory opinions on this point, and we do not know the view that was held in Ceylon. One hears of a female slave called the wife slave (*dāsi ca bhariyā*).² This may refer to the wife of a slave who was apparently herself a slave. *Kaṭṭayāna* holds that a free woman marrying a slave herself becomes a slave. Such may be the meaning here. On the other hand we may take it as slave wife. If so she may be the type of wife who according to *Nārada* is purchased.³ Apart from these doubtful interpretations there is no other reference to the institution of marriage among slaves in Ceylon. But we hear of a husband and wife working together as slaves in the *Rasavāhini*.⁴ Whether the master had the right of separately selling members of such a family, as in the slave system of the United States in the nineteenth century is not known.

We do know however that they could not be admitted to the *Sangha*. In the *Samantapāsādika* *Buddhaghosha* says that whatever the custom by which a slave is given he should not be admitted to the Order of Monks.⁵ But he quoted the *Mahapaccari* and the *Kurundi*, two of his sources, that slaves born in houses and bought slaves when presented as park keepers to the Community of monks, should be ordained. However he holds that they should be admitted only after manumission.⁶

1. E. Z.—Vol. 1—p. 99

2. *Saratthappakasini*—Vol. II—p. 145

3. *Nārada*—XII. 51

4. *Rasavahini*—II. 32

5. *Samantapasadika*—p. -1001.

6. *Ibid.*

The most common method of manumission was most probably by the master. Sometimes this was granted on conditions. The *Samantapāśādikā* mentions masters bringing slaves for admission to the Order, and they were declared to be free if they took pleasure in a religious life; otherwise they were to revert to the conditions of slaves.¹ The same passage shows that the ceremony observed for the manumission was the pouring of buttermilk on the heads of slaves.

Another method was the payment of money to the owner. Whether the slaves liberated by the donors in the inscriptions we have mentioned above were *bona fide* or not, the custom, recorded, of liberation by the payment of money would have existed. An inscription at Vessagiri records how two men freed themselves from slavery by the payment of money to the Kasubgiri monastery.² But whether all varieties of slaves could be so liberated by the payment of money is not certain. Narada mentions that slaves who had sold themselves, or an apostate from asceticism can never be free.³ Kautilya however holds that the former can purchase his freedom.⁴ What opinion was held in Ceylon, where the Indian Law Books were closely studied is not known.

Kautilya lays down that a person enslaved by judicial punishment has his penalty worked off when he earns that amount, though whether such earnings should be given to the state or to the injured party is not clear.⁵ Most probably a similar system obtained in Ceylon. Or it is possible that such slaves were required to serve a specified length of time in such a capacity. Nārada lays down that those who had become slaves in order to get maintenance are released when they give up the subsistence.⁶ Most probably the varieties of female slaves known in the Commentaries such as *Bhogavāsini*, *Pakkavāsini* etc. obtained their freedom in this manner.

The generally held belief that the horrors of slavery known to the West was unknown in Ceylon seems more due to the lack of evidence to the contrary than to any positive proof to that effect. But we could suggest that widespread cruelty and harshness was not a regular feature. If it had been so, some traces of it would appear in the popular stories we have quoted above from such works as the *Sihalavatthu* and the *Rasavāhini*. Harshness could not appear in a system that did not regard a slave as an inferior being, as the black slaves were regarded by their white masters in the

1. *Ibid.*

2. *E.Z.*—Vol. IV. p. 133

3. *Narada*—V. 35, 37

4. *Kautilya Arthasastra*. (Tr. Shamasastri)—p. 223

5. *Ibid.*—p. 224

6. *Narada*—V. 31

United States and in Europe. The proper treatment of slaves i.e. assigning them work according to their strength, supplying them with food and wages, sharing with them unusual delicacies; tending them in sickness and granting them leave at times was enjoined by the Buddha himself. At least this shows a belief that the slave was a human being who should be treated as such. The Indian Law Books lay down definite rights that slaves have, e.g. that female slaves should not be violated etc.¹ We know that these Law Books were studied in Ceylon. Accordingly we could suggest that the treatment of slaves in Ceylon and India was at least not so harsh as it was in the West. We have instances where slaves were given positions of trust. For example the Vamsatthappakāsini (the Mahavamsa Tika) gives the story of Princess Cittā entrusting her slave woman to take the young Prince Pandukabhaya to safety.² Whether this story of Unmadacittā is historical or not, it shows at least that the unknown author of the Mahavamsa Tika was familiar with situations where slaves were highly trusted. Probably the treatment of slaves varied with individual masters.

But the position of slaves in society was apparently not high. This hardly needs elaboration, as in no society was the slave given a high place. Aggabodhi VIII once addressed his slave with the word slave, and in recompense he let him use the same word towards himself.³ That the word slave connoted an insult clearly points to their inferior position in society.

1. Laws of Manu—VIII. 363

2. Vamsatthappakasini. (Batuwantudawe edition)—p. 194

3. Culavamsa—49; 62.

SOME POLITICAL TRENDS IN THE LATE ANURADHAPURA AND POLONNARUWA PERIOD

B. J. PERERA

The civil war of the 7th century which lasted nearly three fourths of a century had far reaching repercussions on the political history of the island. Trends that had their origin in this period of civil strife lasted throughout the late Anuradhapura and Polonnaruwa periods and only ceased to exist after the abandonment of the Raja rata. This civil war, it is true, was a dynastic struggle fought by the rival claimants to the throne with mainly mercenary troops in a limited area round the capital, but the indirect results of this period of prolonged struggle on the political conditions of the country was disastrous.

As a result of this civil war the monarchy suffered heavily in power, prestige and popularity. During the period of sixty-five years of dynastic struggle the crown changed hands fourteen times, each reign having an average duration of less than five years. The kings were too preoccupied with the problem of maintaining themselves on the throne that they had little time to attend to the affairs of state. The administration of the country would certainly have failed to withstand the heavy stress and strain imposed on it by the frequent wars and the changes of sovereigns. Consequently as the Culavamsa so succinctly states 'the whole people suffering under the wars of these two kings (Aggabodhi III and Dathopatissa I) fell into great misery and lost money and field produce'¹ All this misery would have been attributed to the dynastic war by the people who no doubt would have called a plague on both houses. Both Dathopatissa as king and Kasyapa II as Yuvaraja were guilty of what in the eyes of the people would have been a very heinous crime. In order to finance their wars they carried out the simple but unholy expedient of plundering the viharas and dagobas of their gold and other valuables.² The people were also treated to the frequent and inglorious spectacle of kings being killed, dethroned or fleeing to South India or the hill country. All this would have dimmed the halo of sanctity that in the eyes of the people surrounded their kings. The monarchy did not get a chance to recover from this blow to its prestige, for even after the civil war came to an end, other factors which had their origin in the civil war had a harmful effect on the prestige and popularity of the kings. The "deliberate attempt to raise kingship in the estimation of the people and so buttress it with power drawn from

1. Culavamsa 44. 130

2. Ibid. 44. 131 ff.

hoary tradition or by association with religious beliefs" made by the kings beginning with Kasyapa IV in their inscriptions show the extent to which kingship had declined.¹

During the dynastic wars Tamil mercenary troops hired from South India were brought to the island on seven occasions. These troops do not appear to have returned to their homeland once their services was over. In the period preceding the civil war too, South Indian troops were brought to the island but they either went back home or were absorbed into the population. The Tamils brought to the island during the civil war were not absorbed by the Sinhalese but remained a separate entity for the political condition of the period was not conducive to their absorption. The danger of allowing the Tamils to remain in the island was realized even during the civil war. Mana who acted as regent after the death of Kasyapa II attempted to expel them. But the Tamils reacted to this attempt to oust them by successfully championing the cause of Hatthadatha, a rival claimant to the throne. During the reign of Hatthadatha and that of his brother the Tamils appear to have remained powerful. When he died the Tamil leader Potthakuttha wielded the substance of power while leaving the shadow to two proteges who succeeded each other on the throne. This was the situation at the end of the civil war.²

After Manavamma won the throne putting an end to the civil war the Tamils are not heard of for the next 60 years, till the reign of Mahinda II (779-797). Within this period no fresh Tamil troops were brought from South India. But from the reign of Mahinda II the Tamils in Ceylon are frequently mentioned either directly or indirectly in both the Culavamsa as well as in the inscriptions. We can therefore regard the Tamils who are referred to from the reign of Mahinda II onwards as the Tamils that had been brought to the island during the period of civil strife. Of Mahinda II it is stated that he "gave the brahmanas delicious foods such as the king receives and gave them milk with sugar to drink in golden goblets and to the Damilas he gave horses as they would not take cattle."³ The reason for Mahinda's bounty towards the Tamils and the Brahmins can be explained easily. His reign had a stormy beginning and many were the enemies he had to face. Therefore Mahinda II would have thought it politic to canvass the support of the Tamils in the island. However these measures do not seem to have won the approval of the Sinhalese as is reflected in the undertones of sarcasm in the Culavamsa account quoted above.

1. Ceylon Historical Journal Vol II P. 231.

2. Cv. 45. 11., 46. 39 ff.

3. Cv. 48. 144.

The Tamils are referred to again in the reign of Sena I (833-53) when they sided with the Pandyas who had invaded Ceylon.¹ Sena I himself had treated the Brahmins well but this does not seem to have made an impression with the Tamils in Ceylon. Sena II his successor too tried to win over the Tamils by his liberality to those who could influence them. Of him it is stated that 'he had a thousand jars of gold filled with pearls and on top of each he placed a costly jewel and presented it to a thousand brahmanas whom he had fed with milk rice in pure jewelled goblets, as well as golden threads. He clothed them also as a friend of meritorious works, with new garments at their hearts desire and gladdened them with festive pomp'. This passage is followed by a short sentence. 'To the bhikkhus dwelling in the island he dispensed the three garments'² The reader cannot fail to compare the largesse he gave to the brahmanas with the meagre attention paid to the bhikkhus. Perhaps here too, as in the earlier passage the author was giving sarcastic expression to his resentment.

From the reign of Kasyapa IV (898-914) onwards there are references to 'Demala kaballa' and 'demala kuli' in the inscriptions.³ Perhaps the events of the reign of Sena I may have demonstrated the need of absorbing the Tamils and giving them a vested interest in the country. Udaya III seems to have reversed this policy towards the Tamils for in the Badulla inscription of his reign we get the statement 'The office of district headman should not be given to Tamils: and daughters should not be given in marriage to them'⁴.

All the foregoing evidence point to an important feature in the political conditions in the late Anuradhapura period. The Sinhalese had failed to 'contain' and absorb the Tamil elements that had been left as a legacy of the dynastic wars. They continued to exist as a separate political and social group alternately suppressed and favoured according to the exigencies of the moment.

Another feature of the late Anuradhapura period was the increasing power and independence of the nobility which constituted mainly of the provincial and district administrators and the high dignitaries at the centre. If we, without any reference to the sources attempt to educe the probable results of the civil war, one of the first items that would come to our mind would be the

1. Cv. 50. 15.

2. Ibid. 51. 65. ff.

3. Demala Kaballa occurs in the Colombo Museum Pillar Inscription of Kasyapa IV Ep. Zel. Vol III and the Polonnaruwa Council Chamber Inscription. Demel Kuli occurs in the Viharegama and Sigiriya Inscriptions Ep Zel. Vol IV and A. S. C. A. R. 1911-12. p 108.

4. The Badulla Pillar Insc. Ep. Zel Vol. III.

position of the nobility or the officials of the central and provincial administration. During the period of dynastic struggles the kings would have been too much occupied with the problem of survival to have been able to devote their time to the supervision of the administration. At the same time the kings being conscious of the need of the support of the nobility would have taken great pains to avoid alienating them by too great a supervision of the administration. Once the nobility was aware of this situation they could exploit it to the full, and if the trend could have reached its logical conclusion it would have ended in the eclipse of the monarchy altogether.

If, as we have surmised above, the nobility increased their power during the period of dynastic war then we can expect friction between the king and the nobility after the monarchy became stable again. The first task of the rulers of the post dynastic war period would have been the reorganisation of the administration which had been neglected for a long time. Human nature being the same in all climes and times we can be certain that the power of the nobles was not conducive to the welfare of the ordinary people. In fact the Badulla inscription bears eloquent testimony to the travails of the masses under the officialdom of those days.

We cannot expect the Culavamsa to record the details of a socio-political trend of this nature. But it does contain several incidental references which reflect a political condition as described above. There are references to a recalcitrant nobility, attempts to sow discord among the rulers and measures taken by the kings to curb the power of the nobles.

There was no immediate conflict between the king and the aristocracy as soon as the dynastic struggle came to an end. Probably some of the Pallava troops may have remained back in Ceylon to protect the king from any internal enemies. The 'gedige' at Nalanda astride the route from Anuradhapura to the Malaya rata suggests the presence of a Pallava force stationed there. The remarkable unity shown by the successors of Manavamma may have been a virtue born of necessity.

The three immediate successors of Manavamma were his three brothers Aggabodhi V, Kasyapa III and Mahinda I. These reigns were uneventful. In the reign of Aggabodhi VI however, an attempt was made to bring about a rift between the king and his cousin who was in charge of the administration. The Culavamsa does not mention the people who made this attempt. It only calls them evil minded. But these can be no other than the nobility or at least a section of them. Their machinations brought about a civil war which ended in the defeat of the royal cousin. However

both parties appear to have realized the necessity of preserving unity for their mutual benefit, and therefore the efforts of the evil minded came to nought.¹

On the death of Aggabodhi VI, his cousin Aggabodhi VII became king. He is stated to have rooted out unjust judges. The administration of justice would have been one of the first departments of state to have succumbed to corruption during the period when royal control was lacking. Udaya I, the immediate but one successor of Aggabodhi VII is stated to have entered judgments which were just in books and kept them in the royal palace because of the danger of violation of justice.²

After the death of Aggabodhi VII there was no heir to the throne. Mahinda II who was a son of Aggabodhi VI was not entitled to the throne according to the laws of succession existing at the time.³ His accession to the throne was the signal for chiefs of districts in Uttaradesa to raise the standard of revolt. The cause of this revolt is relevant to the problem of the relations between the monarchy and the nobility. It may be argued that the nobility opposed the accession of Mahinda II on legal grounds. But the Culavamsa definitely states that when the son of Aggabodhi VII died as Yuvaraja there was no heir to the throne.⁴ At the time of the revolt of the chiefs of Uttaradesa there was also a revolt by a maternal cousin of Mahinda II. But there is no indication that there was any connection between the chiefs of Uttaradesa and the maternal cousin of Mahinda. Therefore it does not appear that the nobles of the Uttaradesa were espousing the claims of a rival claimant to the throne. Probably they made use of the king's lack of a perfect claim to the throne to assert their power and wrest some concessions. Although the northern chiefs revolted on two occasions they were defeated each time. As mentioned earlier the king took measures to win over the Tamils in order to counter the power of the nobles.

In the reign of Sena I (833-853) we find the nobles asserting themselves again. During this reign the Pandya king, Srimara Srivallabha invaded the island. The Sinhalese were unable to offer any effective resistance 'owing to the discord among the high dignitaries'. The leaders of the army too seem to have turned traitor to the king and country and deserted their posts, 'the island army as its leaders were absent was without zeal, it scattered in flight and fled in all directions'.⁵ It would be interesting to

1. Cv. 48.45

2. Cv. 48.71, 49.21

3. The University of Ceylon, History of Ceylon (U.C.H.C.) Vol. I p. 320.

4. Cv. 48.75.

5. Ibid 50 .13 ff.

know what the discord among the high dignitaries was, and why the leaders of the army deserted their posts. Probably the reason in both cases was the same. It may be suggested that it was their hostility to the king that made them act in this unpatriotic manner. Whatever the reason may be, we find the high dignitaries engaged in the building of religious works after the reign of Sena I. Perhaps the nobility by this action of theirs demonstrated to the king their indispensability in the protection of the kingdom and were thereby able to strengthen their position further. In the period between Manavamma (684-718) and the reign of Sena I. there is not a single recorded instance of any religious buildings put up by individuals. In that period there may have been religious buildings set up by the nobility, but the important point is that the Culavamsa has not given prominence to the religious activities of the officials, if there were such works by them. The religious works of the officials and other dignitaries referred to in the Culavamsa after Sena I were mainly 'parivenas' or dwelling houses for the monks set up in the existing monasteries. They were insignificant as buildings. The fact that the Culavamsa has recorded the building of the parivenas indicate not so much the importance of the building as the importance of the builder. Bhadda, the Senapati of Sena I built a parivena named after him and endowed it with slaves and revenue. Three other dignitaries named Uttara, Vajira and Rakkhasa are stated to have built parivenas. In the reign of his successor Sena II, the senapati Kutthaka is stated to have built a parivena, and endowed it with revenues. In the reigns of Kasyapa IV, (898-914) a general called Rukkha, the Chief Secretary named Sena and a minister called Colaraja are described as having built religious buildings. In the reigns of Dappula IV and Mahinda IV too there are similar references. As stated above these references indicate the growing importance of the high officials.¹

In the reign of Dappula IV (924-935) the Pandya king Rajasinha having lost his kingdom to the rising Colas came to Ceylon to enlist the aid of the Sinhalese. Although Dappula mobilized an army to help the dispossessed king the nobles prevented him from sending the army to India. This episode too indicates the power and influence of the officials and the high dignitaries.²

In the very next reign of Udaya III (935-938) there was again trouble between the court officials and the king. Some of the court officials were executed in the sanctuary of some ascetics and as a result there was a serious revolt which forced the king to take refuge in the Abhayagiri Vihara. The chronicle wants us to believe

1. Cv. 50.82 ff., 51.88; 52. 31, 53. 11, 54, 49.

2. Cv. 53. 8.

that the violent reactions to the killing of the officials was due to the desecration of the sacred premises. In the past there had been worse desecrations without provoking such violent reactions in the country. Probably the deed itself as much as the scene of the deed angered the people. It is interesting to note that in this upheaval the army played a prominent part.¹

In the Culavamsa account of the reign of Mahinda IV we have another reference which indicates the importance of the district administrators. Of this king the chronicle states that 'the chiefs of districts always upheld him'.² This shows how important the support of the nobility was for the stability of the king.

Mahinda IV married a Kalingan princess. The manner in which this fact is recorded in the Culavamsa leaves us in no doubt that this action of the king was not approved by all sections of the people. 'Although there was also in Lanka a race of nobles, the ruler of men had a princess of the line of the ruler of Kalinga fetched and made her his first mahesi'.³ This marriage with the Kalingan princess has been interpreted as a defensive measure against Ceylon's enemies in South India.⁴ But it is possible to interpret the motives of this marriage differently. This was a time when the kings were making a conscious effort to raise their prestige. Marriages between the royalty and the nobility brought down the prestige of the royalty by making it less exclusive. Therefore it is possible that Mahinda IV married the Kalingan princess in order to avoid matrimonial connections with the nobility. This view is supported by the fact that the author of the Culavamsa stresses the fact that there was a family of nobles in the island from which he could have chosen a queen. This attempt by the king to sever connections with the nobility fits well into our theory of a powerful aristocracy and a weakened monarchy. In any social or political institution where the head is weak the subordinates tend to be both independent and disunited. Competition for posts and positions in the administration would have been a source of discord among the nobility. We do have definite evidence of a divided aristocracy in the Culavamsa itself. The execution of some court officials which led to a revolt in the reign of Udaya III appears to have been the result of a rift among the officials, for it is stated that the troops and townsmen 'struck off the heads of the officials who had helped the strife' at the sanctuary of the ascetics. Perhaps Mahinda IV followed a policy of non-alignment towards the nobility and avoided any marriage connections with them as it would necessarily involve him in their rivalries. The statement in the

1. Cv. 53. 14

2. Cv. 54. 8

3. Cv. 54. 9

4. U.C.H.C. vol I p. 340

Culavamsa that the chiefs of districts upheld Mahinda IV shows that he had won the goodwill of the officials probably due to his impartiality. There was one measure of the king however which would have alienated the nobility. The Senapati of Mahinda IV was called Sena, a very common Sinhalese name at the time. His brother's name was Mahamalla which is however a typical Kalinga name. Therefore very probably the Senapati Sena was a Kalingan. It is quite likely that he accompanied the Kalingan princess from India. The events which took place in the reign of the successor of Mahinda IV too shows that the Senapati Sena was a Kalingan. It is quite possible that Mahinda conferred other responsible posts on the relatives of his Kalingan wife.

The introduction of Kalingan elements to the court was disastrous to the country. In the reign of Sena V the son and successor of Mahinda IV there was an open conflict between the Sinhalese nobility and the Kalingans. Sena was a mere boy of 12 years when he ascended the throne and therefore his mother would have exerted a strong influence over him. The queen mother would have used her influence over the king to further the interests of her Kalingan relatives. While the Senapati Sena was away from the capital the king had the general's brother killed on the charge of his having committed an offence with the queen mother. Whatever truth there may be in the charge it is evident that it was only an excuse to take action against the Senapati and also possibly against other Kalinga officials as well. Sena also appointed a court official named Udaya as the Senapati in place of the Kalingan Sena. Udaya was presumably a Sinhalese noble and the whole course of events represents a victory for the Sinhalese nobles. But this victory was short lived. The Senapati Sena fled to South India and there recruited an army of nearly hundred thousand mercenaries and invaded the island. The Sinhalese were unable to fight the invaders and the Senapati Sena himself appears to have lost control of his troops who in the words of the chronicle 'plundered the whole country like devils'. In these circumstances Sena, the senapati came to terms with the king or rather with the Sinhalese nobles. Udaya whom the king had appointed the Senapati was banished from the island and the king married the daughter of Sena. In this episode the chief participants appear to be Sena, the Senapati and the Sinhalese nobles, and not the king who was a mere puppet in their hands. It is very unlikely that he would have killed the paramour of the queen mother on his own initiative or appointed Udaya in place of Sena as the Senapati. In fact the chronicle states that he took counsel with his ministers before he came to terms with Sena.

The whole episode was a defeat for the Sinhalese nobles. The question had been, who was to control the royal puppet, the

Sinhalese nobles or the Kalingan Sena. The problem was resolved in favour of the latter. The Culavamsa states that Sena V had an untimely death due to his addiction to intoxicating liquors to which he was initiated by his 'low class favourites'. The Pali word used is 'hinaja'.¹ It is unlikely that the king associated with people drawn from the lower strata of society. Probably the author meant the Kalingan relatives of the Queen Mother.

On the death of Sena V, his brother Mahinda V became king. In this reign we come across perhaps the first recorded instance of civil disobedience in the island. In the words of the chronicle 'As he wandered from the path of statecraft and was of very weak character the peasants did not deliver him his share of the produce'.² It is evident that the chronicler has not recorded the full story. In the long list of the kings of Ceylon there would have been many a king who wandered from the path of statecraft or were of weak character. But the peasants did not give expression to their disapproval in this manner. Nor were the lives of the ordinary people so much influenced by the character of their kings as to cause what amounted to open rebellion. In a country in which the administration was decentralized it is difficult to imagine popular resentment of the head of the administration being manifested in so effective a manner unless they were supported if not instigated by the officials who stood midway between the ruler and the ruled. The peasant revolt may have been a revolt of the administrators of the provinces and the districts. If this was the case then we can connect the peasant revolt with the events of the previous reign. It was the ministers of Sena V who had advised the king to come to terms with the Kalingan Sena but the provincial and district rulers may not have approved of what they may have considered a betrayal. It is also possible that after the submission of the king and ministers Senapati Sena 'carried out a policy of repression against the Sinhalese nobles who had been responsible for the killing of his brother and his own dismissal as the Senapati.

The peasants revolt represents a breakdown of the administration. It meant the disruption of the political equilibrium in the country. In a way it also marks the end of the Anuradhapura period of Ceylon history. The direct result of this revolt was the revolt of the mercenary troops which forced Mahinda V to abandon Anuradhapura which ceased to be the capital thereafter. But the conflict between the monarchy and the nobility did not cease with the Cola invasion and occupation. The nobility not only continued to be in power outside the Raja rata but were, as we shall see, able to increase this power and influence.

1. Cv. 54.70

2. Cv. 55.3

Before we proceed to the Polonnaruwa period it is necessary to discuss the evidence in the epigraphical record on the matters discussed above. One of the chief features of the inscriptions of this period is the prominence given to the officials. The inscriptions of the period are as a rule records of the grant of immunities from certain imposts made to villages and lands which were the property of religious or charitable institutions. In the inscriptions, as a rule, the Chief Secretary or Mahale and the Commander of the King's body guard are mentioned by name. This prominence given to these officials may be considered as an indication of the importance of the nobility during this period.

There are quite a number of official titles occurring in the inscriptions with the word 'raja' as a part of it. These titles are come across for the first time in the period under survey and disappear with it. From the inscriptions we get Pirittiradun, Mangul Rad, and Pandirad.¹ From the Pali chronicle we get Colaraja. The use of the term raja in the titles of officials again indicates the prestige of the nobility. This becomes more apparent when we take into account the existence of such titles as Yuva raja and Upa raja which were held by members of the royal family. The use of titles with the term 'raja' would have tended to blur the distinction between the nobility and the royalty.

The basis of the power and influence of the nobles would have primarily been their posts in the administration. Besides, the nobility appear to have had extensive properties held as pamunu or heritable lands. When Prince Kasyapa grateful for the services rendered by the two nobles Kitti and Buddha, requested them to ask for any boon, the latter asked for the village in which he lived.² It is reasonable to suppose that Buddha would not have made this request if nobles did not possess whole villages at that time. Further when nobles built parivenas they also endowed them with lands presumably from their hereditary estates.

There is other evidence to show the close connection between the nobility and the system of land tenure. The term 'bim' in such names as Sitnaru bim and Kalunnaru bim has been taken to mean an administrative division. But this term appears to have meant something more than an administrative division. General Parakrama who carried on the government with Queen Lilavati on the throne is said to have belonged to the Kalunnaru Vamsa.³ At the same time the Ambagamuva inscription of Vijayabahu I men-

-
1. Ep Zel. vol. IV No, 29, Vol II No. 8, Vol. III No 9, vol IV No 22. Cv. 52. 34
 2. Cv. 55. 31
 3. Dathavamsa v. 4

tions Kalunnaru Bim Ayannatavan.¹ Evidently Kalunnaru bim and Kalunnaru Vamsa appears to have meant the same thing. The Ruvanvalsaya Slab Inscription of Kalyanavati mentions a Pirivatu Bim Viyayanavan.² The same name appears as Pirivatu gana in the Dalada Pujavaliya.³ This again shows that the term 'bim' meant a family. Other examples of place names with the element 'bim' preceding the personal names are Sitnaru Bim Budalnavan and Hunannaru Riyan Dala. Hunannaru may be the same as Hunaru bim in the Sigiriya Graffiti.⁴ The foregoing evidence indicates that when a place name occurs associated with a personal name it means that he belonged to a family which was named after that place. The naming of families after places certainly indicates a feudal society in which the topmost strata possessed extensive lands. The system of revenue farming reflected in the Kondavattavan Inscription might have become necessary because the sources of income of the nobles were too large for their personal supervision.

The history of the period following the Cola invasion confirms our view of a powerful aristocracy which had weakened the monarchy. The reaction of the country to foreign invasion and occupation was different from previous occasions. Earlier when the Rajarata was under a foreign invader the rest of the country had rallied under one leader who either had a claim to the throne or had a powerful personality. But after the Chola invasion of 1017 A.D. various high officials of the army and the civil administration seized power and even fought among themselves. There were the Senapati Kitti, Mahalana Kitti, an army leader called Loka and the Kesadhatu Kasyapa. Besides these there were other powerful men like Ravideva, Cala and Buddharaja, and Kitti of Makkhakudrusa whose support of the prince Kitti enabled him to free the country of foreign domination.

Although at first Sinhalese opposition to the invaders was hampered by internecine warfare between the nobles, the latter or at least a section of them appear to have realized that the Rajarata could be freed only under the leadership of a royal prince. Much of the success of Vijayabahu was due to the support he got from the two nobles Buddharaja and Devamalla.

When the Colas were finally defeated and expelled among the many problems of national reconstruction the king had to face was the re-organization of the administration. This would have been a

1. Ep Zel vol II No 35

2. Ep Ze! vol No 33

3. Dalada Pujavaliya cē. Sannasgala 1954 p. 46

4. Ep Zel vol V No 1. and J. R. A. S., C. B., New series vol VI p. 189

tremendous task for the administration had broken down even before the Cola conquest. In Ruhuna too the administration would have become lax resulting in greater power for the nobility. Vijayabahu had been an obscure person till the two nobles Buddha and Devamalla decided to fight under his leadership. Therefore we can surmise that the nobility enjoyed a large measure of freedom from royal control especially as the success of Vijayabahu would have to depend on the support of the nobility. We can be certain that Vijayabahu and his advisers would have refrained from taking any measures which would have alienated the district chieftains. Perhaps the defection of Ravi and Cala would have been the result of some earlier measure taken by the king.

Once the Colas were expelled from the Raja rata Vijayabahu would have had his hands free to attend to administrative reforms. Vijayabahu would have had to appoint a large number of new officials and he took good care to choose them according to merit and he specially instructed them to collect the dues in the kingdom in a fitting manner. Unfortunately the Culavamsa has no record of any administrative reforms made by the king except that he kept the administration of justice under his control. The Ambagamuva inscription however mentions certain imposts, officials and even noble families that appear in the pillar edicts of the late Anuradhapura period. Therefore it is unlikely that any sweeping changes were made. Nevertheless the Ambagamuva and Kapuru Vadu Oya inscriptions are the only inscriptions of the Polonnaruwa period which bears any similarity to the pillar edicts of the late Anuradhapura period.¹

The revolt of the three brothers who held the high posts of Head of the Umbrella Bearers, the President of the court of Justice and the Chief of Merchants is important. Vijayabahu had liberated the country from over half a century of foreign domination. This would have invested him with a large measure of authority and prestige in the country. Therefore only some very desperate person or persons would have attempted to overthrow him. What drew these nobles to desperation and made them rebel against so powerful and popular king as Vijayabahu? There is no doubt that it was a serious rebellion as it spread to the whole island except the Raja rata. The very widespread nature of the rebellion shows that the three brothers had support in the country. We can only surmise on the cause of this revolt.

The Anuradhapura period ended with a weakened monarchy which had lost much of its power and prestige to the rising nobility. The monarchy emerged from the period of Cola rule with renewed

1. For the Kapuru Vadu Oya Inscription see J.R.A.S., C.B. vol XXVI p. 55

power and prestige. Nevertheless the nobility too had emerged from the same struggle against the foreign foe more powerful than ever. Such a state of affairs would have been incongruous. The Kalingan elements in the court who would have been familiar with the position of the king in their own country would have prompted measures to curb the power of the nobility. This surmise is supported by the fact that the revolt took place in Ruhuna, Malaya rata and Dakkhina desa and not in the Raja rata. In the Raja rata the nobility would have been swept away during the period of Cola rule while in the rest of the country they remained powerful.

Vijayabahu was too much of a statesman to alienate all the nobles. In fact he appears to have made deliberate attempts to win their goodwill. The chronicle states 'The ruler (Vijayabahu) chose people of good family whom he had all round him and as customary, charged them with his protection' and 'To women of good family who were unprotected or widowed, the Sovereign (Vijayabahu) gave according to their deserts villages, food and clothing'¹ Thus although Vijayabahu, as we have surmised, dealt firmly with the nobility where the administration was concerned he did not wish to suppress them altogether.

When Vijayabahu I died the high officials and the Sangha consecrated as king Jayabahu the brother of Vijayabahu. But as Upa raja they appointed Mitta's son Manabharana instead of Vikramabahu the son of Vijayabahu. The history of Ceylon has but a couple of instances of the nobility and the clergy conspiring to oust the lawful heir from the throne. When we consider the fact that it was the son of one of the greatest kings of Ceylon who was being excluded from the throne than we realise that there must have been some serious objections to the accession of Vikramabahu.

It has been suggested that Vikramabahu was kept out of the succession because his mother was a Kalingan while Manabharana's mother was a Sinhalese. This may have been the excuse but not the real reason. From the earliest times the succession had been patriarchal and the Culavamsa itself reflecting no doubt the opinion of the time states that in this case 'the path of former custom' had been ignored.²

The opposition of the Sinhalese to the accession of Vikrama Bahu was probably due to the fact that Vikrama Bahu leant too much on the support of the Kalinga elements in court. Tilokasundari was accompanied by other members of the royal family. The Culavamsa mentions three of them by name i.e., Madhukanna, Bhimaraja and Balakkara. Vikrama Bahu himself married

¹. Cv. 60.1, 78.

². Cv 61.4

one of their sisters.¹ According to the Culavamsa the cause of Parakrama Bahu's invasion of Raja rata was that 'the Ruler Gajabahu had fetched nobles of heretical faith from abroad and had thus filled Rajarattha with the briers (of heresy)'.² These heretical nobles from abroad can be none other than Kalingan nobles. It appears that the Kalinga elements in Ceylon were unpopular. Probably they were inimical to Buddhism. The Culavamsa has recorded the fact that his Mahesi disturbed the peace of the viharas and was deprived of her revenues and was led out of the town with an iron collar round her neck.³ As King Vijayabahu had two Mahesis it is difficult to determine which one disgraced herself. Certain considerations however point out to Tiloka Sundari as the person concerned. Yasodhara the daughter of the Mahesi Lilavati appears to have been a supporter of Buddhism as she is stated to have been the author of two religious edifices. Therefore it seems unlikely that the mother was opposed to Buddhism. In the case of Tiloka Sundari of Kalingan lineage we know that her son Vikrama Bahu was an opponent of Buddhism. Therefore the indications are that it was Tiloka Sundari who was publicly disgraced by the king. It is inconceivable that Vijayabahu would have punished his own Mahesi in so drastic a manner on his own initiative and he probably was compelled to do so by the pressure of the Sangha and also probably the Sinhalese nobility who, as we saw, were hostile to the Kalingans. Both the Sinhalese nobility and the Sangha had reason to fear the accession of Vikramabahu the son of the disgraced queen. The disgracement of the Kalingan Mahesi was only an incident in a trend. The trend was the polarisation of the political forces in the country into two enemy camps. On one side was the King and the Kalingans who formed a 'new nobility' and those who considered Vikramabahu the son of the national deliverer as their lawful sovereign. On the other side were the sons of Mitta supported by a large section of the clergy and the nobility. It is very probable that the nobility welcomed disharmony in the royal family for such a situation would strengthen their hands. Further, Vijayabahu had by his heroic leadership of the country against the Colas raised the position of the monarchy from the low levels it had fallen to in the closing years of the Anuradhapura period. The accession of Vikramabahu the son of Vijayabahu would strengthen the position of the monarchy and that would be inimical to the interests of the nobles. This perhaps was another reason why the nobility wished to prevent the accession of Vikramabahu.

The subsequent course of events confirms the view that the Sinhalese nobility opposed Vikrama Bahu's accession for selfish

1. Ibid 59.46

2. Ibid 70.53

3. Cv. 60.54

reasons. After Vikrama Bahu and the three sons of Mitta had divided the island among themselves they carried out various repressive measures against the nobility. Vikrama Bahu's hostility to the nobility can be easily explained but not the attitude of the sons of Mitta towards them. Perhaps they realized what the motives of the nobles were and once they were entrenched in the principalities they had carved for themselves carried out the repressive measures against the nobility whose power was not consonant with their position as rulers.

The Culavamsa refers to the persecution of the nobility by the four princes several times. 'In their heedless way of acting they slighted people of good family and placed ambitious men of the lower classes in leading positions! From people of good family even in the absence of an equivalent offence, they would seize forcibly their possessions' and 'The slaves too and the workmen of people of good family despised their masters without respect and devoid of all fear. They became mercenaries to the kings and worming themselves into their confidence, they by means of offices conferred on them, attained even greater power'. The persecution of the nobility was so great that 'people of good family, scattered here and there, kept themselves hidden in places which seemed good for them'¹ In other words the social and economic basis of the power of the nobles was destroyed by confiscating their properties and appointing men of the lower classes to various posts in the administration.

It would be relevant here to discuss the question as to why neither Vikrama Bahu nor his son and successor Gajabahu III were consecrated kings. Dr. Paranavitana has suggested that there must have been a body, a college of jurists, whose decision was a prerequisite for a ruler's consecration, and that body was independent enough to withhold its sanction for the consecration of a prince enjoying 'de facto' sovereignty.² This suggestion if correct would confirm our view of a powerful and independent nobility. Unfortunately, however we cannot agree with Dr. Paranavitana on this point. The Culavamsa describes in great detail how Vikrama Bahu desecrated temples by handing them over to his attendants and foreign soldiers. It describes how even the treasures gifted to the Tooth and Bowl relics were plundered by him.³ Therefore Vikrama Bahu does not appear to be one who cared for public opinion or depended on the support of the Sangha and the people. Therefore if any body of jurists dared to deny his right to the throne which as mentioned earlier is even accepted in the Culavamsa, he would have dealt with them immediately and drastically.

1. Cv 61.50 ff., 61.62, 68.

2. UHC vol I, p. 531

3. Cv 61.54,

In the political context obtaining at the time there was nothing to prevent Vikrama Bahu from cutting off the necks of the body of jurists or disposing of them in some similar fashion and appointing a body of his own choice who would vigorously affirm his right to the throne.

The probable reason for the two kings remaining unconsecrated was that they could not get hold of the crown and other paraphernalia which were necessary for the consecration. Jayabahu I the predecessor of Vikramabahu had died in Ruhuna and the crown and other paraphernalia would have fallen into the hands of Mitta's sons. It is worthy of note that when the Colas conquered Pandya, the Cola king deemed it necessary to obtain the diadem of the Pandya kings to be consecrated the king of the Pandyas. It is likely also that Vikrama Bahu and Gaja Bahu depending on foreign troops for support cared little for a ritual in which the Sangha and the nobility would play a prominent role. But this does not explain why those two kings dated their inscriptions from the reign of Gajabahu.

King Parakramabahu reversed the policy of his father and uncles towards the nobility. He possessed a personality which could keep the nobles in check without suppressing them. He would also have realized that if his soaring ambitions were to be achieved he needed the co-operation of the nobility. He was too realistic to fritter away his time, energy and resources in a contest with the nobility when the latter could be made use of in gaining his ambitions. In the opening verses of chapter sixty nine of the Culavamsa which deals with the collection of troops and money by Parakrama Bahu when he was the ruler of Dakkhinadesa, the following statement is attributed to him. 'Former foolish kings to whom good direction of affairs was unknown, for long injured at their pleasure people and order'.¹ This account is followed by an account of how Parakrama Bahu raised an army with the aid of the nobility. The mention of so many officials and the prominence given to them leaves us in no doubt about the meaning of this statement. Apparently, it alludes to the fact that Parakrama Bahu unlike his predecessors had confidence in the nobility and utilized them for his own purposes. This attitude towards the nobility is further reflected in such statements as 'The Sovereign brought up many of the sons, brothers and grandchildren of distinguished families in his own palace' and 'The prince granted to all his dignitaries amongst his followers, to each according to his merit, posts and inclined them to himself by gifts of money'. Further the

1. Cv 69.2

Culavamsa states 'He (Parakrama Bahu) who had won the hearts of his many officers through the fulness of his excellent qualities who had reduced all hostility to nothing' ¹

Parakrama Bahu's reign was a period therefore in which the nobility flourished. The centralization of the administration, the many wars and the heavy building programmes of the king would have kept the nobility occupied and even contented. Their power and influence was however neutralized by the dominating personality of the king. On the death of Parakrama the trends that first appeared under the dynasty of Manavamma reached their logical conclusion. None of the successors of Parakrama Bahu had his strength of personality and could stand up to the opposition of the nobility. Nissanka Malla made a vain bid to restore the institution of kingship to its former position but the trends had developed too far. It needed the devastating invasion of Magha to demonstrate to the nobility the utilitarian value of the institution of kingship.

1. Cv 69.23, 68.6, 67.96

A NOTE ON PORTUGUESE MISSIONARY METHODS IN THE EAST

16th-18th Centuries

By

PROFESSOR C. R. BOXER

A learned Ceylonese Jesuit wrote some years ago: "A very large number of persons of all sorts and conditions of life, our own countrymen and foreigners, much as they differ in education and upbringing, in racial prejudice and religious convictions and outlook on life, all agree on one thing, that the Portuguese made their converts at the point of the sword." The Reverend S. G. Perera, S.J. added that "if you study the Portuguese methods of conversion from the sources available, you will be startled at the result. You will find that they give very little information, good or bad, about the methods of conversion; you will find that there is not the slightest justification in them for the statement that the Portuguese used force and violence. I hesitate to assert it too emphatically and say that you will find absolutely nothing; not because I fear that anything will be found, but because I know that it is never safe to make a sweeping statement in matters of history." He goes on to explain that neither in the chroniclers such as Barros, Couto, and Castanheda, nor in later writers such as Menezes, Ribeiro, and Queiroz, nor in contemporary published documents had he found any evidence of any single person being forcibly converted, nor any suggestion that any ever were.¹ As my Ceylonese readers well know, this topic is not a purely academic one, being an issue in Ceylon politics today. But I doubt if many of those who discuss it have access to the original printed sources, and it may therefore be worth briefly considering here the missionary methods formerly employed by the Portuguese. Did they use force, and if so, to what extent? How far were things spiritual and temporal separated in theory and in fact?

The last question is the easiest to answer succinctly and accurately. Diogo do Couto, the official chronicler of Portuguese India, where he spent most of his life until his death at Goa in 1616, tells us in his sixth *Decada*, that "the kings of Portugal always aimed in this conquest of the East at so uniting the two powers, spiritual and temporal, that the one should never be exercised

1. S. G. Perera S.J., "Portuguese missionary methods," pp. 168-200 of a photostatic copy of an unspecified and undated Ceylon magazine, kindly sent me by Professor K. Gunewardena some years ago.

without the other.”¹ This indissoluble union of the Cross and the Crown was exemplified in the *Padroado Real*, or Crown Patronage of the Church in Portuguese overseas territory, which the Kings of Portugal exercised in their capacity as governors, administrators, or Grand-Masters of the Order of Christ, and in which the things of Caesar and the things of God were inextricably intertwined. Couto's predecessor as the official chronicler of the Portuguese deeds in the East, Joao de Barros (1496-1570), was even more emphatic in expressing his conviction that the Portuguese were entitled to act as both spiritual and temporal *conquistadores*. He explains that the Popes are divinely empowered to distribute among the faithful followers of the Roman Catholic Church such lands as are in the possession of those peoples who are not members of the true Christian Faith. He adds that as the souls of all unregenerate Muslims and heathens are doomed to hell fire, their bodies cannot plead the benefit of Christian laws, nor have they any real right to the lands in which they live. Not belonging to the Christian faith, they can therefore be lawfully conquered and subdued.²

Neither Barros nor Couto advocated the forcible conversion of heathen peoples to Christianity; but it is obvious that the close connexion between the spiritual and temporal powers, on which they both laid such stress, gave every inducement to the ecclesiastical authorities to call upon their secular colleagues for assistance and support—not excluding the employment of force when this was deemed to be necessary. This, indeed, is what happened in practice; but since neither Barros nor Couto were theologians, although their respective works were only printed and published after having been examined and approved by qualified theologians, we must first see what was the theoretical standpoint of the Church in the Eastern mission-field.

The main lines of missionary policy were laid down by successive Ecclesiastical Councils periodically celebrated at Goa under the presidency of the local Archbishop from 1567 onwards. The decisions of these councils might, of course, be subsequently modified by higher authority at Rome, or at Lisbon where the Crown had an advisory Board—the *Mesa de Consciencia e Ordens*—to

-
1. “Porque os Reys de Portugal sempre pretenderao nesta conquista do Oriente untanto os dous poderes, espiritual, e temporal, que em neuhum tempo se exercitasse um sem o outro” (Diogo do Couto, *Decada VI* (Lisboa, 1612), Livro 4, cap. vii). This observation, incidentally, was made apropos of the dispatch of Franciscan missionaries to Ceylon by the Governor of Portuguese India, Dom Joao de Castro, in 1547.
 2. Joao de Barros, *Decada I* (Lisboa, 1552), Livro 6, cap.i, apropos of King Manuel I's assumption of the title of “Lord of the conquest, navigation and commerce of Ethiopia, Arabia, Persia, and India,” in 1501.

prompt, as its name implies. the royal conscience in such matters. ¹ In practice, however, the decisions of the Ecclesiastical Councils at Goa were usually accepted as they stood, as can be seen by those which achieved the dignity of print at Goa in 1568, 1643 and 1649. The pioneer council of 1567 was a particularly important one, as the post-Tridentine Church was in the first flush of its confident strength, and the decisions then taken were reaffirmed with only slight modifications in the subsequent councils. The deliberations of 1567 were guided by three main considerations, the last of which was difficult (if not impossible) to reconcile with the other two:

1. All religions other than the orthodox Roman Catholic faith as defined in the Council of Trent were intrinsically wrong and harmful in themselves.
2. The Crown of Portugal had the definite duty of spreading the Roman Catholic faith, and the secular power of the state could be used to support the spiritual power of the Church.
3. Conversions must not be made by force, since the grace of God can be confirmed by Him alone.

The decision of the Council on this last point was worded, in part, as follows:—*“First of all, it decrees that it is not licit to bring anyone over to our faith and baptism by force with threats and terrorism, for nobody comes to Christ by faith unless he is drawn by the Heavenly Father with voluntary love and prevenient grace, . . . but unbelievers must be drawn to the faith by the example of a good life, and by the preaching of the truth of our belief and the refutation of their errors, so that with the knowledge of these things they may leave their falsehoods and receive Christ who is the way, the truth, and the life. Likewise, those who want to bring unbelievers over to the true faith must try to treat them meekly and benignly, so that not only by preaching but by means of benefits and favours they may gain them for Christ.”*

The practical effect of this exhortation to tolerance was, however, largely discounted by various other decisions of the Council, which received the force of law by a viceregal decree promulgated on the 4th December, 1567. This decree enacted, *inter alia*, that all heathen temples in Portuguese-controlled territory should be demolished; that the name of the prophet Mohammed should not be invoked in the Muslim call to prayer from a mosque; that all non-Christian priests, teachers, and holy men should be

1. The Board of Conscience and (Military) Orders was instituted by King Joao III in 1532, to act (when required) as the keeper of the king's conscience, but it only received its first regulations in 1558.

expelled; and that all their sacred books, such as the Koran, should be seized and destroyed whenever found. Hindus and Buddhists were prohibited from visiting their respective temples in the neighbouring territories, and even the transit passage of foreign pilgrims to such destinations was forbidden. A ban was also placed on that ritual bathing which is such a feature of Hinduism.

Non-Christian marriage ceremonies and religious processions could not be celebrated publicly. No conversions were allowed from Islam to Hinduism or to Buddhism, and *vice versa*, but only to Christianity. Monogamy was decreed for everyone, irrespective of their religion. Men who were already living with more than one wife (or co-habiting with more than one concubine) were ordered to dismiss all save the one whom they had first married (or to make a lawful wedded wife of one of the concubines). All orphaned children were to be given Christian guardians or foster-parents; and if any one of the partners in a pagan marriage was converted, the children and property were to be given into his (or her) keeping. Christians were not allowed to live or lodge with non-Christians, nor were the former to have other than strictly business dealings with the latter. Nominal rolls were to be made of all heathen families, and these latter were to be sent in groups of fifty to hear Christian propaganda in the local churches and convents on alternate Sundays. A sharply increasing scale of fines was levied on those who tried to evade this obligation. Non-Christians were to be officially and legally discriminated against, and converts equally favoured, in competition for such public offices and remunerative posts which were not reserved (as many were) for Christian converts only.¹ Most of these regulations were tightened by the later enactments of successive ecclesiastical Councils, though a few were relaxed.² Nor was it long before Muslim mosques shared the fate of Hindu and of Buddhist temples in places where they had not already been destroyed by the crusading fury of the original *conquistadores*.

-
1. Cf. S. G. Perera S.J., (op. cit., p. 197): "Though the Portuguese favoured converts, they did not force unwilling men to be baptized, as did the Dutch in practice, who refused offices to any except those who submitted to baptism, and ill-informed writers speak as if the Portuguese did the same." In this instance it is Fr. S. G. Perera S.J., who was ill-informed and not the (unnamed) writers whom he criticises. Knowingly or otherwise, the Dutch were merely copying the Portuguese in this respect.
 2. The enactments of the Ecclesiastical Councils of 1567, 1575, 1585, 1592, and 1606 are conveniently collected in J. H. Cunha Rivara (ed.), *Arquivo Portuguez Oriental, Fasciculo IV que contem os concilios de Goa e o synodo de Diamper* (Nova Goa, 1862). Cf. also the legislation favouring converts and discriminating against all non-Christians as summarized in P. Pissurlencas, *Roteiro dos Arquivos da India Portuguesa* (Bastora, 1955), pp. 62-95. It covers the period 1562-1843.

It is obvious that these discriminatory and coercive measures, if they did not actually force people to become Christians at the point of the sword, made it very difficult for them to remain anything else. Deprived of their priests, teachers, holy men, sacred books, and places of worship, not to mention the public exercise of their respective cults, it was confidently expected that the "false heathen and Moorish religions" would wither and die on territory controlled by the Portuguese Crown. But, as the Council of 1567 sententiously observed, it was one thing to enact good laws and another to enforce them. In fact, their application varied widely according to place, time, and circumstances, and more particularly according to the character of the different viceroys, whose powers were very great.

Fr. Perera's emphatic denial that "the contemporary documents published from time to time in Portugal or Goa or England of Ceylon, speak of any single person forcibly converted, nor suggest that any ever were" (*op. cit.*, p. 182), would hardly have been made had he read the following passage in the viceregal decree of 4th December, 1567. "Forasmuch as some unbelievers complain frequently to my justices, saying that force has been used against their children, or their slaves, or their dependents, alleging that they wish to make them Christians by force: I hereby order that when such a case occurs, the judge before whom it is brought must send and inform the local prelate thereof, so that the latter may, if he so desires, send a priest with the minister of justice, before whom the said judge will order the complainant to be asked whether he wishes to become a Christian or not; and if he says 'yes', then they will let him be; and if he says that he was constrained and does not want to be a Christian, then he will be dismissed freely to go whithersoever seems good to him"¹

It is obvious from the wording of this decree that the practice of forcible conversion, although illegal and not countenanced by the highest civil and ecclesiastical authorities—with one exception which is mentioned below—was, in fact, far from being unknown. Moreover, it is possible to adduce chapter and verse in some specific instances, although the allegations, or admissions, are as a rule couched in only general terms. As might be expected, the instances where coercion was used occurred more frequently in places like Goa and Bacaim, which were under complete Portuguese control, than they did in places like Macao, which had strong and non-Christian native authorities in their immediate vicinity.

Azu Naique, a Hindu agent of the Portuguese Crown at Bacaim wrote a letter to King Joao III of Portugal on the 18th December, 1549, politely rejecting that monarch's earnest recommendation that he should become a Christian. Giving the king

1. *O Primeiro Concilio Provincial celebrado em Goa; no anno de 1567*. (Goa, 1568), fls. 43-44.

an unsolicited testimonial on the advantages of a policy of religious toleration, Azu Naique asserted (as the Ecclesiastical Council of 1567 was to do eighteen years later) that true and lasting conversions were only made through the grace of God, "and to him alone does this pertain." He claimed that every individual was responsible for his own soul, and that many Indians had already been converted to Christianity without the employment of any force at all. He deplored the practice, which had recently been introduced into Goa and elsewhere, at the insistence of the Bishop, D. Joao de Albuquerque, of giving the indigenous inhabitants the option of conversion to Christianity or expulsion from Portuguese territory. He stated that this policy was opposed by the majority of the Portuguese themselves, and that the Hindus of Goa, who had served their European rulers loyally for nearly forty years, did not deserve to be treated in this way. He likewise protested against the temple-wrecking and idol-bashing activities of the Franciscan missionaries in Bacaim, assuring the king that peaceful methods would give much better results in the long run than did threats and violence.¹

Simao Botelho, one of the few outstandingly honest and competent officials of 16th-century Portuguese India, who ended his life as a Dominican friar, wrote to the King in 1552: "The religious in this country desire to spend so freely and give so many alms at the expense of Your Highness' revenue that a large part of the money goes in this. And besides this, there are some who are so desirous of favouring Christianity that a great part of the revenue is alienated, and the lands are becoming depopulated, principally those of Bacaim. I can well believe that they do all this with true and worthy zeal, and in the belief that Our Lord and Your Highness are very well served thereby; but it seems to me that they could take a middle course in this, and it might well be better if they did so, for there are some others who often want to make Christians by force, and they harass the Hindus so much that it is a reason why the lands are becoming depopulated, as I say. Let Your Highness decide what is best for the service of Our Lord."²

-
1. Azu Naique to D. Joao III, Bacaim, 18th December, 1549, in A. da Silva Rego (ed.), *Documentacao para a historia das missoes do padroado portugues do Oriente. India* (12 vols., Lisboa, 1949-58), Vol. IV (1950), pp. 450-61. This Azu Naique was presumably an ancestor of the Brahmin of the same name who was Chief Interpreter (*Lingoa do Estado*) at Goa from 1610 to 1626 or later. Cf. Panduronga Pissurlencar, *Agentes da Diplomacia Protuguesa na India. Hindus, mucalmans, judeus e parses* (Bastora, 1952), pp. l-liii, 22.
 2. Simao Botelho to the Crown, Cochin, 30th January, 1552 (Silva Rego, *Documentacao. India*, Vol. V, p. 108). My translation of this passage differs slightly from that given by R. S. Whiteway, *The Rise of the Portuguese Power in India 1497-1550* (Westminster, 1899), p. 64.

Although Simao Botelho does not specify who the advocates of forcible conversion were, another permanent official writing to the Crown in the same year was more explicit. According to him, the Jesuit missionaries, being more concerned with the prestige than with the fruit of conversion, "besides other vexations and annoyances which they inflict upon the Hindus in order to constrain them to submit to being baptized, forcibly shaved many of them, and compelled them to eat the flesh of cows and to sin against other of their superstitious and idolatrous rites; for which reason the majority of them have fled, and the Portuguese Christians complain because they cannot live without their services, both as regards the cultivation of their orchards and farms, as for other necessary tasks which are essential here."¹

The mixture of coercion and favouritism which the Portuguese missionaries sometimes employed to induce conversions is expounded in the "general letter" written by Pedro de Almeida, S.J. to the Jesuits of Portugal at the end of the year 1558. He describes how the missionaries on the one hand forcibly prevented the Hindus from celebrating their own rites and ceremonies, even in their own homes and behind closed doors at night. He explains how the Padres encouraged stool-pidgeons to spy and inform on their friends and neighbours, and even on their own kith and kin. "By thus impeding the heathen rites, by punishing those who perform them, and with the support which the lord governor Francisco Barreto and the lord Dom Constantino gave and give us in this matter, the number of the chosen of the Lord increases daily. May it please Our Lord that it will continue to increase always."²

It is true that on other occasions the Jesuits categorically denied that they made Christians by force,³ but it is equally clear from the published documentation that they often used methods which were tantamount to coercion when they could count on the support of such priest-ridden bigots as Francisco Barreto and Dom Costantino de Braganca. During the viceroyalty of the last-named, the exodus of Hindus from Goa reached such proportions that his immediate successors found it necessary to reverse his policy. Both the Count of Redondo (1561-64) and Dom Antao de Noronha (1564-68) gave the Hindus of Goa specific assurances that they would not be converted by force. A decree promulgated

1. Manuel Nunes to the Queen of Portugal, Goa, 20th December, 1552 (Silva Rego, *Documentacao. India* Vol. V. p. 297).
2. "General Letter" of Pedro de Almeida S.J., Goa, 26th December, 1558, in Silva Rego, *Documentacao. India*, Vol. VI, pp. 467-83. Francisco Barreto was governor of Portuguese India, 1555-58, being succeeded by the viceroy Dom Constantino de Braganca, who ruled from September 1558 till September 1561.
3. e.g. letter of Luis Frois S.J., to the Jesuits of Portugal, Goa, 8th December 1560, in Silva Rego, *Documentacao. India*, Vol. VIII, pp. 204-08, especially pp. 211-12.

by the former viceroy on the 3rd December 1561, announced that all Hindus who had fled from Portuguese territory to avoid religious persecution, and whose property and lands had been confiscated by order of Dom Constantino, would receive them back again if they returned within six months. ¹

As stated above, the Ecclesiastical Council held at Goa in 1567 condemned the employment of force, or the threat of force, to induce conversions to Christianity, and King Sebastiao's instructions to the viceroy Dom Luis de Ataide in the following year contained the same stipulation. ² Nevertheless, advocates of forcible conversion were not wanting as late as the eighteenth century and in the time of the relatively enlightened viceroy, Joao da Saldanha da Gama (1725-1732), who did not hesitate to criticise the Goa branch of the Holy Office of the Inquisition for its unwarranted interference with Hindus and Muslims. ³ Yet this same viceroy on one occasion ordered that some Maratha women and children who were prisoners at Bacaim should be placed on starvation rations and threatened with forcible conversion to Christianity. It is true that he gave secret instructions that in point of fact these prisoners were *not* to be forcibly converted "until further orders," and that this threat was made with the object of bringing pressure to bear on the Marathas to make peace. ⁴ But this was a dangerous as well as a dishonourable procedure, and in all probability formed one of the reasons for the Marathas' invasion of the Province of the North six years later. On the other hand, Joao da Saldanha da Gama must have unhesitatingly rejected the advice given by a fanatical Dominican friar at Goa in 1728, that all the unconverted inhabitants who refused to become Christians forthwith should be expelled! ⁵

1. Cf. Silva Rego, *Documentacao. India*, Vol. IX, pp. 410-11, 433-34; 615-17.
2. "vos emcomendo muito que o mais principal cuidado de todos os vosos seja em procurarades e ordenardes que a conversam das gentes das dictas partes se faca e continue, tendo os ministros que nela entemderem tal modo nisso, que todos os que se converterem seja com tanta temperanca e amor, como a mesma obra require, nam entrevindo nela por nenhuma via escandalo nem forca alguma"; (King Dom Sebastiao to Dom Luis de Ataide, Lisboa, 27th February, 1568, in Silva Rego, *Documentacao. India*, Vol. X, p. 438).
3. Joao da Saldanha da Gama to the Crown, Goa, 19th December, 1729, in *Arquivo Portuguez Oriental*, Fasc. VI (Nova Goa, 1876), pp. 324-26.
4. Correspondence of the Viceroy with the General of the North in 1731, printed in *Arquivo Portuguez Oriental. Nova Edicao*, Tomo I, Vol. III, Pt. IV (Bastora, 1940), pp. 198, 206, 210, 220, 235, 246.
5. *Parecer* of Fr. Caetano de Sao Joseph O.P., given in the Dominican convent of Santo Tomas, Goa, 10th January, 1728, and quoted by J. H. Cunha Rivara, *Grammatica da lingua Concani e o ensaio historico de Concani* (Nova Goa, 1857) p. xlix.

I mentioned above that the practice of forcible conversion was permitted by the ecclesiastical and civil authorities in one sphere, and a few words may be said about that now. In March 1559 a royal decree was promulgated at Lisbon that "all children of heathens in the city and islands of Goa . . . who are left without mother, and without grandfather or grandmother or any other forefathers, and who are not yet of an age when they have a proper understanding and reasoned judgement, . . . should forthwith be taken and handed over to the College of Sao Paulo of the Company of Jesus in the said city of Goa in order to be baptized, educated, and catechized by the Fathers of the said College." ¹ Legislation subsequently enacted both at Lisbon and Goa specifically authorized the use of force in taking such orphaned children from their surviving relatives, friends, or guardians; and force often had to be used.

Nor did this coercive legislation stop there. While the wording of the original decree of 1559 made it clear that an orphan-child was defined as one who had lost both parents and grandparents, the practice quickly arose of defining an orphan as a child who had lost his (or her) father, even if the mother and the grandparents were still living. The excuse for this behaviour was that the *Ordenancas*, or Portuguese code of law, defined an orphan in this way, and that this definition was equally applicable in colonial as well as in metropolitan territory. The age under which orphans could be forcibly taken from their non-Christian relatives was not specifically stated in the original decree, and in practice seems to have varied widely before a viceregal edict of the 11th July, 1718 (duly confirmed by the Crown in April 1754, however) fixed the age limit at fourteen for boys and at twelve for girls. ²

The task of ferreting out Hindu orphans and securing them if necessary by force was entrusted to a priest, who was called the *Pai dos Christaos* or "Father of Christians," and who exercised a wide range of powers in protecting and favouring the spiritual and temporal interests of converts. ³ The *Pai dos Christaos* was usually though not invariably a Jesuit, and holders of this post were appointed not only in Goa, but in Bacaim, in Ceylon, and in most other places where the Portuguese exercised effective jurisdiction in the East. Under pressure from Jesuit *Pai dos*

-
1. For the full text of the decree of 23 March 1559 see Silva Rego, *Documentacao. India*, Vol. VII, pp. 273-74.
 2. P. Pissurlancar, *Roteiro dos arquivos da India Portuguesa*, pp. 88-91.
 3. The duties and privileges of the *Pai dos Christaos*, and the abuses to which the office lent itself, are well documented in P. E. Pieris and M. A. H. Fitzler, *Ceylon and Portugal. Kings and Christians, 1539-1552* (Leipzig, 1927) pp. 365-76.

Christaos at Goa in 1646, a law was passed stating that henceforth any Hindu child who had lost its father would be considered as an orphan, even if the mother and grandparents were still alive. This was a great victory for the extremists, but the decision was reversed after much argument in 1678, when the provisions of the original law of 1559 were restored. The viceroy's advisors on this last occasion deprecated the seizure of Hindu orphans by force, "for the conversion of the said heathens should be made by the gentle methods of the law of Christ and through the preaching in which the missionaries of India should employ themselves."¹

Despite this pious admonition, the seizure of Hindu orphans by force continued, and their relatives naturally made every effort to conceal these children from the unwelcome attentions of the *Pai* and the Inquisition. Padre Alexandre de Sousa, the Jesuit *Pai dos Christaos* in 1711, complained to the Crown that adult Hindus not only concealed such orphans in Portuguese territory, or smuggled them across to Hindu and Muslim territories on the mainland, but that they also reclaimed some whom the Jesuits had already seized, "by pretending they have mothers or grandparents, when in reality they have not." The zealous Padre reported that the civil power gave scant support to the ecclesiastical in this respect, and he added that the laws ordering that Christian converts should be favoured at the expense of Hindus and Muslims were very ill obeyed.²

Apart from the forcible seizure of orphans, which seems incidentally, to have been applied much more rigorously to Hindus than to either Muslims or to Buddhists, another forceful missionary method which naturally caused much ill-feeling against the Portuguese was their systematic destruction of temples, mosques, pagodas and other sacred places. There were, however, three notable exceptions to this general rule. The mosques of Ormuz were specifically exempted from destruction by the first Ecclesiastical Council of 1567, since the Muslim population of that island was too numerous to be outraged in this way. So far as I am aware, this state of affairs continued down to the capture of Ormuz by the Persians and English in 1622. The Portuguese did not venture to interfere with the Buddhist and Taoist temples at Macao, for obvious reasons; and Diu afforded a singular instance of religious toleration being applied in a place where the Portuguese had the power to demolish all temples and mosques.

1. Cf. P. Pissurlencar, *Roteiro dos arquivos da India Portuguesa*, pp. 84-88; Ibidem, *Assentos do Conselho do Estado da India, 1659-1695* (Bastora, 1956), pp. 280-91, 299-303, 378-82.
2. Padre Alexandre de Sousa S.J., to the Crown, Goa, 20 January 1711 (Biblioteca da Universidade de Sao Paulo, Brazil, "Coleccao dos MSS de Alberto Lamego," MS no. 34). Cf. also the allegations of the "povo gentilico" (Hindu population) against the tyrannical behaviour of the *Pai dos Christaos* in 1709, in Pissurlencar, *Roteiro dos arquivos*, pp. 86-87.

The Hindus of Diu were guaranteed the use of their existing temples when the island and city were seized by the Portuguese after the death of Sultan Bahadur Shah of Gujerat in 1537. It was allegedly stipulated at the same time that these temples could be neither repaired nor enlarged, nor new ones built; and these restrictions were renewed during the reign of King Dom Sebastiano. The more zealous of the Jesuits and other missionaries naturally resented the toleration granted to the Hindus at Diu, and they frequently but unsuccessfully tried to have these privileges revoked. The viceroy Rui Lourenco de Tavora reported favourably on the continuation of this tolerant policy in 1610, four years after the ecclesiastical Council presided over by the Archbishop Dom Fr. Alcixo de Menezes had insistently demanded the destruction of "all the pagodas and temples of the heathen idolatry at Diu and Ormuz." During the viceroyalty of the Count of Aveiras (1639-1645), the Jesuit Patriarch of Ethiopia, Dom Affonso Mendes, reversing his predecessors' attitude, secured leave from the authorities for the Hindus of Diu to rebuild and repair their temples, out of gratitude for the timely help which he and his colleagues of the Ethiopian mission had received from the Hindu merchants of Diu during the persecution inaugurated by the Negus of Abyssinia. This precedent was quoted in 1671 when these privileges were again under attack, and it helped to save the Diu temples from destruction when similar efforts to condemn them were made at intervals in the eighteenth century. The Muslims of Diu also retained the use of their mosques, although this privilege was not so well attested as was the toleration of Hindu temples.¹

Towards the end of the disastrous Maratha war of 1737-40, when the abandonment of Chaul was under consideration at Goa in December 1739, Caetano de Sousa Pereira, the last Portuguese governor of Bacaim, offered to take upon himself the defence of Chaul subject to certain conditions. The third of these read: "That the Hindus and Muslims and other peoples will be allowed to live freely in their religions and to have temples and mosques outside the walls of the fortress, where they can perform their rites and ceremonies without let or hindrance, in the way which they are permitted to do in Diu; nor will the *Pai dos christaos* be allowed to seize the orphaned children of Hindu and Muslim women." Although Caetano de Sousa Pereira was a soldier with a distinguished fighting record, and a man with greater experience of the Marathas in war and peace than was possessed by any other

1. For the toleration of Hindu temples at Diu see the documents printed in *O Oriente Portugues*, nos. 7-9 (Nova Goa, 1934-35), pp. 201-03; *Arquivo Portugues Oriental*, Tomo IV, Vol. II, Pt. II (Bastora, 1938), pp. 640-59. Cf. also Archbishop Dom Ignacio de Santa Teresa, "Estado do presente Estado da India. Tratado politico, moral, juridico, theologico, historic e asctico, escrito na India no anno de 1725" (MS in the author's collection) fs. 19-23.

Portuguese in Asia, his proposals were adversely criticised by the members of the viceroy's advisory council of state, and particularly by the Archbishop of Goa.¹ The offer of religious toleration scandalised both clerics and laymen, although some previous viceroys and governors had agreed that the economic decline of Goa and other Portuguese possessions in comparison with the vigorous growth of Bombay was largely due to the policy of religious toleration which the English had pursued ever since their acquisition of the island.

The toleration granted to Hindus and Muslims at Diu was all the more surprising since the Holy Office of the Inquisition more than once proposed that all Hindus in Portuguese territory who refused to be converted to Christianity should be expelled forthwith. In 1699 the Crown sharply reprimanded the Goa Inquisitors for suggesting such a drastic measure, but the chief inquisitor made it again, forty years later, this time with the rider that all the Hindus' property and possessions should be confiscated as well. In the upshot, the Hindus of Goa were not expelled at the crisis of the Maratha war, but they were subjected to a forced capital levy which left them with little more than their eyes to weep with.²

Many other instances could be given to exemplify the fact that the Portuguese sometimes used force, or the threat of force, to forward their conversion policy in the East, but one more example will suffice. Padre Alexandro Valignano, S.J., the great reorganizer of the Jesuit Asian missions at the end of the sixteenth century, wrote that the saintly Xavier "realized with his spirituality and prudence how incapable and primitive is the nature of this people in the things of God, and that reasoning does not make such an impression on them as does force. And for this reason he considered that it would be very difficult to form any Christian community among the Niggers,³ and much more difficult to preserve it, unless it was under the rule of the Portuguese, or in a region whither their power could be extended, as is the case with the sea coast, where the fleets of His Highness can pass to and fro, dealing out favours or punishments according to what the people there deserve." Valignano added—and who should know better than he—that the spectacular success of Xavier's missionary methods near the Fishery Coast was largely due to his mixture of promises and threats,—“and now with the favours which he promised them, and at times adding some threats and

1. P. Pissurlencar, *Assentos do Conselho do Estado da India, 1696-1750* (Bastora, 1957), pp. 562-66.
2. P. Pissurlencar, *Assentos do Conselho do Estado da India, 1696-1750*, pp. 530-32; *Ibidem*, "Portugueses e Maratas" (*Boletim do Instituto Vasco da Gama*, Nr. XI, Nova Goa, 1932, pp. 69-86).
3. "... entre los negros," although he was speaking here of Indians in general and of those of the Malabar Coast in particular.

fears of the harm that might come to them if the captain deprived them of their fishing and sea trade, that finally *compellendo eos intrare ad nuptias* as the Lord says, he influenced a great multitude of them to become Christians."¹ Where St. Francis Xavier thought it justifiable to employ a mixture of threats and promises, it is obvious that some at least of his followers would not have hesitated to use similar methods in later years, despite the admonitions of the Ecclesiastical Council of 1567 against the use of force.

From the foregoing it is evident that the Reverend S. G. Perera, S.J.'s statement that the Portuguese never under any circumstances used force and violence in their missionary methods requires considerable modification. To take a fatherless child from its mother's grandparents' care, and to bring up that child as a Christian against their expressed wishes, *is* using force and violence, whatever theological sophistries may have been advanced in defence of this action. Moreover, to deprive Hindus, Muslims, and Buddhists (to say nothing of Protestants and Jews) of their places of worship, of their spiritual teachers and leaders, and of the open—and in many cases the secret—profession of their respective cults, *is* tantamount to making Christians by force, whatever some casuists may have argued to the contrary.²

In demolishing the Reverend Perera's thesis I do not wish to imply that religious persecution and intolerance were exercised by the Portuguese alone. Far from it. The basic root of the trouble was, of course, the principle that ruler and ruled should profess the same faith—*cujus regio illius religio*—and this was shared by many protestants as well as by Roman Catholics. The penal laws which were enacted against the open profession of Buddhism, Hinduism, and Islam in most of Portugal's Eastern possessions, have their counterpart in the penal laws enacted in Protestant

-
1. A. Valignano—J. Wicki, S.J., *Historia del principio y progreso de la Compania de Jesus en las Indias Orientales, 1542-1564* (Rome, 1944), pp. 69-71. The "compel them to come in" school of thought among the missionaries also had its adherents in Brazil, where Xavier's Jesuit contemporary, Jose de Anchieta, wrote to the Jesuit General at Rome in April 1565 that "the sword and the rod of iron" formed the best mode of preaching ("para este genero de gente nao ha melhor pregacao do que espada e vara de ferro, na qual mais do que em nenhuma outra e necessario que se cumpra o *compelle eos intrare*").
 2. Francisco de Sousa S.J., *Oriente Conquistado a Jesu Christo pelos padres da Companhia de Jesu da Provincia de Goa* (2 vols., Lisboa 1710), Vol. I, pp. 127-35; *Ibidem*. Vol. II, pp. 135-44, for a defence of the practice of orphan conversion and temple destruction. In spite of the evidence which this author, a former *Pai dos Christaos*, so plentifully supplies to the contrary, an enviable capacity for self-deception enabled him to maintain: "dizerem que os faziao. Christaos por forza, era patranha gentilica, e porfia sem fundamento de homens temerarios e mal informados" (op. cit., Vol. I, p. 129).

England against Roman Catholics in general and against Jesuits in particular—though perhaps sixteenth to eighteenth century Ireland affords a better comparison in some ways. Moreover, as indicated at the beginning of this essay, the practical application of these coercive laws varied widely in time and place. If some viceroys, such as Francisco Barreto and Dom Constantino de Braganza, were priest-ridden bigots who strove to enforce them as far as possible, other viceroys, such as Dom Luis de Ataíde and the Count of Lavradio, were relatively tolerant and applied them half-heartedly.¹ Padre Alexandre de Sousa was not the only *Pai dos Christaos* who complained of the lack of support which he received from the civil power; and whenever the privileges of the Hindus at Diu were attacked, influential defenders among the Portuguese were not wanting. Nevertheless, when all due reservations and allowances have been made, the fact remains that many of the Portuguese in the East regarded themselves as forming the spearhead of militant Roman Catholic Christianity, and as such they took literally the Biblical injunction (Luke XIV, 23) to “compel them to come in.”²

-
1. Francisco de Sousa S.J., *Oriente Conquistado*, passim is critical of these and of some other viceroys on this account.
 2. This article elaborates certain points already adumbrated in my essay, “Christians and Spices: Portuguese missionary methods in Ceylon, 1518-1658” (*History Today*, Vol. VIII, no. 5 May 1958, pp. 346-54). Cf. also C. Mercedes de Melo S.J., *The recruitment and formation of the native clergy in India, 16th-19th century. An historico-canonical study* (Lisboa, 1955), pp. 17-29.

BUDDHISM AND THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT IN CEYLON 1840-55

By

K. M. DE SILVA

Part one 1840-47

On 2nd March 1815, the Kandyan Kingdom was ceded to the British by its chiefs and bhikkus. The Kandyan Convention¹ of the same date, signed on behalf of the British by the Governor Sir Robert Brownrigg, and on behalf of the Sinhalese by the chiefs, preserved intact the powers of the chiefs, the laws, customs and institutions of the country, and—what in the eyes of the Sinhalese was most important—the position of their religion. The fifth clause of that Convention, employing language described by Brownrigg as being “more emphatical than would have been my choice,”² declared that “The religion of Buddho, professed by the chiefs and inhabitants of these provinces is declared inviolable; and its rites, ministers and places of worship are to be maintained and protected.”³

When he sent a copy of the Convention to the Colonial Office, Brownrigg explained that considering that it was vitally important to quiet the apprehensions of the Kandyans about their religion, he had been obliged to consent to “an article of guarantee couched in the most unqualified terms.”⁴ He went on to explain that it was only by making it clear that the fifth clause of the convention would be scrupulously observed, that the British

-
1. The Convention is printed in G. C. Mendis, (ed.). *The Colebrooke-Cameron papers*, 11, pp. 227-31.
 2. Co. 54, 55. Brownrigg to Bathhurst. 15-3-1815.
 3. It must be pointed out that Buddhism as it exists today and as it existed in 1815 was an amalgam of the original Theravada Buddhism and elements of Mahayana Buddhism and Hinduism. The fifth clause of the Kandyan Convention undertook to protect and maintain all this and not merely Theravada Buddhism pure and simple. A Sinhalese version of the Convention printed in P. E. Peiris *Sinhale and the Patriots* pp. 591-593 makes this clear. There specific reference is made to the religion of the Buddha and the Agama of the Devas and protection is promised to both the viharayas and devalayas. It is important to stress the threefold nature of popular Buddhism because one of the arguments used by those who sought to sever the connection between the British government and Buddhism was that the Kandyan convention protected only the “pure” Theravada Buddhism.
 4. Co. 54, 55. Brownrigg to Bathhurst, of 15-3-1815.

could gain the adherence of the chiefs and bhikkus.¹ The convention was approved by the Home Government though they were at first inclined to favour one in which the guarantees on religion were less emphatic. Wilberforce objected particularly to the fifth clause, as being likely to exclude any future attempts at conversion. He suggested that the word "inviolable" was far too strong.² Bathurst had his own misgivings, but Brownrigg distinctly disclaimed any idea of interpreting the fifth clause in the manner objected to and explained that the Sinhalese words translated as "inviolable" really meant "could not be broken down." At the same time he made no move to change the wording of the convention in any way³. He did however utilise the opportunity provided by the Kandyan Rebellion of 1817-8, to modify the declaration slightly. The proclamation of 21st November 1818, which embodied the terms on which the chiefs surrendered, greatly reduced their privileges, but the guarantees on religion were only slightly changed. The sixteenth clause of the proclamation minimised slightly the categorical promises made in the convention of 1815; while reserving to Buddhism the respect promised in 1815, that clause specifically extended protection to all other religions as well.⁴

The Kandyans believed that the relationship between Buddhism and the British Government defined in 1815 was indeed permanent. Their insistence on this connection of their religion with the State puzzled officials and missionaries alike. Tennent came nearest to providing a sound explanation. He stated that . . . "it is not *protection* which they look to us . . . for, . . . it is not our *management* they want . . . But what they really want under the semblance of interference and appearance of control is really our identification with their religion and the prestige of the Government name as associated with their appointments and patronage."⁵ Like most of his contemporaries, he believed that the connection of the State with Buddhism "confers dignity on their religion: which would otherwise sink into insignificance."⁶ In coming to this last conclusion Tennent was making a grave error of judgement. What he did not understand was that the Kandyans sought to maintain the connection of the state with Buddhism, because it

1. Co. 54, 55. Brownrigg to Bathurst, 100 of 1-4-1815, and 104 of 20-7-1815.

2. Referred to in P. E. Pieris, *Sinhale and the Patriots*, pp. 596 ff.

3. Co. 54, 57. Brownrigg to Bathurst, 143 of 1-6-1816 and private despatch of 21-6-1816.

4. C. R. de Silva, *Ceylon under the British occupation*, 1 p. 197.

5. Co. 54, 296. Tennent. *Memorandum on Buddhism, and the means of severing the connexion between the British Government and the Buddhist rites and temples in Ceylon*. paragraphs, 138 and 139.

6. *Ibid* para, 139.

was hallowed by tradition. That connection did bring 'dignity' and 'prestige' to Buddhism no doubt, but it was in their eyes a connection worth maintaining as an end in itself apart from any benefits it might bring. The connection between the State and Buddhism had very seldom been broken, and the Kandyan in 1815 hoped that their new and alien rulers would accept this heavy responsibility, as the Nayakkar dynasty had done.

The Kandyans on their part erred in thinking that the relationship established in 1815 would be maintained unchanged. There was a strong belief among them that the Kandyan Convention of 1815 and in particular its fifth clause could never be abrogated and the promises embodied in it could never be broken. They did not see that the peculiar form of the Kandyan convention depended on political factors operating in 1815—factors which were subject to rapid change.¹ The concessions made to the chiefs and bhikkus in 1815 were made because of the comparative weakness of the British position then. But with every year that passed the position of the British had improved and that of the Kandyans had weakened. The years 1815 to 1840 were years of rapid, even revolutionary, change in the Kandyan provinces. The failure of the rebellion of 1817-8 had broken the power of the Kandyan chieftains, and helped to consolidate the British position. With the Colebrooke-Cameron reforms of 1833 the Kandyan kingdom lost its separate identity. The whole trend of legislation was directed at breaking down the old conservative, aristocratic, status ridden and caste-oriented society, and at replacing it with a new commercial and egalitarian society.

In 1815 if Wilberforce had had his way, the Kandyan Convention would have taken a different form. But in 1815 Evangelicalism was still too weak. In the course of the next two decades, however, it had developed into a powerful force, influencing Government policy, and seeking to convert the "heathen" of the Empire to Christianity. The new generation was more inclined to put their faith in Christianity and Evangelicalism, pouring scorn on ancient alien cultures, religions and traditions. This generation would inevitably challenge the relationship established in 1815 between Buddhism and the British Government in Ceylon.

1. For an excellent account of the opinions of the Kandyans on these matters, see the Kandyan petition (with 1,941 signatures) to the Queen, enclosed in Campbell's despatch to Stanley, 37 of 7-2-46 in Co. 54, 223. The main arguments used by the Kandyans were (1) that since 1815 the policy of maintaining Buddhism had been continued unchanged, and the Government had acted in strict conformity to its promises at the convention of 1815. (2) that the convention of 1815 did not mention any time or period after which the patronage would cease. It had in fact declared that that patronage should continue for ever, and would not be withdrawn in time.

Between 1815 and 1840 there were no substantial modifications in the relationship between the Government and Buddhism. The British Government—though with an obvious lack of enthusiasm—sought to play much the same role in relation to Buddhism that the Kandyan King had played. At moments of crisis, or when a radical social change was envisaged, the Government insisted on making clear that the relationship with Buddhism was unaffected. In 1833 when the Colebrooke-Cameron reforms were introduced in Ceylon, the Home Government left the decision on matters relating to Temples and Temple lands to the Ceylon Government, merely pointing out that any direct sanction of “heathenism” must be carefully avoided. It was emphasized however that the British Government would secure to the inhabitants of the country the free exercise of the religious rites guaranteed them in 1815. And it was decided that the Order-in-Council abolishing compulsory service (Rajakariya) was not to affect temple lands.¹

But the abolition of Rajakariya did indirectly affect the State's relationship with Buddhism. For, when the Government lands—the lands traditionally belonging to the Kandyan King—were sold after the abolition of Rajakariya in 1832, it was necessary, since a share of those revenues were used to support Buddhist ceremonies, to make some new arrangement to continue these ceremonies. Governor Wilmot-Horton arranged to make an annual monetary grant. This grant, usually £310.0.0, was made till it was abolished by Lord Stanley after 1844.

In 1834 a number of Kandyan chiefs were arrested on very flimsy evidence, on a charge of “conspiracy” against British rule. They were tried, but were all acquitted. During the trial it was suggested that among the reasons for the continued hostility of the Kandyan aristocracy to British rule, was their fear for the safety of their religion. To satisfy the Kandyans that the changes brought about by the Colebrooke-Cameron reports were not meant to impose on them a new religious policy detrimental to the interests of Buddhism, Horton issued a proclamation on 15th September 1834 declaring that the old religious policy was to be maintained without substantial change.

Thus in the year 1840, when the connection between the British Government and Buddhism first became a matter of acute controversy, the Buddhist religion enjoyed many privileges. The lands of the temples and Dewales were exempt from the operation of the ordinance that abolished Rajakariya. The tenants of the

1. Co. 55, 72. Goderich to Horton, 52 of 3-5-1832, and the Order in Council of 12-4-1832.
Co. 54, 296. Tennent. Memorandum on Buddhism.

Temple lands continued to perform their traditional services for the lands they held. The British Government was the custodian of the Temple of the Tooth at Kandy.¹ A missionary pamphleteer described this particular function of the Government thus. "(The Temple of the Tooth) is venerated more than any other spot in the world by many of the natives, and is frequented by great numbers at the principal festivals. The relic is in the official custody of the Government Agent (of the Central Province), the keys of the room in which it is kept are lodged in his house, and the keys of the Karanduwa in which the relic is immediately deposited is also in his possession. For the purpose of opening and closing the temple an aratchy is appointed by the Agent, who receives from the Government a monthly allowance and is called the aratchy of the Maligawa."² A soldier stood guard at the entrance to the Temple.

The principal Bhikkus³ were appointed by the Governor as were the Basnayake Nilames and some Kapuralas of the principal dewales. The British Government granted a trifling monthly allowance for the support of bhikkus. It made a more substantial grant for the performance of various traditional religious ceremonies, the chief of which was the Kandy Perahera.

The campaign against the connection of the British Government in Ceylon with Buddhism in the Kandyan Provinces, coincided with and was deeply influenced by the campaign against the

1. The possession of the Tooth Relic and the Alms Bowl Relic was essential to a ruler of Ceylon. These two relics had always been in the possession of the chief ruler of the island—they had passed into the hands of the Kings of Kandy after 1591—and they were associated with the continuity of Sinhalese kingship. W. Rahula, *A History of Buddhism in Ceylon*, pp. 62-74.

2. Spence Hardy, *The British Government and the Idolatry of Ceylon*, p. 23. See also, J. E. Tennent. Memorandum on Buddhism in Co. 54, 296.

The British Government undertook the custody of the Tooth Relic only after the rebellion of 1817-18. It had been in the possession of the bhikkus between 1815 and 1817. The relic was stolen during the rebellion; it was recaptured in 1818. Governor Brownrigg attributed the suppression of the rebellion to a great measure to the superstitious awe of the people on the relic again—accidentally—falling into the hands of the British, for it was a common belief that no conquest of the Kandyan Kingdom could have been complete without the possession of the Tooth Relic. Hence the care with which it was guarded after 1818.

³ See. C. R. de Silva, *Ceylon under the British occupation*, 1, pp. 196-200.

3. Forty-two bhikkus were paid by the Government. The heads of the two Chapters of Malwatta and Asgiriya each received a monthly allowance of 7s. 6d. The priests who officiated at the Temple of the Tooth received 3s. each and 4 parras of paddy. The others received an allowance of from 7 1/2 to 3 3/4 parras of paddy and a monthly allowance for salt and oil. These payments and the grants to the outstation temples cost the Government about £150 annually.

Pilgrim Tax in India.¹ It began with the publication in 1839 of a pamphlet² by the Revd. R. Spence-Hardy, a Wesleyan missionary calling on the Government to sever its connection with Buddhism.³ For a missionary pamphlet of this nature and this age it was singularly free from appeals to emotion; it had in fact a thoroughness and a solemnity normally associated with the Blue Books of that period. Its importance lies in the fact that in the long controversies on this problem that followed no one introduced an argument against the state's connection with Buddhism that Spence-Hardy had not included in this pamphlet.

Spence-Hardy's task in Ceylon was curiously much more formidable than that of his contemporaries in India. In India the missionary agitation against the Pilgrim Tax concentrated on two things. First, they condemned the fact that the East India Company was associated with the organisation of Hindu religious ceremonies and—what was more—derived a considerable income from the Pilgrim Tax. (The missionaries held that it was immoral to obtain a revenue from this "tainted" source). Secondly, they drew attention to such ritual ceremonies as those associated with the temple of Jaganath where scores of frenzied devotees threw themselves under the wheels of the temple chariot to be crushed to death. This was all so much grist to the missionaries' mill. They organized a superbly sustained campaign, noteworthy for its heady emotionalism, its high moral tone, and its intelligent, realistic appreciation of what was necessary to impress public opinion in England. But the campaign in Ceylon had to be organized on different lines. For there, the state derived no revenue from its association with Buddhism; and there were no ritual ceremonies such as those of the temple of Jaganath. The connection between Buddhism and the state could only be contested on the grounds of principle—that the association with Buddhism however tenuous it might be was still inherently harmful—and it was on these grounds that it was challenged.

1. On the missionary agitation against the Pilgrim Tax, see K. Ingham, *Reformer in India*, pp. 33-43; "The Evangelicals and the Pilgrim Tax in India 1800-62" in *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 3, (1952) pp. 191-200.
2. R. Spence-Hardy *The British Government and Idolatry of Ceylon*.
3. Spence-Hardy collected the material for his pamphlet during his brief stay at the mission station at Kandy. (The Wesleyans abandoned their mission station at Kandy in 1839). This pamphlet was greatly influenced by the campaign in India against the connection of the East India Company with Hinduism. Spence-Hardy quoted with approval the policy declaration made under strong Evangelical pressure in 1838 that the East India Company should as soon as possible sever its connections with Hinduism in those parts of India under its control. The aim of Spence-Hardy's pamphlet was to persuade the Ceylon Government to adopt a similar policy in the Kandyan Provinces.

The chief argument used by Spence-Hardy—and it was to be the main argument used by all those who opposed the association of the state with Buddhism—was that the connection between the British Government and Buddhism was a connection between a Christian Government and an idolatrous religious system.¹ (Nineteenth century missionaries—and laymen interested in religious problems—held nothing in greater contempt than “idolatry”. And to them most oriental religions were ‘idolatrous’). It was therefore a connection that must be severed no matter what were the circumstances in which it originated, and no matter what were the consequences of the step suggested.

Apart from this main argument Spence-Hardy used two others. He insisted that Government ‘interference’ in the religious practices of the country would be interpreted by the people as official approbation of their religion.² And Spence-Hardy believed as did most missionaries of his day that it was only Government “support” that kept Buddhism alive. If that were removed (by dissociating the state from Buddhism) that religion was to lose its hold on the people.³

Not content with his lucid and skilful presentation of the case for dissociation, he went on to suggest the arguments likely to be used by the defenders of the established policy and proceeded to demolish them. He anticipated that one line of defence would be that the interference of the Government was too slight to be productive of harm. Spence-Hardy met this with the assertion that all Government interference, however slight it might be—must cease because it was a matter of vital principle to dissociate the state from Buddhism.⁴ He knew that the Government in Ceylon derived no financial advantages from its connection with Buddhism but while making this admission he commented that the British Government used this connection with Buddhism “to consolidate the British power in Ceylon”. This, he insisted, was quite as sinful as deriving a revenue from its association with that religion.⁵

Spence-Hardy was too intelligent not to realise that those who defended the existing arrangements would hardly rely entirely on arguments such as these. Their defence lay on altogether more secure grounds, viz., that the connection with Buddhism had been solemnly guaranteed at the convention of 1815. No one realised the strength of this argument more than Spence-Hardy. He

1. Spence-Hardy op. cit. pp. 12-13.

2. Ibid. p. 44.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid.

suggested two arguments against it neither of which was wholly satisfactory from his point of view. The first of these was that even if the convention of 1815 was not contrary to the Law of Nations it was contrary to the Laws of God. It was a weak argument in a secular age and realising its weakness he proceeded to a second line of attack by suggesting that even conceding that the Treaty was valid in law there were certain aspects of the existing connection with Buddhism that could not have been guaranteed by the Convention. Here he was referring to the Hindu practices in popular Buddhism.¹ But this argument was as weak as the first because the convention guaranteed protection to Buddhism as it existed and not to Theravada Buddhism in its pristine purity.

Spence-Hardy's pamphlet aimed at attracting the attention of those missionary organizations in England who were campaigning against the Pilgrim Tax in India. It was equally important to win the support of Governor Stewart Mackenzie in Ceylon. This latter task he left in the hands of the Rev. D. J. Gogerly, the chairman of the Wesleyan Mission Society in South Ceylon, who had great influence with the Government.² But at this stage Mackenzie was not as enthusiastic in his support of this cause, as he was to be later. Realising that these missionaries wanted a complete reversal of the policy that had been followed since 1815, he confessed his inability to make so radical a change and pointed out that it could only be done by agitation in England. It was necessary to get the support of missionary organizations there, and to persuade them to use their influence at the Colonial Office to have the policy changed.

Since Spence-Hardy's pamphlet had already been published Mackenzie could not ignore it. His speech to the Legislative Council of the 16th December 1839, moving the first reading of a Bill to provide for the contingent expenditure of 1840, contained a cautious defence of the existing policy and a broad hint that this policy was being challenged. He refused to be precipitated into indiscreet action and warned that the "all important object" of converting the heathen "will not be advanced by violent assaults upon the Religious establishments of a nation or upon those who administer the heathen ceremonies so long cherished amongst them."³

Spence-Hardy had in the meantime sent several copies of this pamphlet to missionary organizations at home, and sent an urgent

1. *Ibid.* pp. 43-49.

2. Wesleyan, MSS. Ceylon 1. Spence-Hardy 8-7-1840; See also Spence-Hardy's letters of 14-12-1839, and 7-5-1840.

3. *Governor's Addresses, Ceylon 1833-60.* Mackenzie's speech of 16-12-1839 pp. 88 ff.

appeal to the Wesleyan Mission Society to review it in the journals, to publish extracts from it, and most important of all, to use their influence at the Colonial Office to persuade the Home Government to reverse the established policy.¹ The Wesleyans did review his pamphlet and publish extracts from it,² but it is doubtful if they ever petitioned the Colonial Office on this matter. In the files of the Colonial Office there are no letters from the Wesleyans on Spence-Hardy's behalf.

But it was not really necessary for the Wesleyans to move on his behalf for Spence-Hardy found an eager and influential convert in Dandeson Coates, the Secretary of the Church Missionary Society, and a close friend and associate of the Evangelical James Stephen the Permanent Under-Secretary at the Colonial Office.³ Coates sent copies of this pamphlet to three missionaries of the C.M.S. who had served in Ceylon, for their views on the subject. Their replies confirmed the main conclusions of Spence-Hardy's pamphlet, and all of them agreed on the need to dissociate the British Government from all connection with Buddhism. Armed with these letters, Coates took upon himself the task of championing Spence-Hardy. In a letter to James Stephen, he called for an urgent re-appraisal of the existing policy on Buddhism.⁴ The theme of his letter was simple—State support of "idolatry", *i.e.* Buddhism, was an obstacle in the way of missionary activity, and the countenance given to this "idolatry" created the impression in the minds of "heathen" people that the British Government approved of "practices which throughout the whole of Divine revelation are condemned with the utmost severity as most affronting to the majesty of the True God." The State must therefore sever its connection with Buddhism.

James Stephen needed little coaxing on this matter. From the moment that Coates' letter arrived, till the day of his retirement in 1847, Stephen fought ceaselessly for a reversal of the established policy on Buddhism in Ceylon. On this subject his mind was more than half made up before he began, and he took an increasingly hostile attitude, coaxing, cajoling, and pushing his political superiors into accepting a stronger line than they were likely to have taken on their own. His reputation and his prestige were

1. Wesleyan MSS. Ceylon I, Spence-Hardy, 14-12-1839 and 7-5-40.
2. His pamphlet was reviewed in the Wesleyan Journal, *The Watchman*, on 18th March, 1840.
3. For a discussion of the close relationship between Coates and James Stephen, see, Bell and Morrell, *British Colonial Policy, Select Documents*, introduction, p. XXII.
4. Co. 54. 193. Coates to Stephen, letter of 23-3-41. The replies of the three CMS missionaries were enclosed in this letter.

so high and his capacity for hard work so well known that he was less a technical adviser than a policy maker on his own. This was particularly so when Glenelg was Secretary of State. And Lord John Russell was only slightly less dependent on him. On the subject of the state's relations with Buddhism Stephen became the real policy maker.

When a subject, like the reform of the Ceylon Civil Service caught Stephen's eye, or when a serious social evil like slavery attracted his attention, his usual method was an exhaustive study of the problem, with lengthy memoranda written with great care for detail, and persistent lobbying of his political superiors. On Buddhism however, Stephen was profoundly ignorant, and showed no desire to acquaint himself with the facts of the situation. His memoranda, lengthy and detailed though they were, contained more prejudice than fact; only his lobbying possessed its usual qualities. Stephen's attitude to this subject, is a study of the darker side of Evangelicalism—its intolerance, its bigotry, its self-righteousness, and its confident assumption of moral superiority.

When Coates' letter arrived at the Colonial Office, Stephen on the very next day, wrote a stiff minute recommending immediate action on this matter, suggesting that the Governor should be called upon to send home a report; he recommended that an injunction should be given that the Governor take immediate steps to redress "these evils" if Spence Hardy's report were substantially correct.¹ He declared that "I cannot but agree with the writer of these letters (Coates) that no Christian Government should countenance or actively participate in idolatry which we are all agreed in regarding as not merely absurd but positively criminal. I should hold it wise to hazard any consequences however formidable of acting on this principle but I totally disbelieve that there is anything to be dreaded, unless it be the sacrifice of some revenue."²

This minute aimed at gaining the support of Vernon Smith, the Under-Secretary at the Colonial Office. Smith, however, frankly admitted that he would have preferred a policy of "quieta non movebit."³ He pointed out that the C.M.S. missionaries who denounced the connection of the state with Buddhism had made no complaints about it when they were in Ceylon. But taking a politician's approach to the problem, he agreed that since the matter was being agitated in England "it may be as well to ask

1. Co. 54, 193. Stephen's minute of 24-3-41.

2. Ibid.

3. Co. 54, 193. Vernon Smith's minute of 25-3-41.

the Government for a report.”¹ “It has hitherto been our policy” he declared, “to govern the natives of India and Ceylon by non-interference with their religion which has been extended in instances to support. After the changes in India, we must follow the example in Ceylon and perhaps the time has come when we may very safely, and as good Christians violate our engagements . . .” It was a practical if rather cynical approach.²

Smith’s cynicism disappointed Stephen. A week later, Stephen wrote a longer and more substantial minute, more critical of Mackenzie and more vehement in his support of Spence-Hardy. This minute sought to win the support of Lord John Russell, then Secretary of State for the Colonies. The burden of this minute was that since Mackenzie’s speech of 16th December 1839 did not meet Spence-Hardy’s arguments, it would be necessary to call for a full report without further delay.³

Stephen organized in impressive array the arguments for dissociation. There was first the familiar one that the connection of the British Government with Buddhism was a connection with idolatry which was in principle so utterly wrong that it had to be severed notwithstanding any possible risks. But he paid much greater attention to the construction of an Evangelical interpretation of the Kandyan convention of 1815. He took the view that this convention should not be supposed to infer that “the British Sovereign succeeded to the obligations of the Kandyan Sovereign and must maintain and protect their idolatry in the same way in which it was maintained and protected by their former princes . . . It could never have been meant by the contracting parties that the conquering state should locally adopt a system of religious observances condemned in the strongest possible terms by its own religion . . . (The Convention) was a contract for absolute toleration . . . which bound the British Government to prevent . . . every interference with . . . the Kandyan religion . . . or every encroachment upon the property dedicated to the maintenance of it. But it could not mean that King George the Third bound himself and his successors in the persons of his and their offices to tread in the footsteps of the Kandyan Princes by lending to the idolatry of the country the same active support and direct countenance.

Or if such was the meaning of the Treaty it was a compact which in my judgement no British Sovereign had a right to make or having made, is at liberty to fulfil . . .”⁴

1. Co. 54, 193. Vernon Smith’s minute of 25-3-41.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid. Stephen’s minute of 30-3-41.

4. Co. 54, 193. James Stephen’s minute of 30-3-41.

Stephen never changed these views. (For the rest of his stay at the Colonial Office he continued to give his superiors the same advice). But the nearer he came to the end of his duties the more violent became the language in which he expressed them. If his understanding of the subject did not increase, his bigotry and intolerance did.

Stephen made a complete conquest of Russell (though Smith was once again less than enthusiastic)¹ who not only recommended a despatch asking for a report, but also suggested the inclusion in it of a statement of policy embodying Stephen's main arguments in a modified form. The declaration read as follows " . . . (The) Queen while she is determined to abide by the Treaties of her predecessors, does not consider herself bound to give any active and ostentatious support of the religion of the natives—that the less the Governor interferes in the nomination of priests, unless to prevent foreign intrigue or domestic sedition the better—that however the Governor is entitled to see that no disaffected or disloyal person is appointed to a station of influence or power—that the natives should be protected from all interruption of their religious rites by violence or breach of the peace, that the property of their Temples and priests should be respected by the Tribunals, but that the Government must let it be clearly seen that we are not induced to act thus tolerantly from any fear of the power of idols or any wish to perpetuate their religion—but likewise we believe that truth does not require to be enforced by cannon and muskets"² Evangelical enthusiasm was thus blended with a politician's caution.

It was a great triumph for James Stephen, but the triumph though significant was not complete and the despatch was never written because the Whig ministry was defeated soon after, and Lord John Russell was succeeded at the Colonial Office by Lord Stanley, whose relations with James Stephen were by no means as cordial as those of his predecessor Russell—and much less so than those of Glenelg. He would not have his policies dictated to him or even initiated for him by James Stephen. Stephen had therefore to bide his time and wait for an opportunity to arise when he could convert Stanley as he had converted Russell to his line of thinking.

1. *Ibid.* Smith's minute of 30-3-41.

2. Co. 54, 193. Lord John Russell's minute of 31-3-41.

II.

In Ceylon, in the meantime, Mackenzie on the eve of his return home, had become an enthusiastic supporter of the missionary point of view on the question of the Government's relations with Buddhism. Realizing that he could not attack the problem in all its details, he concentrated on one aspect of it—temple appointments. He called for reports on this problem from each member of his Executive Council, and in concert with the Chief Justice prepared the draft of an ordinance to be introduced into the Legislative Council during the session of 1841.¹ At a meeting of the Executive Council² he drafted a minute declaring that "The Governor brings before the Executive Council the course which he as a Christian deems it requisite for him in future to pursue in regard to the appointment of officers to the several Buddhist Temples in the colony. Having decided not hereafter to interfere in these appointments, His Excellency finds himself compelled to suggest the immediate repeal of a Proclamation which has been considered hitherto, and is still considered to be in force."³ But time was against him and he was recalled before he could bring this measure before the Legislative Council. All that he had the time to do was to lay down a deliberate protest against himself or his successors being called upon to interfere in any future appointments to the Viharas and Dewales.⁴

His successor, Sir Colin Campbell, an old soldier—he had been Wellington's companion in his Maratha campaigns and he was also a Peninsular War veteran—was a Presbyterian by conviction and much less enthusiastic than his predecessor on the question of separating the state from Buddhism. And when he was faced with this problem he showed a greater awareness of the legal and administrative difficulties involved.

But in the early months of his administration he followed Mackenzie's line of policy. Thus in 1841 when the Government Agent of the Central Province asked to be informed of the Governor's views as to the regular appointment of persons to the posts of Basnayaka Nilames of the Pattini and Alawatugoda Dewales, where two persons had been acting without regular appointments, Campbell, acting in accordance with his

1. Co. 54, 210. Campbell to Stanley, 14 of 21-1-44. Sec. T. W. C. Murdoch's memorandum in this despatch. It is difficult to account for this radical change in Mackenzie's attitude on the question of Buddhism. Perhaps it was due to Gogery's influence but one cannot be certain of this.
2. Meeting of the Executive Council of 16-10-40.
3. He sought to repeal "So much of the Proclamation of 21st November, 1818 as is contained in clause 10".
4. Executive Council meeting of 24-3-41.

predecessor's resolution, at first, declined to make an appointment, arguing that "it is highly desirable to abstain as far as possible for all interference in regard to the management of heathen temples."¹

Campbell's attitude changed considerably with the passage of time. Some of the consequences of this new policy on temple appointments gave cause for concern. One of the direct results of this policy was that some of the temple tenants refused to render the services due from them in return for their lands, and the bhikkus found it impossible to assert their rights at law. In 1843 the bhikkus petitioned the Government, and urged that a new law be enacted to give them redress; but the Governor and his Executive Council while they admitted that the new policy had created difficulties for the vihares and devales, confessed their inability to apply the remedy the bhikkus desired. A Minute of the Executive Council of 11th August 1843 recorded that

"The Governor and Council are of opinion that there is much ground for complaint. The Temples were formerly supported by the Government who compelled the attendance of those who held lands under them. Now all such interference is withdrawn, and the Temples are referred to the Courts of Law to establish their rights. It must be understood that they cannot so enforce them, and they have thus been material sufferers, by this change in the policy of the Government".

Besides there were more serious worries for the Government. In 1843 there had been a scare of rebellion in the Kandyan Provinces. It had come to nothing, but Government remembering the rebellion of 1817-8 took no chances. Campbell believed that the Government's changed attitude to Buddhism had much to do with these events. He noted that

"some degree of dissatisfaction exists attributable to an impression that has gone abroad of the Government being hostile to the Native Institutions and Religion and the refusal of the Government to fill up appointments which are absolutely required to protect the temporal interests of the religious establishments is regarded as evidence of this hostility".

He called a meeting of the Executive Council to discuss this problem both because of the excited feeling among the Kandyan,

1. Co. 54, 210. J. A. Mooyart G. A., Central Province to Colonial Secretary, 16-11-1841, and the latter's reply of 3-12-41; both these letters are enclosed in Campbell to Stanley 14 of 2 4-1-44.

and also in "justice to the Native Religious Establishments".¹ The Executive Councillors were unanimous in recommending that the vacant Temple appointments or at least the more important of them should be filled at once.² The Pattini Devale at Kandy immediately benefited from this change of heart. Legal measures were necessary to recover certain dues of this devale but the acting Basnayake Nilame was unable to produce a warrant of appointment and could not therefore be recognized by the Courts of Law. When Campbell was informed of this he instructed the Government Agent of the Central Province to issue an Act of Appointment to the acting Basnayake Nilame, but on the clear understanding that it was a purely provisional arrangement designed solely to protect the temporal interests of the devale.³

The Pattini Devale was an important religious institution and the arrangements made with regard to that devale were not intended to be applied to smaller and less important institutions. It was perhaps primarily with regard to these that the Executive Council suggested that Campbell should call a levee at Kandy of the principal headmen and bhikkus to explain to them that though the Government would not interfere in the appointment of officers to the Temples it was by no means intended that such vacancies as existed should not be filled. Campbell was to suggest that election to these vacancies should be left to a Committee of Kandyan chiefs, presumably the Government would then recognise their nominee.⁴ There is no evidence to suggest that such a levee was held in 1844. And even if a levee had been held it would not have led to any important results, because the Kandyans were strongly opposed to any change in the existing connection between the Government and their religion.

In 1843 there occurred an event that was to be of great significance for the future not because of any intrinsic importance of its own but because of unexpected developments that sprang from it. A deputation of Siamese Buddhist monks from the King of Siam arrived in Kandy to see the Tooth Relic. The Kandyan bhikkus applied to the Government for permission to hold a special exposition of the Tooth Relic for the occasion. Permission was granted, and on 27th March, 1843 there was a picturesque ceremony at which the Governor and Lady Campbell, C.R. Buller the Acting Government Agent of the Central Province, and several other civil servants and their wives were present. The presence of these officials attracted the critical comments of missionaries. In June 1843,

1. Co. 54.210. Campbell to Stanley. 14 of 24-1-44.

2. *ibid.*

3. Co. 54.210. Campbell to Stanley 14 of 24-1-44.

4. *Ibid.*

the Indian Baptist Journal, *The Friend of India* published an account of this ceremony severely critical of Campbell and C. R. Buller. Its comments are worth quoting as an example of the reaction of the missionary mind to the association of Government officials in ceremonies of this nature. That journal commented that the presence of these officials at this ceremony was

“ . . . injurious to the progress of moral and religious truth: it (was) calculated to confirm the confidence of the Buddhists in a creed the abandonment of which must be the first step to improvement. It (was) derogatory to the honour of an enlightened Government. The Siamese pilgrims returning to their own land, will proclaim abroad that they consider our piety, what we cannot but consider our shame . . . ”

When this account of the ceremony appeared in this journal Spence-Hardy was moved to write to the Wesleyan Headquarters in London urging them to give it as much publicity as possible; in his letter home he sent an extract from the article in *The Friend of India*.¹

In the meantime this article had attracted the attention of a more formidable individual—the Rev. James Peggs, the Baptist Missionary who had urged a successful campaign against the connection of the East India Company and Hinduism in India, and against the Pilgrim Tax there.² He had earned a high reputation as a missionary in India, and officials both there and in England had a healthy respect for his skill at agitation and lobbying. It was Peggs rather than Spence-Hardy or the Wesleyans who brought this incident to the attention of the Colonial Office. He published this article, along with a few extracts from Spence-Hardy's original pamphlet, in the form of a printed public letter to Sir Robert Peel, calling upon him to sever the connection between Buddhism and the British Government in Ceylon.³ A copy of this letter he sent to Lord Stanley.

T. W. C. Murdoch, an assistant of James Stephen at the Colonial Office, was all for ignoring this letter,⁴ but Lord Stanley who probably knew more about Pegg's skill as an agitator, sent a copy of the letter to the Ceylon Government asking for a general report on the recent exposition of the Tooth Relic. Stanley also enquired from Campbell where Government officials, civil or

1. Wesleyan Mss. Ceylon 1, Spence-Hardy, 8-7-43.

2. K. Ingham, *Reformers in India*, pp. 39 ff.

3. Peggs' letter was entitled "British Connection with idolatry in the Island of Ceylon". See Co. 54.209. Peggs' letter to Lord Stanley, 28-8-43.

4. Co. 54.209. Murdoch's minute of 8-9-43.

military, had in recent times assisted "at heathen rites and ceremonies" and if so, under what authority that assistance had been afforded and what considerations of policy were involved in the matter. He was particularly interested in knowing whether C. R. Buller had participated in the recent exhibition in his capacity as Government Agent; and whether the Ceylon Government interfered in any way in the appointment of priests and officials.¹

In the meantime, Peggs proceeded to bombard Stanley with a pamphlet urging him to immediate action. (His original letter of two pages had grown into a pamphlet of forty pages.)² As Campbell took his time in sending the report he had asked for, Stanley was unable to reply to Peggs' letters as early as he would normally have done. In a letter of 20th December 1843, Peggs, who suspected that Stanley was deliberately delaying action, hinted that this might compel him to adopt different tactics. "I have not sent copies of this letter to the Public Papers because I wish your Lordship to have the opportunity of removing those evils in Ceylon without their being much known to the Public . . ."³

Campbell's reply was sent in January 1844.⁴ His despatch was a cautious defence of government policy. He admitted his presence, as well as that of C. R. Buller and other officials at the ceremony, but he denied that this could be interpreted as official support of Buddhism. He was on rather weak ground here, for while Buller's presence and even his own may have been justified, it was more difficult to justify the presence of other officials and much more so that of the wives of the officials. Campbell was on stronger ground when he explained that the priests had a perfect legal right to display the Tooth Relic, and that because of a superstitious belief in the country that those who possessed the Tooth Relic were the real masters of the country, it was absolutely necessary to see that it was not stolen. It was Buller's responsibility to see that strict precautions were taken for the security of the relic. It was for this reason that Government officials had been present, but no official took any part in the religious ceremony.

He informed Stanley that the Government no longer interfered in the appointment of priests to Viharas and Devales; it merely recognized the priests who were elected by their colleagues. The Legislative Council made an annual grant of £310, to the Temple of the Tooth, the Vihares and Devales, but though it was legally

1. Co. 54, 209. Stanley to Campbell, 76 of 15-9-43.
2. The new pamphlet was entitled "*The Present state of the British connection with idolatry in Ceylon*." Stanley sent a copy of this pamphlet to Campbell in his despatch 101 of 10-12-43. (Co. 54, 209).
3. Co. 54, 209. Peggs' letter to Stanley, 20-10-43.
4. Co. 54, 210. Campbell to Stanley, 14 of 24-1-44. This was in reply to Stanley's despatch, 76 of 15-9-43.

possible to stop this grant, there were doubts whether it could be done in good faith; since the greater part of Government revenues were derived from Buddhists, it would be difficult to justify a refusal to continue this trifling grant.

Campbell's main aim was to show Stanley that while the official connection of the State with Buddhism did exist it was so slight as to be harmless. He sought to show, also, that the outstanding difficulty in the way of a complete dissociation from Buddhism, was in regard to the management of the large landed property belonging to the Temples and Dewales; if the Government did not appoint the Basnayake Nilames of the Dewales, it was possible that there would be large scale speculation and fraud. He explained that it was impossible "to find anybody in whom this species of patronage may be vested"¹ Campbell admitted that these appointments were not without other advantages. "The appointments are valuable and constitute nearly the most valuable patronage that remains in the hands of the Government, and it is used to reward deserving public servants."²

In a later despatch he warned Stanley against taking Peggs too seriously, pointing out that Peggs had never been in Ceylon, and that his knowledge of Buddhism and its position in Ceylon was decidedly meagre. As an example of this ignorance Campbell referred Stanley to the frontispiece of Peggs' pamphlet, where there was a picture of what was supposed to be a bhikku. But the picture was really one of a Kandyan chieftain in his traditional clothes, with his attendants. The bhikku was the shaven, robed figure in the background.³

James Stephen seized the opportunity provided by Peggs' pamphlet and Campbell's despatch to continue from where he had been compelled to stop in 1842. He rushed to Peggs' defence and, picking with unerring accuracy the weak links of Campbell's arguments, he wrote another of his more impulsive minutes, in which the civil servant's caution had given way to the missionary's

1. Co. 54, 210. Campbell to Stanley, 14 of 24-1-44.

2. Ibid.

3. Co. 54, 210. Campbell to Stanley, 53 of 16-3-44.

See, also P. E. Wodehouse's evidence before the Parliamentary Committee on Ceylon, (1848-50) 2nd Report, p. 269, where he stated that "Mr. Peggs sent in to the Colonial Office a pamphlet with a frontispiece giving a picture of a Buddhist priest in Ceylon; it was in reality extracted from an old History of Ceylon; it contained a picture of a chief in Ceylon, with a priest walking by his side, but he suppressed the word "chief" and he left the readers of the pamphlet to infer that the dignified person was a Buddhist priest....."

fire.¹ In all his minutes on this problem Stephen was less the civil servant advising his superiors, recommending carefully considered alternatives, than the religious zealot egging his superiors to an uncompromising stand.

He began with a subtle hint that the Tooth Relic might perhaps be destroyed. ("The obvious course is to destroy it, which however might provoke an insurrection".²) But he checked himself and suggested that "the middle course would appear to be that of keeping it but refusing to make any exhibition of it. Possibly it might be safe to send it off the Island." He was very critical of the presence of Government officials at the ceremony. "... (To) have a spectacle of this kind in the presence of the Governor and with the Government Agent sitting by him as the official Guardian of the Relic . . . gives to idolatry a countenance which no consideration of human policy could justify." He asserted that "voting public Money for the support of Buddhist Priests would seem to be a gratuitous homage to their faith. One would suppose that the Funds might be supplied (for it is but a small sum) from the Temple Lands without implicating the British Government."³

With Stephen and Peggs both urging immediate action, Stanley could no longer postpone a decision on this matter, even if he was so inclined. After a careful study of the papers on the subject—chiefly, a memorandum on the history, and the nature of the connection of the British Government with Buddhism, prepared by Murdoch—he issued instructions to Campbell to sever the connection between the State and Buddhism. Stanley's despatch of 27th April 1844 was a clear and well formulated declaration of policy, reversing the British policy on Buddhism which had prevailed since 1815.⁴ The strength of this despatch lay in the fact that it recognized that there were two different aspects in the existing relationship between Buddhism and the Government. "First, what relates to the support of the Religious Rites including the custody of the Relic—the appointment of the Priesthood and the maintenance of idolatrous ceremonies, and second, the management of the landed property belonging to the Temples".⁵ The weakness of the despatch was that it did not recognize that this second aspect was as important as the first, and that if the connection between

-
1. Co. 54, 210. Stephen's minute of 13-3-44 on Campbell's despatch to Stanley, 14 of 24-1-44.
 2. *Ibid.*
 3. *Ibid.*
 4. Co. 54, 210. Stanley to Campbell, 210 of 24-7-44. This despatch was based to a very great extent on Stephen's minute of 13-3-44.
 5. *Ibid.*

the Government and the Buddhist religion were to be severed, it was necessary to issue clear and detailed instructions on the question of Temple lands.

Concentrating on the first aspect, Stanley declared that the time had come "when the British Government may, without risk to the tranquillity of the colony, relieve itself from all connection with idolatry." He believed it to be a vital matter of principle on which there could be no compromise. He instructed Campbell to refrain from making any appointments to Temples and Devals. Since these recent discussions had arisen out of an exhibition of the Tooth Relic, the despatch paid great attention to that aspect of the problem. Echoing Stephen's remarks, Stanley insisted that "there can hardly be a doubt that the scrupulous care with which it (the Tooth Relic) has been guarded by the British Government must have tended to sanction in the minds of the natives the idolatrous veneration with which they are accustomed to regard it. This therefore, is an arrangement in the continuance of which I cannot acquiesce. And although I am not prepared to direct the destruction of the Relic, a measure which would manifestly offend the prejudices of the Priests and People, I see little risk and much advantage in making over the custody of it to the Priests—in withdrawing the sentry heretofore posted at the Temple and in strictly prohibiting the Government Agent and his subordinates from taking any part in the exhibition of the relic."¹ On the question of the annual monetary grant Stanley—largely because of Campbell's doubts on the subject—was unable to issue clear instructions. He would have preferred to see it struck out of the public expenditure. He believed that "... Nothing but the clearest evidence of an obligation on the part of the Government could justify the grant of money by a Christian Legislature for such purposes."² But he was willing to postpone a decision on the matter, till Campbell informed him whether there was such an obligation.

The despatch laid it down that Campbell was to treat the question of the dissociation of the Government from Buddhism as a matter of the greatest urgency; he was instructed to introduce an Ordinance in the Legislative Council to effect this severance. Since the handing over of the Tooth Relic was to be the most delicate, as well as the most dramatic manifestation of the policy of dissociation, Campbell was asked to use his own judgement as to the precise manner and moment of this transference, but he was to allow no "unnecessary delay".

1. Co. 54, 210. Stanley to Campbell, 210 of 24-7-44.

2. Ibid.

These instructions were clear enough. But they should have been accompanied by equally clear instructions on the question of Temple lands. It was impossible to treat this—as Stanley's despatch did—as an entirely separate subject. The severance from Buddhism could not be effected without a settlement of this problem. To do so, would have been to undermine the whole legal position of the Temples over their lands and tenants. Stanley postponed a decision on this problem, on the grounds that he did not have sufficient information on which to base any positive instructions. Campbell, was instructed to send home a report, providing the most ample information on the Temple Lands.

Stanley's despatch was of very great significance in the history of Ceylon. At first glance it would not appear to do much—it merely instructed that the Tooth Relic be handed over to the Buddhists; that the sentry at the Temple of the Tooth be removed; that Government officials should not be present at expositions of the Tooth Relic; and that the Governor was to refrain from making appointments to Temples and Dewales. But these instructions in effect severed the tenuous connection of the British Government with Buddhism. In the eyes of the Kandyan's however this connection was not tenuous¹, but symbolic of the ancient bond between their religion and the ruler of their country. The severing of that bond was therefore an event of great significance. The connection between Buddhism and the State which had lasted with only insignificant interruptions from the very beginnings of the recorded history of Ceylon was now at an end.

III

Stanley's despatch could not have come as a complete surprise to Campbell, because even before its arrival, he was considering two schemes, submitted by C. R. Buller and P. E. Wodehouse,² for dissociating the Government of Ceylon from its connection with Buddhism. Once the despatch was received the discussion of these plans was intensified. A meeting of the Kandyan chiefs and priests was summoned, to discuss the changes recommended

1. P. E. Wodehouse (Government Agent, Western Province, and Asst. Colonial Secretary) in his evidence before the Parliamentary Committee on Ceylon (1849-50) stated that the great mass of the people attached the greatest importance to any connection of their religion with the Government, in any shape whatever.
2nd Report on Ceylon, pp. 264 ff.
G. Ackland (Merchant, and non-official member of the Legislative Council) stated that the people felt that the custody of the Tooth Relic by the Government, was equivalent to the religion being established in the country.
2nd Report on Ceylon, pp. 13-14.
2. P. E. Wodehouse Government Agent, Western Province, and Asst. Colonial Secretary.

by Stanley. At a meeting held in Kandy on 23rd April 1845, Campbell explained to them the substance and significance of Stanley's decision.¹ He laid great emphasis on the transference of the Temple of the Tooth to the Kandyans. They were informed that this Temple would be handed over to them as the representatives of the Buddhists, and that they were to devise the best means for its safe custody. Needless to say, the chiefs and the priests were unanimously opposed to Stanley's policy. They argued and pleaded with Campbell that the existing relationship should be continued, but when they realized that it was beyond Campbell's power to give them satisfaction, they decided to send a memorandum to Stanley protesting against these projected changes.²

On Campbell's return to Colombo, the Buddhist problem was brought before the Executive Council.³ The discussions centred round the two schemes of C. R. Buller and P. E. Wodehouse. Buller's scheme envisaged a Board of Commissioners of 5 persons (to be chosen by an electorate composed of bhikkus, chiefs, sons of chiefs, and all persons who had held or were holding office) to whom the powers exercised by Government in relation to Buddhism, were to be transferred. Wodehouse criticised Buller's Board of Commissioners, on the ground that, founded as it was on the principle of centralization, and vesting as it did the entire management of the Temples and their property in this Board, it would have "the effect of gradually placing the whole of the revenues and influence of the Temples in the hands of a small body of influential chiefs, principally resident at Kandy."⁴ It would appear, however, that Wodehouse's main objection was not to the power thus given to these chiefs, for his own scheme too envisaged the transfer of powers to a similar Board, with the difference that in this instance the power of election would lie in the hands of the inhabitants of the Districts whose interests were involved. His objection to Buller's Board of Commissioners was based on the fear that they would not give their consent to the diversion of a portion of the revenues of the Temples for purposes of education. Wodehouse suggested that one of the great advantages of his own scheme was it was designed to make it easier to obtain money for educational purposes from Temple revenues, since it was to be enacted that the default by any group of electors to fill a vacant incumbency would result in the forfeiture of the revenues of such incumbency to the Crown, who Wodehouse assumed, would spend it on education. In his opinion the ultimate aim of all these

1. Co. 54, 217. Campbell to Stanley, 120 of 8-5-45.

2. *Ibid.*

3. Meeting of the Executive Council, 23-4-1845.

4. P. E. Wodehouse's minute of 30-4-45, in Campbell to Stanley, 120 of 8-5-45 Co. 54, 217.

schemes should be the "moral improvement" and conversion to Christianity, of the Buddhists.

The great merit of Wodehouse's scheme was that it—unlike Buller's—touched upon the important question of Temple Lands; it was thus more comprehensive and valuable than Buller's. He recommended that Government should proceed with the registration of these Temple lands, acknowledging generously, wherever possible, the claims of the Temples to these lands, on the condition that it should be relieved of all concern in the management of Temples, and from the annual contribution from public funds towards the expenses of Temple festivals.¹ He laid down a second important condition viz, that the services due from the peasants to the Temples in return for the lands they held should be commuted.²

Although the discussion at the meeting of the Executive Council centred round these two schemes, the most noteworthy incident at that meeting was a clash between Philip Anstruther, and Arthur Buller. It was not a mere clash of personalities, but a clash of two sharply contrasted points of view on the question of Buddhism; one reflecting the influence of missionary opinions, called for immediate and radical changes; the other was the traditionalist view, arguing for the status-quo. Anstruther represented the first, Arthur Buller the second.

Anstruther did not make any frontal assault on the Kandyan Convention of 1815. (He did indeed suggest that the Convention was not a binding treaty but this was more in the nature of an afterthought than a serious argument. In any case he did not develop this theme at any considerable length). Instead he concentrated on drawing a distinction between pure Buddhism, which alone, in his opinion, was guaranteed protection by the Convention, and Hindu ceremonies and institutions which formed part of the popular religion.³ He demanded that these latter should not be either financed or supported by the Government. He suggested that while the Buddhist temples should hold their lands free of taxes, the lands of the Hindu temples should not only be taxed but should be seized and their revenues used for the propagation of Christianity, and for the financing of Christian education.⁴

1. Ibid.

2. There was at this time a genuine concern for the condition of these temple tenants who did not benefit from the abolition of Rajakariya in 1833; men like Wodehouse, and later on, Tennent believed that these tenants were mere serfs. These officials made regular pleas for the commutation of their services on humanitarian grounds.

3. Anstruther's minute of 30-4-45 in, Campbell to Stanley, 120 of 8-5-1845 in Co. 54, 217.

4. Ibid.

This distinction between 'pure' Buddhism and popular Buddhism did not, in fact, exist. Nor did the Kandyan Convention draw any such distinction. But it was a popular argument with those who were opposed to the connection of the State with Buddhism. Arthur Buller explained that no distinction could be drawn between the rights of the Temples and the rights of the Dewales: it was "perfectly true that the worship of those dieties forms no part of *pure* Buddhism, but it was not *pure* Buddhism which we undertook to maintain. It was the Buddhism of the people . . . (or) to use the words of the Convention itself it was the 'Religion of Buddha as professed by the chiefs and the inhabitants.' It was impossible to deny that the Dewales were objects of protection to the Kandyan Kings as fully as Viharas, nor could it be any more doubted that the guarantee given at the Convention extended to both institutions alike."¹

The question of the Temple of the Tooth figured prominently in these discussions. Anstruther held that it should be handed over to the Buddhists immediately. He argued that the fifth clause of the Kandyan Convention gave no undertaking "to protect Buddha's Tooth"; the British Government did not undertake its protection till after the great rebellion of 1817-18, and even then, only for political reasons. Since these political reasons did not exist any longer there was nothing in the Convention to prevent its being handed over to the Buddhists. The Temple of the Tooth and its property should be handed over to the Kandyan Bhikkus to whom Anstruther suggested a salary should be reserved out of the produce of the lands of the Temple. They were to be warned however, that if the Tooth Relic disappeared all the lands of the Temple would be confiscated to the Government. Anstruther argued that there was little prospect of political danger in this course of policy.²

Arthur Buller would have preferred to let the existing arrangement remain undisturbed but he realised that the possession of the Tooth Relic had attracted a great deal of censure from missionary organizations at home. He had little objection, therefore, to giving up the Tooth Relic, but he insisted that it must be done in a quiet and conciliatory manner, after judicious and friendly discussion and without any unnecessary announcement of a determination to break all connexion with the religion of the Kandyan.³

-
1. Arthur Buller's minute of 30-4-1845 in Campbell to Stanley, 120 of 8-5-45 in Co. 54, 217.
 2. Anstruther's minute of 30-4-45.
 3. Arthur Buller's minute of 30-4-45.

Warrants of appointment were the third issue on which Anstruther clashed with Buller, the former urging that the Governor should not sign them in future.¹ Anstruther's argument in favour of this line of policy was based on a false assumption; he believed that the bhikkus were averse to the Government giving up the practice of signing their Commissions because they feared that if they did not hold the Governor's Commission few would pay them any respect. The evidence would suggest however that the bhikkus wanted these warrants of appointment because without them the Courts would not recognize their legal right to the Temple lands and property.

These conflicting views arose from two diametrically opposed interpretations of the Government's obligations to the Kandyans under the fifth clause of the Kandyan Convention. To Arthur Buller's keen legal mind it was perfectly clear that as long as the Convention of 1815 and the Proclamation of 1818 were respected by the Government—and he saw no good reason why they should not be respected—it would be impossible for the state to dissociate itself from Buddhism. Besides, there was also a moral obligation quite as strong as the legal obligation for the Government had given a solemn understanding that the national religion of the Kandyans would not be left to shift for itself, but should be maintained and protected by the whole might of the secular power.² Anstruther on the other hand, urged that the Government's connection with Buddhism must be completely withdrawn; and he believed that with this withdrawal the whole structure of Buddhism could collapse.³ He had little to say, and little concern for—moral and legal obligations.

There was no support in the Executive Council for Arthur Buller's rigid insistence on the maintenance of the existing relationship, but even among the staunchest advocates of the policy of dissociation there was little doubt that Buller's interpretation of the Convention of 1815 was fundamentally correct. It was for this reason that Anstruther himself had refrained from making a direct attack on the Convention itself; and it was for the same reason that James Stephen was to concentrate his attack on Arthur Buller's interpretation of the Convention.⁴

1. Anstruther's minute of 30-4-45.

2. Arthur Buller's minute *op. cit.*

3. Anstruther's minute *op. cit.*

4. James Stephen's Minute of 4-7-45 in Co. 54.217. Campbell to Stanley, 120 of 8-5-45.

He was so strong a supporter of the existing relationship that he would not have it disturbed even by an Ordinance such as that suggested by Wodehouse. He criticised Wodehouse's Ordinance on the grounds that it would be an ostentatious parade of a breach of faith, inasmuch as it announced to the Kandians that "(The British Government) will have no more to do with your religion. You may manage its affairs as best as you can . . ." ¹ But a much stronger objection lay in the fact while the Government withdrew from Buddhism the "... present merely nominal protection" it would, if Wodehouse's Ordinance were adopted, "substitute in its place a protection that will be of great avail." ² He felt that such an ordinance was an elaborate and well considered scheme for the endurance of Buddhism. Hence, "the merits of the Ordinance are its only fault. It would be admirably adopted for the purpose of Buddhist reformer and . . . (it) would be looked upon by Mr. Peggs as it would in reality prove it carried into effect 'An ordinance for the encouragement of Buddhism.' " ³

Campbell faced with this great divergence of opinions in his Executive Council, did not make any significant contribution of his own, but merely sent along to the Colonial Office, the views of the individual Executive Councillors and the plans of Wodehouse and Buller. He did however, recommend great caution in this new policy, declaring that the object aimed at could be attained without alarming the prejudices of the people. He asked Stanley to leave it to his discretion to determine the proper time and method of effecting the change of policy. ⁴

When these papers arrived at the Colonial Office James Stephen, whose task it was to examine them, picked on Arthur Buller's interpretation of the Convention of 1815 for special attack, aware that it was the foundation on which the old policy was based. Referring to the Convention of 1815 Stephen declared that its object was simply to "... reassure, on the subject of their Religion a people from whom we had taken everything else." The treaty did not and could not mean that King George III should succeed to the Religious duty and character of the King of Kandy, and the Defender of the Christian faith should in the same sense be the Defender of the Buddhist faith. The Treaty merely meant this "... if you will surrender to Great Britain all secular dominion you may keep up your Religion. If you will deliver up to us your Treasury your Temple Lands shall be inviolate. If you will become subjects

1. Arthur Buller's minute op. cit.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

4. Co. 54, 217. Campbell to Stanley, 120 of 8-5-45.

of our King he will permit no one to interrupt your Religious offices or to despoise your Priests or your Temples'". He rejected Arthur Buller's interpretation as totally unacceptable.¹

Then turning to the schemes formulated by Wodehouse and C. R. Buller, he asserted that they both departed from the principles laid down in Stanley's despatch—both would involve the Government in direct intervention in idolatry. Buller's scheme would go far to establish something like a Buddhist Papacy. Stephen's view was that it was for the Home Government to lay down the main principles of policy. Since Stanley's despatch had already done that, nothing further remained to be done but to refer to those instructions, and to insist on as prompt and exact a compliance with them as possible, leaving to the local authorities only the power to determine the time and the manner in which they could be most conveniently carried into effect. He added that "I think it evident enough from these papers that the obstacles to denying them have been rather personal than substantial—the want of agents willing and able to act with decision, rather than any inherent difficulty in the subject itself . . ." ² Lord Stanley, accepting James Stephen's views completely, called for a strict adherence to his instructions conveyed in the despatch of 24th July, 1844. He would leave in the hands of the Ceylon Government merely the details of timing and method. And Campbell was asked not to needlessly postpone a decision on this matter.³

In the Colonial Office there was a deplorable refusal to understand the difficulties that faced the Ceylon Government. It was not merely the formidable problem of the Temple Lands. There was the more important fact that in its organization Buddhism was fundamentally different from Christian churches. Buddhism had no central organization—the individual viharas having a great degree of independence in most matters. In such a situation the Government, before it dissociated itself from Buddhism had to create or evolve a central organization to take over those functions which were performed by the Government. The schemes of Wodehouse and Buller had precisely this aim in view. The Colonial Office, under the influence of James Stephen treated Buddhism as though it were a centrally organized religion like Christianity. When the despatches from Ceylon recommended caution, the Colonial Office merely suspected the local officials of

1. James Stephen's minute of 4-7-45 in Co. 54, 217. Campbell to Stanley, despatch 120, of 8-5-1845.

2. James Stephen's minute of 4-7-45.

3. Co. 54, 217. Stanley to Campbell, 388 of 7-8-45.

This despatch instructed Campbell to omit from all future Bills of Supply, the monetary grant hitherto made for traditional religious ceremonies.

lethargy, unaware that they required of the Ceylon Government nothing less than doing at a moment's notice what Sinhalese rulers had for centuries failed to do—to give Buddhism a central organization.

Faced with this uncompromising attitude, Campbell had no alternative but to proceed at speed with the business of dissociating the Government from Buddhism. He sent Wodehouse to Kandy to confer personally with the chiefs and bhikkus, and to persuade them to agree to the changes recommended by the Colonial Office.¹ It was no easy task. Wodehouse adopted a conciliatory tone. He informed them that the Governor would receive any proposals they wished to make. But behind his conciliatory tone, there was a firmness that could not have failed to impress his audience. He announced that while he would receive any proposals on this matter, there must be the distinct understanding that the announcement recently made to them was the solemn and final decision of the Queen's Government. The only significant concession that Wodehouse had been instructed to promise was that all lands recognised and registered as temple property would be entirely exempted from taxation. The Kandians on their part rigidly adhered to the view that the Convention of 1815 should be carried out as regards the maintenance of their religion²—in the same way as it had been by the Kings of Kandy. Then, both at this conference and at a private interview with Wodehouse, they sought to appeal to the home authorities, but Wodehouse told them that the home Government was acting under missionary influence, and that the local Government alone was likely to be conciliatory.³ The Kandians had no alternative but to accept these decisions. They had to get what satisfaction they could from a brief and sharply worded petition to the Queen protesting against the new policy.⁴

-
1. This conference was held on 10-11-1845. See memorandum of the conference held by P. E. Wodehouse with the Kandian Chiefs and bhikkus, dated 14-11-45, enclosed in Co. 54, 223. Campbell to Stanley, 37 of 7-2-46.
 2. Petition of the Kandians, to the Queen, dated 7-1-46 enclosed in Co. 54, 223. Campbell to Stanley, 37 of 7-2-46.
 3. Co. 54, 223. Campbell to Stanley, 37 of 7-2-46. Enclosed memorandum of the conference held by P. E. Wodehouse with the Kandian Chiefs and bhikkus, dated 14-11-1845. Evidence of P. E. Wodehouse. 2nd Report on Ceylon, p. 248.
 4. Ibid.

IV

The Government then proceeded to frame an ordinance to effect the dissociation. It was based largely on Wodehouse's scheme, with modifications to meet the criticisms heaped on it by Stephen and Stanley. This Ordinance—Ordinance No. 2 of 1846 "An Ordinance to provide for the management of Buddhist vihares and Dewales in the Kandyan Provinces—was based on the principle "that that which a Government could do, or was bound to do by itself as the sovereign authority, it could delegate to an authority."¹ It provided for the appointment of a Committee of sixteen persons (of whom in the first instance six were to be bhikkus), who were to keep the Tooth Relic and the treasure belonging to it; and all the ecclesiastical authority vested in the Government by the Kandyan Convention was to be transferred to this Committee. Provision was made for the appointment of a Commissioner to register the Temple Lands, and if required, to commute the tenant's services. Lands could not in future be donated to temples without the Governor's license; nor were the Temple Lands to be alienated without the consent of the Governor and the central committee to be appointed under this Act.²

Campbell sent this Ordinance home, along with the petition of the Kandyan chiefs and bhikkus, with another word of warning, stressing the need for tact and understanding in discontinuing a connection that had been so solemnly promised at the moment of cession of the Kandyan kingdom.³ Stanley had by this time left the Colonial Office. His successor was W. E. Gladstone. There was thus the possibility of a fresh start in this matter. The new Ordinance was carefully examined for Gladstone by Frederick Rogers, one of Stephen's assistants. In a lengthy minute summarising the main trends of the controversy and examining the salient features of the new Ordinance, he informed Gladstone that while on the whole the new Ordinance effected the dissociation so strongly recommended by Stanley, it nevertheless contained some features potentially so dangerous, that it would be best to reject it. He directed his criticism mainly at the new committee created by this Ordinance. He believed that this committee would give to the Kandyan religion "a most dangerous force and unity" and to the Buddhist hierarchy a "dangerous organization."⁴ This defect in the Ordinance, overshadowed its many merits. But while he suggested that this Ordinance should be rejected, his

-
1. Evidence of G. Ackland. 2nd Report on Ceylon, p. 5.
 2. Co. 54, 223. Campbell to Stanley, 37 of 7-2-1846.
 3. Co. 54, 223. Campbell to Stanley, 37 of 7-2-1846, and enclosed? Kandyan petition of 7-1-46. (1,941 signatures).
 4. Ibid. T. F. Rogers' minute of 25-6-46.

attitude was free from the innate hostility and intolerance that characterised Stephen's. He emphasised that the dissociation was an exceedingly difficult and intricate business and that the Kandyan had a genuine grievance against the new policy. He felt that more attention should be paid to the opinions of the local civil servants, particularly to those who had a thorough understanding of the problem.¹

For the first time since this controversy began, James Stephen found himself faced with the problem of opposition to his views within the Colonial Office itself. He lost no time in seeking to convert Gladstone to his way of looking at this problem. Taking up the challenge offered by Rogers' minute, he wrote a startlingly prejudiced and hostile minute. Turning to the Kandyan Convention he declared that "if this compact meant that the sovereign in whose name it was made was to become the Guardian and defender of all the crimes and pollutions practiced in the Candian (sic) country in the name of Religion and as an integral part of their religion, it was a compact absolutely void *ab initio*. No Christian King can contract a valid obligation to do any act which Christianity unequivocally forbids . . . This appears to me a conclusive answer in the absence of any other to all the arguments used by Mr. Buller² and employed (by the aid of some English lawyers) by the Singalese Petitioners."³ He then proceeded to his own, usual interpretation of the Convention.⁴ Campbell's Ordinance, he insisted, was contrary to this (Stephen's) interpretation of the Convention, and should on that account alone be rejected. He agreed with Rogers that the committee created by the Ordinance would constitute as formidable a hierarchy as could possibly be put together . . . (and this committee) when created, would, probably be found, if not irresistible, at least most intractable, and inconvenient." The Ordinance would thus, far from "actually and apparently disconnecting" the state from Buddhism, only make that connection stronger.⁵

But while Stephen's main target was Campbell's Ordinance, he was not a little perturbed by Rogers' recommendations on Buddhist policy, in particular the latter's suggestions that the opinions of local officials should be given greater weight than hitherto and that there should be a more sympathetic consideration of Kandyan sensibilities. It was precisely this that Stephen wanted to avoid, for if these views were accepted as Colonial office policy

1. *Ibid.*

2. He was referring to Arthur Buller (Queen's Advocate).

3. Co. 54, 223. Campbell to Stanley, 37 of 7-2-46. Stephen's minute of 26-6-46.

4. See above p. 101.

5. Stephen's minute of 26-6-46.

it would mean a significant modification of the policy hitherto pursued. Stephen's policy was based on assumptions diametrically opposed to these. The first of these assumptions was that the dissociation of the state from Buddhism was an urgent necessity; that there were religious and moral considerations of such vital importance that the separation must be effected notwithstanding the possibility of disturbances. (In any case he did not believe there would be any). The second, there was the belief that the dissociation far from being a complicated or intricate business, was in fact a matter of remarkable simplicity. And finally, the principles of the policy were to be laid down by the Colonial Office alone. Not much attention should be paid to the opinions of Ceylon officials with their myopic concentration on local considerations. And pervading all these considerations was a deep religious fervour which was totally absent in the case of Rogers.

As regards the Ordinance itself Stephen's recommendations were simple—the Ordinance was to be rejected and the Buddhists instructed

“to make any kind of agreement among themselves . . . for the Regulation of their own religious affairs, the custody of their Relics, and the choice of their Priests”.¹

All that would be necessary would be “a Law to recognize, or perhaps, to establish this right”.²

Gladstone was, unlike his predecessors, unwilling to let Stephen assume the role of policy maker. He agreed indeed with Stephen “on abstract grounds” but he was more inclined to accept Rogers' views. He realised that a rigid adherence to Evangelical principles in matters relating to Buddhism would be unjust to the Kandyans, and therefore though he reluctantly agreed that the Ordinance ought to be disallowed, he nevertheless declared that much more attention should be paid to the opinions of the local officials in these matters, and that if the Ordinance was disallowed, it was vitally important to concentrate on the problem of issuing instructions for the framing of a fresh one. He took the view that the British Government had a definite moral obligation to create some sort of organization to take over the functions performed by the Government in relation to Buddhism.³

-
1. Stephen's minute of 26-6-46.
 2. Ibid.
 3. Ibid.

Gladstone thus preferred Rogers' approach to the problem to Stephen's. And it was to Rogers that he turned for assistance in seeking an equitable solution to this problem. Rogers, like Gladstone, felt that the obligations assumed, and the pledges given at the convention should not be lightly revoked. He declared that "we shall break our original promise that Buddhism shall be maintained . . . if we first appropriate or allow to vest in ourselves certain powers necessary to the existence of Buddhism and then abandon them without enabling anyone else to take them up. This is virtually to extinguish them—and that, by a series of acts of our own . . ." ¹ He agreed that on principle Campbell's Ordinance ought to be rejected and all connection between Buddhism and the Government in its executive capacity should cease. But before the Ordinance was rejected it would be imperative to prepare fresh legislation on this problem, handing over these powers to "some definite body of persons". ² It was left to Gladstone now, to lay down the principles to be followed in the fresh Ordinance. But here, though he was in complete agreement with Rogers in insisting on the need for legislation, he was extremely vague and confused as to the form it should take. His suggestion reads thus. "As to our obligation, I think we are not entitled to turn around upon our construction of the convention or to alter our protection in such a way that Buddhism shall *suffer* from it; . . . on the other hand it has no claim to stand better.

"These I think are the principles on which we should write with regard to the new Ordinance. We want for the future an effective practical separation: and we should give to these religionists, of course avoiding at the same time whatever endangers law and the public fence, neither more nor less (or as nearly as we can hit that mean) than it may be fair to presume they would have had if we had never interfered: so that no man may be able to say with justice hereafter either that we destroyed the religion inavowedly or that when it was destroying itself, we went out of our way and beyond our obligation, and raised it from its natural death.

"The application of these principles can only be regulated on the spot."³

The significance of this minute lies in its rejection of James Stephen's ideas, and in its attempt to adopt a less uncompromising attitude. Had Gladstone stayed longer at the Colonial Office, the question of the State's connection with Buddhism might have been tackled with less rancour, and more understanding and tolerance.

1. Rogers' minute of 30-6-46.

2. *Ibid.*

3. Gladstone's minute of 1-7-47.

He was as sincere a Christian as Stephen but he was no bigot. However, he did not stay long enough at the Colonial Office to leave his mark on this problem. His was a brief stay of a few months. A double change, one at the Colonial Office where the Third Earl Grey replaced Gladstone, and one in Ceylon where Viscount Torrington replaced Sir Colin Campbell, postponed for a few months a final decision on Campbell's despatch. The delay was sufficient for Stephen to regain lost ground. Earl Grey was, in this matter a man after Stephen's own heart. Quite early in his administration he had become an active supporter of Stephen's point of view. In a long minute which deserves extensive quotation he declared himself in complete agreement with Stephen. He declared he would "altogether deny the possibility of our being bound by any stipulation in a treaty to take an active part in maintaining and encouraging the abominable superstition called the Buddhist religion, nor do I see that the words quoted from the Treaty are susceptible of any such construct. I also deny that in human affairs any immutable arrangements can be made by men of one generation wh(ich) men of all future generations are bound to abide by—The Sovereign authority in no country possesses or ought to possess the power of making laws binding even upon its successors . . ." ¹ He insisted that the convention should be "construed liberally", the liberality of construction would, it appears, lie in changing it to fit the needs and opinions of a new age.

He believed like Stephen that it would be best to abstain from all legislation on the subject. In Grey's opinion it would be best ". . . simply to abdicate all those functions connected with . . . (Buddhism) which have hitherto devolved upon the Government, leaving those who profess that religion to make such arrangement as may seem proper to themselves upon the subject but not giving to those arrangements any legal force—If however a law is absolutely necessary the objects to which it is directed ought to be very carefully and precisely determined; as far as I can understand the subject I can see none for which it is so necessary to provide except the regulation of the right of exemption from taxation of the temple lands . . ." ² It was not necessary for Stephen to spend much time in winning Grey over to his point of view; he was at best preaching to the converted. For Grey had reached those conclusions on his own without any prompting from him. Grey did not seek the assistance of Rogers. Instead he invited Stephen to "oblige me by considering what instruct ought to be given upon it to the Governor and suggesting them to me—" ³ This was precisely the opportunity

1. Grey's minute of 30-9-46.

2. Ibid.

3. Grey's minute of 30-9-46.

that Stephen was waiting for. He was anxious to see that Torrington arrived in Ceylon with clear instructions on the policy to be followed. Stephen was clearly disappointed with Campbell, of whom he wrote that "it was obvious that (he) either would not, or could not, execute Lord Stanley's instructions on the subject."¹ On Grey's instructions he prepared a draft of a despatch which he hoped "will at least serve as a basis on which to proceed."² This draft was adopted by Grey as his own despatch; he did not change one single word in it, or for that matter a single comma or period. It was Stephen's last despatch on Buddhism rather than Grey's first. It was inspired by Evangelicalism, written by James Stephen and merely signed by Earl Grey.

A remarkably uncompromising despatch, it was the high water mark of missionary influence on Colonial Office policy on Buddhism in Ceylon. It began with a criticism of Arthur Buller's interpretation of the Kandyan convention—the petition of the Kandyans had used much the same arguments—and Stephen reiterated for Torrington's benefit his own interpretation. "The convention declares that the Religion of Buddha is inviolable and that its Rites, Ministers, and places of worship, are to be maintained and protected. The obvious meaning of these words is that the Buddhists should be free to celebrate their Religious Rites, and to hold all the places and property devoted to their worship without molestation from their new sovereign or from any one else. The stipulation was little else than a copy of the language usually employed during the last war on every capitulation to British Arms. It is a form of which the meaning is, at first sight, sufficiently obvious, and which usage in a great variety of cases has exempted from all ambiguity."³ Stephen was quite wrong in assuming that it was little else than a copy of the language employed on every capitulation of to British Arms.

The hesitation of Bathurst and the criticism of Wilberforce were quite incompatible with the idea of a stereotyped formula, and Brownrigg's assertion that the convention employed language "more emphatical than would have been my choice," is only compatible with a deliberate departure from the usual form.

And it must be remembered that in the first place, the Kandyan Provinces were not conquered; they were ceded by the chiefs and the priests without whose aid the expulsion of the last king of Kandy from his throne would have been extremely difficult.

-
1. Co. 54, 227. Grey to Torrington 2 of 13-4-47. Stephen's minute of 6-4-47.
 2. Ibid.
 3. Co. 54, 227. Grey to Torrington, 2 of 13-4-47.

Secondly, whatever the form of the document, it undertook to maintain and protect Buddhism, as a condition of the cession of the Kingdom. As Brownrigg himself admitted, without an undertaking couched in the most emphatic form, it would have been impossible to placate the chiefs and priests in 1815. Indeed the undertaking took that emphatic form out of sheer necessity; it was not as Stephen would have it, merely formal.

Perhaps Stephen himself had doubts on this matter. For his despatch informed Torrington that even if Buller's interpretation was correct, it ought to be rejected on the grounds that "The Christian sovereign of a Christian State had no authority to bind himself and his successors to a course of conduct which Christianity unequivocally forbids . . . (it meant) the maintenance of abominations, to which, not merely the revealed Law of God, but the general conscience of mankind is irreconcilably hostile."¹ The great defect of this argument (apart from its rampant emotionalism and bigotry) was that it failed to draw a distinction between a Government of Christians—which the British Government was—a Christian Government—which it clearly was not. The Kandyan convention, from the point of view of the British Government, was a political document. Religion had little to do with it. Evangelical Christianity had in Stephen's case triumphed over the rational consideration of political realities.

He informed Torrington that Campbell's Ordinance was rejected, because it was based on a principle to which the Colonial Office took strong objection ". . . the principle namely that we are not only bound to secure the Buddhists against molestation and injury in their persons or in their property on account of their religious observations, but (were) bound to advance further, and to enact and execute laws having for their express object the more easy, convenient, and orderly celebration of the Buddhist rites and ceremonies . . ." He declared that this Ordinance assured that "the convention of 1815 vested in the Governor of Ceylon the appointment and removal of the Priests and a controul (sic) over the internal discipline of the ministers of the Buddhist Religion." He denied that "such is the real effect of the convention."²

Stephen insisted that on this matter the Home Government had decided to reject the advice of the Ceylon Government. But then "the present is a case in which the principles brought into

1. Co. 54, 227. Grey to Torrington 2 of 13-4-47.

2. Ibid.

debate depend, not upon any local circumstances, but upon considerations which can be appreciated with equal clearness in whatever country they may be discussed, or which (it may be no exaggeration to say) can be appreciated more clearly at a distance from the scene of action, than in the centre of a society agitated by the proposed application of them to practice."¹ He then proceeded to lay down, in the strongest possible language, the policy to be followed. "To separate the British Government from all active participation in practices at once idolatrous and immoral, is a plain and simple, though a most urgent duty. That they who live in Ceylon may have a far clearer and more comprehensive perception than I have of the difficulties, and even of the dangers of performing that duty there, I do not, for a moment dispute . . . I take that on a review of the subject, they will agree with me that the difficulties, whatever they may be, must be encountered, and that the danger whatever it may be, must be incurred, in order to maintain inviolable the sacred principle in question."² P. E. Wodehouse was to complain that this despatch embodied a far more religious view of this question than Lord Stanley's despatches. It was also an impracticable approach. "It carried out the views, as we say in Ceylon, of the missionaries rather than any system of Government."

Stephen who could be so clear and precise in rejecting the Ordinance, did not bother to suggest an alternative. He merely stated that "as far as I can judge, at this distance from the place, it appears to me that no Law whatever is necessary . . ."³ The Buddhist priests should be told that they may regulate these matters for themselves and execute their own regulations as they should see best. He was still reading English experience into a different set up. He imagined that the Buddhist religion had an institutional structure akin to that of a Christian Church, and that the Buddhist bhikkus had the organization with which to regulate those affairs which the State was to hand over to them.

PART II — 1847 - 1855

Grey had briefed Torrington on the subject of Buddhism before the latter had left for Ceylon⁴ Indeed he came to Ceylon with instructions disallowing Ordinance 2 of 1846 and with orders to effect the dissociation from Buddhism as soon as possible.⁵ Torrington did not waste much time either. Soon after the receipt in Ceylon of Grey's despatch laying down the principles to be

1. Co. 54, 227. Grey to Torrington, 2 of 13-4-47.

2. Ibid.

3. Second Report on Ceylon. Evidence of P. E. Wodehouse, p. 253 ff.

4. Co. 54, 227. Grey to Torrington, 2 of 13-4-47. Stephen's minute of 6-4-47 and Grey's minute of 30-9-46.

5. 2nd Report on Ceylon 1850, pp. 249 ff., the evidence of P. E. Wodehouse *ibid.*, pp. 5 ff., the evidence of G. Ackland.

followed, he made up his mind to effect the dissociation as early as possible. He convened an assembly of Kandyan chiefs and bhikkus at Kandy where he conveyed to them the gist of Grey's proposals.¹ At that conference Torrington made it clear that the Kandyans could discuss merely the details of the dissociation and not the fact of dissociation itself. On 2nd October 1847, the Temple of the Tooth was handed over to a Committee consisting of a chief and two bhikkus.² It was with great reluctance that the Kandyans accepted this decision.

There were grave misgivings in Ceylon about Grey's despatch. Wodehouse explained that "the first practical result of it was the disallowance of the Ordinance (2 of 1846) and it left everything unsettled; it laid down what we looked upon as very extreme views as to the future legislation that was to take place on the subject".³ There were fears that the handing over of the Temple might lead to civil commotion, because the Kandyan people attached great importance to the connection of the Government with Buddhism in any shape whatever.⁴ They believed that the custody of the Tooth Relic by the Civil Government was equivalent to the religion being established in the country.⁵ At the conference there were great objections to these measures from the bhikkus who took up the position that "the Queen is the head of our religion, and that we wish it to be; that is what you promised and what you are bound to do."⁶ The chiefs too—though to a lesser degree than the bhikkus—considered the dissociation a most impolitic step. The common people were equally disappointed with the new policy.⁷

A great practical difficulty stemming from Grey's refusal to ratify the Ordinance was that vacancies in Viharas and Devales could not be filled; and some temple tenants took advantage of the fact that the priests had now no legal status, and refused to perform the services due from them for the lands they held. This even more than the handing over of the Tooth Relic alienated the bhikkus who felt that by this means they were being deprived of all their temporal power.⁸ Tennent declared that the dissociation would

1. Co. 54, 229. Torrington to Grey, 133 and 134 of 14-10-47. Despatch 133 contains the minutes of the conference.
2. Ibid.
3. 2nd Report on Ceylon pp. 250 ff., the evidence of P. E. Wodehouse.
4. Ibid, pp. 15 ff., the evidence of G. Ackland.
Co. 54, 239. Torrington to Grey 134 of 14-10-47. P' E. Wodehouse's memorandum of 13-10-47.
5. 2nd Report on Ceylon pp. 15 ff., the evidence of G. Ackland. Ibid. p. 264 the evidence of P. E. Wodehouse.
6. Ibid, pp. 253, 269, the evidence of P. E. Wodehouse.
7. Ibid. pp. 10, 11, the evidence of G. Ackland.
8. Ibid.

not have alienated the bhikkus and people so much, "if we had legislated to restore their temporalities and their property to the state of order in which we found them; but on the contrary our policy has thrown it into confusion."¹

The opinions of his senior officials, and his own observations after his arrival in Ceylon, served to open Torrington's eyes to the realities of the situation. In a private letter to Grey he observed that the problem had not been understood or explained properly to the Secretary of State. "The question at home, has been considered as a Religious one—Religion is the least part of the question."² Instead he emphasised the importance of the question of Buddhist Temporalities which he felt would become the great problem of the immediate future. But he had other and more serious misgivings. He confided in Grey that "Mr. Carr, the Acting C(hief) J(ustice) says, argue it as you will on the highest moral grounds, in Law we have committed a breach of faith . . ."³

Torrington's executive councillors had equally serious doubts of their own on these matters though none of them denied that the Government could take the steps suggested by Grey, or that the principle of dissociation itself was sound. Wodehouse feared that the act of dissociation—particularly the ostentatious handing over of the Tooth Relic—would lead to disturbances.⁴ (In fact, the handing over of the Tooth Relic has passed off without incident). His colleagues were not so pessimistic. They all, however, insisted on the urgent need for a legislative enactment safeguarding the property rights of the Temples. Abrupt change, they felt, would result in confusion and disorder. Both Macarthy and Tennent believed that the protection of property rights was not a religious question but an indispensable civil right. Macarthy pointed out that these property rights and interests "are so many and various that it (would) . . . be quite out of the power of the British Government without formally abdicating its sovereignty to abstain from legislating on them in the fullest detail."⁵ This was all the more important because, as Macarthy realised, in Ceylon there was "no such recognized or organized body in existence such as a Buddhist (sic) priesthood or church; and above all there (was) no sort of analogy, between the position of the British Government as regards the Temple lands and other temporalities of the Kandyan Provinces, and its relations with any Christian church or community in any part of its dominions . . ."⁶

1. 3rd Report on Ceylon 1850 p. 215 the evidence of Tennent.

2. Grey MSS. Torrington to Grey 15-8-47.

3. Grey MSS. Torrington to Grey 15-8-47.

4. Co. 54, 239. Torrington to Grey. 134 of 14-10-47. Wodehouse's minute of 13-10-47.

5. Ibid. Macarthy's minute of 7-10-47.

6. Co. 54, 239. Torrington to Grey 134 of 14-10-47. Macarthy's minute of 7-10-47.

Wodehouse and Macarthy took objection to the Committee to whom the Tooth Relic had been handed over—Wodehouse, because he believed that the committee was “without law and title,”¹ Macarthy because it would create “a state within a state, (and) would throw a strong engine of political and social power into hands often unfaithful, always unsteady . . .”² This was particularly hard on Torrington for it appears that Grey had left him no instructions as to whom the Tooth Relic was to be ‘handed over.’ The choice of the committee was on Torrington’s own initiative.

The Executive Councillors ended on a note of cautious optimism. Both Macarthy and Tennent believed that the dissociation of the State from Buddhism would lead to the ultimate triumph of Christianity and the corresponding decline of Buddhism. Tennent was particularly emphatic on this point, confidently asserting that the severance of the State’s connection with Buddhism would in reality mean “the withdrawal of the only stay that could much longer have retarded its decay.”³

The extent to which Torrington’s views had been changed by the opinions of his officials, is indicated by the fact that apart from supporting them in the despatch that accompanied their minutes, he also sent a private letter to Grey in which he explained that he attached the greatest importance to the opinions expressed in those minutes.⁴ And he endeavoured to make Grey understand that once the connection between Buddhism and the state had been severed, it was imperative that the energies of the Government should be concentrated on the provision of detailed legislation on the question of Temple lands and Temporalities, without which, he believed, much serious confusion and evil would result.⁵

But Earl Grey was much too delighted with the quiet efficiency with which the dissociation had been effected to heed these pleas and warnings. He hailed Torrington’s acts as “open and outward manifestations of the great principles on which my instructions of the 13th April last (were) based; that of a complete and thorough dissociation of the British Government from religious practices repugnant to their essential Christianity . . .”⁶ But he was willing to admit that the British Government as a temporal sovereign power still had a function to perform in its relations with Buddhism. The important question of the form this function was to assume,

1. Ibid. Wodehouse’s minute 13-10-47.

2. Ibid. Macarthy’s minute 7-10-47.

3. Ibid. Tennent’s minute 11-10-47.

4. Grey MSS. Torrington to Grey 14-10-47.

5. Ibid.

6. Co. 54, 245. Grey to Torrington 257 of 19-7-1848.

he left to the local Government to determine. In fact he stated explicitly that the initiative on the problem of Buddhism was in future to lie with the Ceylon Government. In spite of these concessions, however, Grey did not give any indication that he had realised the importance of the question of temple lands in the settlement of the Buddhist problem.

Before this despatch reached Ceylon, the disturbances of 1848 broke out in the Kandyan Provinces. Torrington ascribed them chiefly to the measures of the Government in regard to Buddhism from Mackenzie's time to his own. During the disturbances he was obliged to direct the Government Agent of the Central Province, C. R. Buller, to resume the custody of the Tooth Relic, this relic being considered by the Kandyan people as the "palladium of political power".¹

For Torrington the disturbances were a bitter and unforgettable experience. He was convinced that the chiefs and bhikkus had indeed engineered them; but he was equally convinced that they had been driven to this opposition in the main, by the religious policy of the Government. He explained to Grey that the Government's Buddhist policy had struck "a blow . . . at Buddhism which each year has been more severely felt. Temples are without Head Priests; those *who act* cannot legally enforce their rights and are cheated of their dues . . ." ² He was deeply impressed by the words of a Kandyan chief who had asked him "what good have we gained by British Rule if you violate our Treaties—not only cease to protect our Religion but on the contrary endeavour to destroy it (?)" ³. That chief had complained that "the Kandyans had ". . . been unfairly and unjustly used in this, *a matter to us of the utmost importance . . .*" ⁴ Torrington was moved to inform Grey that "unless we hold some moral control over the chiefs and Priests, unless they have some advantage by supporting the Government we shall always be liable to Treason and Rebellion. They have great power over the people who blindly obey their orders . . ." ⁵. He was more than ever convinced that the only way to do this would be to evolve a new Kandyan policy in which, the early settlement of the Buddhist problem by an enactment to protect Buddhist temporalities, should have the highest priority.

-
1. Co. 54, 258. Torrington to Grey 54 of 14-4-49.
Grey MSS. Torrington to Grey 11-8-48.
 2. Grey MSS. Torrington to Grey 11-8-48.
 3. Ibid.
 4. Grey MSS. Torrington to Grey 11-8-48.
 5. Ibid.

Torrington's first move in the direction of a new policy was the exemption of bhikkus from liability to service or payment in commutation thereof, under the Road Ordinance of 1848 — in spite of the strong opposition of the Bishop of Colombo and some of the clergy. Then in January 1849 he submitted to Grey the draft of an Ordinance, which while effecting the desired dissociation between the state and Buddhism, at the same time protected the legal rights of the Temples and Dewales. In sending this draft Ordinance home he did not go the length of positively recommending it, but merely indicated that he would introduce it in the Legislative Council in June 1849, as a final settlement of this vexed problem, if Grey agreed.¹ This draft Ordinance was a hastily prepared re-hash of Campbell's Ordinance 2 of 1846. It was prepared at a time when the country had not yet recovered from the disturbances of 1848, and was obviously meant to be a sop to the Kandyans. The main feature of this draft Ordinance was that the powers of the Government in relation to Buddhism, were to be handed over to a Committee of chiefs and bhikkus. It followed Campbell's ordinance on this as on most other matters; the only difference between the two committees was that in Torrington's, the chiefs outnumbered the bhikkus. It is difficult to decide from the existing records whether this was a matter of deliberate choice. (It is significant, however, that at the Conference on Buddhist policy, held in 1847, it was always the bhikkus who were more vehement in their opposition to the new policy.²)

This projected Ordinance was severely criticised by P. E. Wodehouse. It is rather ironical that his criticisms should have been concentrated on the committee to which the powers of the Government were to be handed over, for it was Wodehouse who had drafted Campbell's Ordinance of 1846, in which these same powers were handed over to much the same sort of committee. He criticised Torrington's Ordinance on the grounds that it would create a powerful, close corporation of chiefs, likely to be injurious to the interests of the Government and oppressive to the mass of the people. He felt that the authority and influence of the bhikkus would be too much diminished, partly because they would always be, numerically, a minority on the Committee, and partly because the power of election of bhikkus to the Committee was vested not in the whole body of bhikkus but in the Committee only.³ Wodehouse's first criticism could just as well have been made of the Committee envisaged in his own Ordinance; the validity of his second criticism would depend on the question of which of the two

1. Co. 54, 257. Torrington to Grey. 16 of 5-1-49.

2. Co. 54, 229. Torrington to Grey, 133 and 134 of 14-10-47.

3. Co. 254. Torrington to Grey 24 of 12-2-49.

groups—the Kandyan chiefs or the bhikkus—was held to be potentially more dangerous to British rule. Perhaps Torrington thought the bhikkus to be the more dangerous group and Wodehouse, the chiefs. But the issue was never as clear cut as that; there were individuals in both groups who were willing to support the British, while others were implacably hostile.

At the Colonial Office, too, the disturbances of 1848 had had a sobering effect. It became the accepted view of the Colonial Office that religion was a major cause of these disturbances, and it was generally felt that the chiefs and bhikkus had been antagonised by the new policy on Buddhism. There was a reluctance now to proceed further with that policy for fear of aggravating the sense of grievance that prevailed among the Kandyans. Grey himself began to have doubts about the virtues of his Buddhist policy, and he gradually abandoned the uncompromising stand he had adopted earlier. This uncompromising attitude of his had been strengthened by Stephen's advice. In the years 1840-47 James Stephen was by far the most important influence on the formulation of British policy on Buddhism. He was at the hub of affairs in his post of permanent under-secretary at the Colonial Office, an efficient, industrious and respected figure, wielding enormous authority with all his political superiors. To the missionaries, his presence at the Colonial Office seemed to be the Lord's own work. If the campaign against Buddhism and its connection with the Government of Ceylon reached its goal with so much less agitation, than that against the connection between the East India Company and Hinduism, two factors would explain the difference.¹ Firstly there was the success of the Indian campaign—waged in England and in India—which made the task of preserving the connection of the Ceylon Government and Buddhism almost impossible. Secondly there was James Stephen—to the missionaries "Our man in the Colonial Office"—fighting their case for them better than they could have done themselves. But Stephen retired from his post in 1847 and his retirement cleared the way for a more generous and less doctrinaire attitude. His successor Herman Merivale in no way his inferior in ability, was also more practical and much less "religious" in his approach to this problem. Further, the new Colonial Office "expert" on Buddhism, William Strachey was a man with some experience of administration in India.² His attitude to the

1. It is significant that in the whole of this period, 1840-47, only once was this question raised in Parliament; and even that was in the form of a question in the House of Commons by Sir R. Inglis M.P.

2. See. Sanders, C. R. *The Strachey family 1588-1932* (Duke University Press, 1953) pp. 211 ff.

W. Strachey was an eccentric bachelor who had served the East India Company as a writer from 1838 to 1843. He joined the Colonial Office sometime in 1848.

Buddhist problem was remarkably free from the religious intolerance that had characterised Stephen's. And in the background there was a Parliamentary Committee investigating affairs in Ceylon, remorselessly cross-examining officials and private persons alike on the affairs of the colony.

It was Strachey who examined Torrington's ordinance. He wrote a long minute, and an equally long memorandum showing why, in his view, the draft ordinance ought not to be approved. His main criticism was that it resembled Campbell's rejected ordinance too much. It provided for much the same sort of Committee to take over the functions of the Government. In Strachey's opinion this Committee gave a degree of comprehensive and efficient organization to Buddhism, such as it had never possessed before. He took objection to this, on the grounds that "all that we are bound to do is to secure to Buddhists a fair equivalent and substitute for the Government interference now to be withdrawn—to see that Buddhism does not suffer—not to revive a declining system in unusual vigour."¹

His second criticism was that this ordinance did not dissolve but re-established the connection between the state and Buddhism. True, that neither the Governor nor the Government Agent had to appoint or confirm the appointment of any persons but certain minor officials—native chieftains holding government appointments were ex-officio members of the committee which was to possess great power both secular and religious, and full control over every kind of question relating to the management of Temples and the religious discipline of bhikkus and votaries.²

It was on the committee that Strachey concentrated his attention. Recent events in Ceylon were very much in his mind when he wrote this minute. He feared that the committee would increase the political power of the Kandyan aristocracy and the bhikkus—"that very aristocracy and hierarchy which are the natural enemies of our rule and have been at the bottom of every insurrection since our rule began." The ordinance, he believed, did not even possess the advantage that it would be popular with the bhikkus and chiefs who in 1847 had vehemently opposed a similar plan. Then, referring to the divisions that had been evident among the chiefs and priests in 1847, he remarked that "the existing jealousies between the chiefs and priests should have been made the ground by us for making no general committee at all. The committee

1. Co. 54, 257. Torrington to Grey 16 of 5-1-49. Strachey's minute of 20-3-49, and his memorandum of 21-4-49. This memorandum reproduced his minute of 20-3-49.

2. Ibid.

once formed designing men will find means to reconcile those jealousies and to convert the combined influence of both parties to purposes inimical to the British. The present ordinance is at once irritating and invigorating to the native aristocracy and hierarchy." Further, Strachey believed that the powers given to the committee could constitute a revolution in local customs. Such changes, he felt, may have consequences which it was impossible to foresee and on that account ought not to be attempted. He was referring to the fact that under this ordinance, the Viharas and Devalas would be under one common management, while they had hitherto been kept distinct. Besides, he noted that there was no evidence to show that the mode prescribed by the ordinance for electing bhikkus and other functionaries was at all consistent with existing customs.

But Strachey did not stop with a mere criticism of the ordinance (he also suggested that Torrington ought to be censured for submitting an ordinance so much like the one rejected in 1846-7); he recommended—and this was to be his main recommendation—that a new and thorough enquiry ought to be instituted into the whole problem by someone other than Wodehouse.¹ But one concession he was willing to allow to the Kandyans without this preliminary enquiry. He insisted that Grey's despatches did not convey to Torrington specific instructions to stop the annual grant to the Temples from public funds. (Here, Strachey was surely right, for a reading of Grey's despatches would suggest that no specific instructions were given, the matter being left to the Governor's discretion). Strachey recommended that this grant be renewed, if as was pointed out by Stewart Mackenzie, there was a positive undertaking to make it.²

Grey was so impressed with Strachey's minute, that he had it printed as a memorandum for the Parliamentary Committee with only very slight alterations. (The rebuke to Torrington was omitted on Merivale's advice). The same memorandum was sent to Ceylon as an enclosure in Grey's despatch on Torrington's ordinance.³ The memorandum recommended the grant of a free gift of land to the Temples "somewhat commensurable in value with the money grant which had been discontinued." It suggested the

-
1. Strachey's suggestion was that this person should "examine the records, visit the Temples, confer with the different parties interested (and) . . . ascertain the precise functions hitherto performed by the Government in relation to Buddhism." Strachey believed that Wodehouse was responsible for misleading both Campbell and Torrington.
 2. Strachey's minute of 20-3-49.
 3. Enclosed in Co. 54, 261 Grey to Torrington 384 of 23-4-1849.

appointment of some competent person to review the whole problem of the state's connection with Buddhism. It recommended that powers hitherto possessed by the Government should be transferred to some less "powerful" and more "general" Buddhist association. Grey's own despatch was brief; he left it to be understood that he agreed on the whole with Strachey's memorandum. Among the reasons he gave for arriving at this decision was the fact that he found Wodehouse's objections to be of so 'fundamental a character' that they materially strengthened the case against approving the ordinance. He suggested that Torrington should reconsider the whole problem paying particular attention to another plan recommended to Grey according to which each of the different Buddhist establishments connected with the Government in the Kandyan Provinces should receive its own independent organization, in place of the politically dangerous measure adopted in Campbell's as well as Torrington's ordinance. It was obvious that Grey like Strachey rejected this ordinance mainly because of its political implications. That was not the only moral he drew from the disturbances of 1848. He had also learnt to be less doctrinaire on this issue. He ended his despatch with the advice—which Torrington and his civil servants hardly needed—to settle this difficult problem in a mode less open to controversy. With this in view, he stated his willingness to defer the period for relinquishing the interference of the Government with Temple appointments.¹

In Ceylon, in the meantime, the Buddhist problem over-shadowed all others. Torrington had now come round to the view that the policy pursued since Stanley's administration should be quietly abandoned and that there should be a reversion to the old policy. At this time he had received several petitions from bhikkus that they had been unable to obtain their dues or indeed any of their rights of property for the lack of warrants of appointment which had been discontinued since 1847. This disorganization affected not only the bhikkus and other administrators of Temple property, but also the tenants and cultivators as well for they were deprived of their former security of tenure. Recognizing the serious nature of the situation Torrington pleaded with Grey for authority to resume the practice of granting these warrants of appointment. He insisted that this was one of the obligations undertaken by the British Government at the Kandyan Convention. He pointed out that the granting of these warrants was a purely secular act, and that it afforded no reasonable pretence for saying that the Government took an interest in the perpetuation of Buddhism. He added that in these controversies the real question was unconnected with religion. It was entirely of a

1. Co. 54, 261. Grey to Torrington 384 of 23-4-1849.

temporal nature affecting the rights of property. And it was the duty of the Government to protect all parties in the enjoyment of their property, whatever their religion might be.

While he concentrated on this aspect of the controversy he did not forget his other objective—a reversion to the old policy. He believed that it was better for the Government to retrace their steps and to attempt no legislation at all. (He had an interesting reason for all this. He believed that if there was no legislation Buddhism would sink of itself; legislation would only perpetuate it). He considered the policy laid down by Lord Stanley and continued by Lord Grey as being altogether mistaken on religious grounds while (in Torrington's view) the disturbances had shown how questionable it was on political grounds. Criticising Mackenzie for having originated this misguided policy in the first place, Torrington commented that "he (Mackenzie) refused to fulfil a duty as binding and imperative on him as any other portion of the trust committed to his charge. He mistook an act purely temporal for one of a spiritual nature." In a brief paragraph Torrington explained what the Government's attitude to Buddhism ought to be." "We are bound to protect them (the Buddhists) in the exercise of their religion; the only protection they require is that which we have latterly hesitated on a most mistaken plea to afford them; the Buddhist religion is the religion of the people, and till the ministrations of (Christian missionaries) shall have dispelled the darkness which still hangs over the minds of the people it is both wise and prudent to protect it . . . By Government appointing priests we have a hold and a satisfactory check over their proceedings; we can ensure the appointment of the best intentioned and most respectable of the priests; and their knowledge of the power we possess will ensure the proper fulfilment of their duties, and prevent any attempts at treasonable practices" ²

Torrington's views were supported by most members of his executive council. Macarthy like Torrington believed that it was necessary for Government to interfere in the matters of Buddhist temporalities, if only as a temporary measure, in the absence of a final settlement. But he felt that since the difficulties of legislation were almost insurmountable the wisest course would be to resume the practice—which had worked well in the past—of the Government appointing the bhikkus and Basnayake Nilames, without reference to their spiritual duties, but simply to protect their temporal rights. There was besides another argument — that Government interference in these matters was a "purely temporal function

1. Co. 54, 258. Torrington to Grey, 67 of 10-5-49.

2. Co. 54 258. Torrington to Grey, 67 of 10-5-49.

of sovereignty itself, and therefore an abandonment of it was tantamount to an abandonment of that sovereignty."¹ Tennent was in agreement with Macarthy, believing equally firmly that the question was an essentially temporal one, in no way religious. He agreed with Macarthy that Buddhist bhikkus and temples had suffered severe losses as a consequence of Government's new policy. He drew an analogy between what was happening in Ceylon, and what might happen in England if the established church were precipitately dis-established.² The only member of the executive council to disagree with these opinions was H. C. Selby the Queen's Advocate but even he admitted the hardship and injustice inflicted on Buddhist temporalities; he admitted also the great difficulty of legislating in a manner satisfactory to all parties. But he recommended the continuation of the new policy not only because of the great publicity given to the subject but also because he believed that an attempt on the part of the Government to retrace its steps "would have an injurious effect on the native mind—the people would misunderstand the reasons for the course adopted by the Government, and not look upon it as a simple act of justice."³

There was in the Colonial Office a great deal of sympathy with much that was said by Torrington and Macarthy. Merivale and Benjamin Hawes, Grey's Parliamentary Under-Secretary, agreed with the general views of Torrington, Tennent and Macarthy.⁴ They both regretted the course begun by Mackenzie on whom they put the blame for the existing confusion. Merivale's view of Mackenzie's policy was that it was "in point of principle wholly mistaken."⁵ Hawes wrote that "the original error was certainly Mr. S. Mackenzie's who appointed to govern a people of a religion differing from his own and who were guaranteed their usages, and property; and that their religion should be upheld; declared that as a Christian he can no longer interfere in the appointment of Priests &c—which appointment by the sovereign authority is necessary to their validity. Hence the confusion which has arisen—& the discontent and disaffection."⁶

But it was one thing to regret the past and another to take so strong a step as Torrington recommended, "viz to retrace our way altogether, undo all that has been done since 1840 and revert to

1. Co. 54, 258. Torrington to Grey, 67 of 10-5-49. Minute of C. J. Macarthy enclosed.
2. Ibid. Tennent's minute.
3. Ibid. Selby's minute.
4. Co. 54, 258. Torrington to Grey, 67 of 10-5-49. Merivale's minute of 30-6-49; Hawes' minutes of 1-7-49 and 13-8-49.
5. Merivale's minute of 30-6-49.
6. Hawes' minute of 13-8-40.

the old state of things.”¹ Merivale rejected this suggestion for much the same reasons as Selby’s. He suggested instead a middle course; the draft ordinance was to be rejected for the reasons given by Strachey, and at the same time the Governor was directed not to relax his efforts but to try again to devise some scheme involving less political danger. And in the meantime he was to be authorized to revert without delay to the old plan of issuing warrants for the appointment of bhikkus and officers connected with the Temples, until some other more satisfactory method was devised. Strachey who believed that it was Torrington rather than Mackenzie who was to blame for the existing confusion returned to his view that the settlement of this question depended not so much on the framing of instructions as on the selection of a man, a special commissioner, to proceed to the Temples, to make minute inquiry into this and related subjects and submit a detailed plan.² Hawes on the other hand suggested that the old practice (as suggested by Torrington) should be reverted to temporarily pending a settlement of the problem. Rejecting Strachey’s suggestion of a special commissioner, Hawes recommended instead that the matter be left for the decision of the Parliamentary Committee.³

What was Grey to make of all these suggestions? He refused to let the Parliamentary Committee settle the whole problem as that would be “a most improper abandonment of the duties of the executive Government to a Parliamentary Comm’”.⁴ And he considered Strachey’s suggestion of a Commissioner to be “a different way of evading the responsibility of a decision”.⁵ As far as his own views on a settlement were concerned, he realised that there was no completely satisfactory solution possible, and that the best that could be done was “to effect such a settlement of it as may upon the whole be open to the fewest objections.”⁶ He accepted the view that Torrington’s draft ordinance should be rejected, for the reasons that Strachey had given. All the same he agreed on the whole with Torrington and Macarthy though he felt that it would be impossible to accept their suggestion of a return to the old system. He was convinced now of the vital importance of legislation to settle the question of temporalities, always distinguishing between “the strictly secular office of preserving the property of the temples and the religious office of priests.” A sober pragmatism had replaced his old doctrinaire approach.

-
1. Merivale’s minute of 30-6-49.
 2. Strachey’s minute of 8th August, 1849.
 3. Hawes’ minute of 1-7-49.
 4. Grey’s minute 18-9-49.
 5. Ibid.
 6. Ibid.

He added as an explanation for his change of attitude the fact "that experience having shown that the perservation of the property (of Temples), which we have promised, cannot be ensured without the assistance of Government we will do what is necessary for this purpose".¹

Sir George Anderson, Sir John Pakington and the settlement of the Buddhist problem 1851-55.

The years 1847-51 were remarkable for the absence of missionary agitation on Buddhist policy. In contrast the years 1851-55 saw a marked revival of agitation—missionary agitation on Buddhism reached its peak in these years.

The new Governor, Sir George Anderson, was a man with considerable experience of administration in India—he had served the East India Company in Western India. He was serving the Colonial Office as Governor of Mauritius (1849-50) when Grey appointed him to Ceylon.

There is very little evidence on Anderson's religious beliefs; but the little that exists would suggest that he was the only Governor of this period who was not actively interested in the propagation of Christianity. (His experience in India had convinced him that religion was a most combustible element in the social structure of the Indian sub-continent. He was therefore very wary about missionary activity).² He had the advantage of having as his Colonial Secretary, C. J. Macarthy, a man believed by many to have been a Catholic, and by some a free thinking unitarian, who was the only Colonial Secretary of our period who was not associated with missionary activity. Thus, in this phase of Ceylon's history, the prospect of a solution of the Buddhist problem on an equitable basis were very bright.

Anderson had the advantage of Torrington's experience; Macarthy's advice; and the new found diffidence of the Colonial Office, on this problem. It was not long before he realised that this was much the most important problem that faced his administration. He had, quite early in his administration grasped the crucial fact that Buddhism had no central organisation, and that this made it difficult for the state to abruptly abandon its connection with that religion.³ In August 1851 he informed Grey that after a full consideration of the subject, he saw no alternative but to

1. Grey's minute of 18-9-49.

2. Grey MSS. Anderson to Grey, 13-12-51, and 13-1-52.

3. Grey MSS. Anderson to Grey, 12-3-51.
Co. 54, 281. Anderson to Grey, 134 of 14-8-51

continue the former practice as regards the appointment of bhikkus and Basnayake Nilames.¹ He had the unanimous support of his executive council on this matter.

Anderson had no sooner made up his mind that the old system of warrants of appointment should be resumed than it became publicly known that he had done so. The strong opinions of Viscount Torrington and some members of the Executive Council in support of the same course of action were about the same time made public. The evidence given before the Parliamentary Committee on Ceylon was published in the local newspapers, along with the despatches of Torrington and the minutes of the Executive Council on Buddhism.² Anderson, some time after his arrival, sent a circular to the Government Agents and their assistants empowering them to grant commissions of appointment to bhikkus and Basnayake Nilames in the Kandyan Provinces. This circular alarmed the supporters of the policy of dissociation, who found in "*The Ceylon Times*" an eager and enthusiastic critic of Anderson's policies. This newspaper denounced the new policy as a disgrace to a Christian Government, and called upon the Bishop of Colombo to petition the Queen on this matter. It urged all Christian groups, Baptists and Catholics included, to "raise the banner of protest and preach a crusade against the system of Christian connection with a heathen system."³ The appeal did not go unheeded. Though the Bishop refused to be drawn into this campaign, the rest of the Anglican clergy led by the Archdeacon of Colombo, Dr. B. Bailey, and the Principal of the Colombo Academy, Dr. B. Boake (himself an Anglican clergyman) for the first time took the initiative in this matter. Their first move was a petition signed by the Archdeacon and 17 other clergymen of the Anglican establishment condemning the resumption of the practice of signing warrants of appointment.⁴

The petition declared that this was tantamount to a support of heathenism and claimed that it would be a fresh obstacle in the way of conversion. Anderson patiently explained that the Temples requiring these warrants of appointment were few in number, and that the warrants were to be issued only in essential cases, in order

1. Ibid.

2. *The Ceylon Times* of 14-6-1850 contained a bitter attack on the views of Wodehouse, Tennent and Macarthy on the Buddhist problem. *The Colombo Observer* in its issue of 11-11-50 singled out Macarthy for criticism on the same score. In its opinion Macarthy was responsible for the shift in the Government attitude to Buddhism.

3. *The Ceylon Times* 8-8-51; see also the issues of 5-8-54 and 19-8-54.

4. Co. 54, 288. Anderson to Grey, 10 of 10-1-1852.

to enable the temples to protect their rights of property in the courts of justice.¹ But this explanation did not satisfy the Christian groups in Ceylon. They proceeded to bombard Anderson with petitions, while *The Ceylon Times* in a series of violent editorials and letters to the editor, backed the Archdeacon and other missionary campaigners. The Archdeacon and his supporters sent in another petition protesting against any relaxation of the policy laid down by Stanley and Grey. It earned much the same reply from Anderson as the previous petition; but Anderson included in his reply an appeal for tolerance on this matter. The appeal read as follows: "(The Government) gives (Buddhism) no other favour, no other countenance, no other protection as a religion than what the British Government gives in all countries which it has acquired, and yet where idolatry may exist and prevail, that is, a perfect toleration; but we must ever recollect that offensive and abusive attacks on a religion by an opposing but dominant party is (sic) not toleration but persecution." It was the first time in the history of this dispute that a Governor of Ceylon had adopted so firm an attitude against the missionaries.

A petition signed on behalf of the Baptists by Dr. C. Elliott, and two other deacons of the Baptist congregation at Colombo, was of a rather different sort. Though they regretted as much as any of the other Christian groups the connection between the state and Buddhism, they nevertheless deplored the tendency to ignore the obligations that the Government had undertaken at the Kandyan Convention of 1815. They commented that when "... the British Government have expended a considerable part of the revenue in building places of Christian worship in the Kandyan country and in supporting an ecclesiastical establishment whose duties are avowedly hostile to and aggressive upon Buddhism, there can be no question that the compact has been violated."² Their solution was simple but radical. They recommended that Government should sever its connections with all religions and not merely with Buddhism alone. They wanted the "dis-establishment" of the Anglican Church in Ceylon. But Anderson ignored their suggestions.

-
1. Co. 54, 288. Anderson to Grey, 10 of 10-1-52. See enclosed letter of Anderson to the Bishop of Colombo, 29-12-52.
Co. 54, 282. Anderson to Grey 170 of 4-11-1851.
Grey MSS. Anderson to Grey 13-1-52.
 2. Co. 54, 288. Anderson to Grey, 17 of 13-1-52. The petition of the Baptists enclosed. The petition pointed out that while Buddhist temples had been allowed to go to ruin the Government had constructed a beautiful church beside the crumbling Maligawa in Kandy; and that while Buddhist bhikkus had been deprived of their trifling emoluments from the Government, the money spent on the ecclesiastic establishment had been augmented.

Anderson found himself faced with a well organized missionary campaign. Indeed never had the missionary agitation on this issue reached such a pitch. And at the back of his mind there was always the fear that this missionary campaign would result in unnecessary religious strife in the country. He explained to Grey that the warrants of appointment were to be issued "only in those cases where they are absolutely necessary for the protection of the secular rights of the incumbents of Temples; and until some other arrangement can be made for securing that object without the intervention of Government, I conceive that we are bound in justice as well as by treaty to continue to afford them the protection in the manner in which it has hitherto been done."¹ He warned Grey that "under the state of excitement which has been so industriously fomented, it would at all events at present be very impolitic to make any change, for such would not be attributed to any desire on the part of the Government to be relieved of the existing difficulties, but to the influence and violence of the clergy against the religion of the country."²

He was forced to emphasise this theme, again and again in the course of 1852. In the months of November and December 1851 and January 1852, a series of six letters, called the *Letters of Vetus* were published in the *Ceylon Times*, condemning not only Anderson's attitude to the problem of Buddhism, but also the whole trend of Government policy on that problem since the disturbances. There was a bitter division within the Anglican Church on this issue; the Bishop supported Anderson, while the Archdeacon, and Dr. Boake attacked the Bishop for this stand, in pamphlet, speech and sermon. The *Letters of Vetus* concentrated on the Government officials, paying particular attention to the despatches of Torrington, and the minutes prepared by Macarthy and Tennent. These letters did not introduce any new argument but the violence of the language used and the insulting references made in them to the indigenous religions attracted Anderson's attention, and on inquiry it transpired that these letters were written by the Archdeacon who when challenged by the Governor boldly acknowledged himself to be the author.³ Bailey was not the man to relent even when it was obvious that the Governor disapproved of his tactics. He turned on the Bishop and condemned him for what

1. Co. 54, 293. Anderson to Grey, 11 of 10-1-52.

2. Co. 293. Anderson to Grey, 11 of 10-1-1852.

3. The only original note in these letters was the reliance on Blackstone's *Commentaries on the Laws of England* to prove the nullity of the Kandyan convention. "But in conquered or ceded countries that have already laws of their own, the king may indeed alter and change these laws; but till he does change and alter them, the ancient Laws of the country remain—UNLESS SUCH AS ARE AGAINST THE LAW OF GOD, AS IN AN INFIDEL COUNTRY".

he considered to be his lack of courage, faith and principle in not joining in this campaign. Not to be outdone, Boake delivered a sermon condemning not only the Bishop but the Governor as well. Then followed a furious triangular correspondence between Bailey and Boake on one side, and Anderson and Bishop Chapman on the other two, in the course of which the Bishop considered himself to have been insulted by Bailey and Boake. Bailey went a step further and published under his own name, a letter in *The Ceylon Times* appealing for public sympathy against the Governor.¹

Anderson was both annoyed and alarmed at this campaign. He was shocked at the insubordination of the clergy to their Bishop, and at their turbulence. He was equally concerned about the attacks on the Government by the clergy of the Colonial establishment; he was particularly annoyed at the sermon preached by Boake. But he was most concerned at the intemperate and abusive attack on Buddhism in the *Letters of Vetus* "in language so violent and offensive as calculated to excite and exasperate the whole Bhoodist (sic) population." He remembered with alarm a recent incident in Bombay where the attacks of a Parsee editor on Mohammedanism had led to a riot which was only quelled by the army, and hinted that these attacks on Buddhism by the clergy may have similar effects in Ceylon.²

In the meantime the Kandyan chiefs and Priests presented Anderson with a petition in which they quoted the Kandyan convention in support of their claim for a renewal of the system of warrants of appointment. They emphasised the fact that these certificates had nothing whatever to do with their religion, and that any criticism of the Government on this account was baseless. The petition was clearly meant to help Anderson in meeting the criticisms of the missionaries. Anderson called Grey's particular attention to its contents as confirming his (Anderson's) own views on the matter.³

But he was less concerned with buttressing his policy with the support of the Kandyans, than with the need to check the activities of the Archdeacon and his associates.

At the Colonial Office Strachey sympathised with the Archdeacon, and he considered the line of policy suggested by Anderson to be misguided. But he had no support from either Grey or Hawes. Grey in particular was now anxious that the whole

1. Co. 54, 293. Anderson to Grey, 18 of 14-1-52.

2. Grey MSS. Anderson to Grey 13-12-51, and 13-1-52.

3. Co. 54, 293. Anderson to Grey 18 of 14-1-52.

problem should be settled as quietly and as soon as possible. He directed that Anderson's suggestions should be accepted—but as purely provisional and temporary measures till a fresh policy should be formulated. He made the significant concession that he was "prepared to admit that much mischief has resulted from measures adopted by my predecessors and myself upon imperfect information and which were not consistent with the spirit of our engagements to the people of Ceylon. This is indeed the justification of the course it is now proposed to adopt."¹ At Strachey's suggestion, he enclosed in his despatch, as a guide to a new policy, the Indian Government Acts for the years 1833 to 1850 on the Pilgrim Tax and the severing of the connection between the East India Company and Hinduism.

Grey was in no mood to tolerate the intransigence of the Anglican clergy. After some deliberation, he called upon Bailey to resign his appointment or face dismissal. Boake was severely reprimanded; he was also informed that he would not be considered for appointment to another diocese. He commended the Bishop for his support of the Governor; and declared firmly that he disapproved of the practice of clergymen paid by the state attacking Government policy in the newspapers or from the pulpit.²

The punishment meted out to Bailey and Boake, did not pass unnoticed in Ceylon. *The Colombo Observer* which normally supported Anderson, felt on this occasion, that he had committed an error of judgement in taking Bailey and Boake so seriously.³ *The Ceylon Times* treated the punishment of these two clergymen as a betrayal of Christianity itself and an ignoble surrender to idolatry. Its editorial comment is worth quoting as an example of the emotions generated by this question. "The Archdeacon has left us with the sympathy and esteem of all honourable men, while the Bishop's character never high, was never at a lower ebb in public estimation than in this the day of his petty triumph; or rather the day in which he graces the triumph of idolatry... The Bishop however may not have long to enjoy his victory; if that can be called one which degrades the clergy into tools of an arbitrary Government, empties the churches of their congregations, and brings his own office into disrepute... One effect the present persecution will have is to give a fresh interest to the revolting subject of state sponsored idolatry which can only be enforced by the infringements of the personal rights and liberties of British subjects and the violation of every British principle."⁴

1. Grey's minute of 7-1-52 in Co. 54, 282.
Anderson to Grey, 170 of 4-11-1851.
2. Co. 54, 293. Grey to Anderson, 59 of 8-7-1852.
3. *The Colombo Observer*, 5-2-1852.
4. *The Ceylon Times*, 21-9-1852, see also the issue of 31-8-1852

The Examiner which had always been an outspoken supporter of Anderson's policy on Buddhism, had more than once criticised Bailey for his intransigence. On his dismissal it refused to see in him a Christian martyr. "A martyr is one who suffers for conscience's sake, which is not the case with the Archdeacon; he is simply the victim of his own unhappy temper."¹

But Bailey's retirement was not the end of the battle. It brought the issue of the state's connection with Buddhism into the limelight in a manner that Bailey's letters had been unable to do. The Anglican clergy supported by over 500 Christian laymen of all denominations, petitioned the Queen and the Houses of Parliament. Their petition condemned Anderson's policy, and called for its reversal.² It was sent to England in September 1852, by which time Earl Grey had left the Colonial Office.

More important in its effects was Anderson's attempt to solve the problem created by the need to fill long standing vacancies in the Asgiriya Temple—where the posts of Chief Priest, and Second High Priest were vacant. C. R. Buller as the Government Agent of the Central Province informed Anderson that the Kandyan bhikkus were anxious to have these vacancies filled. At a conference at Kandy, the bhikkus suggested that the Government Agent should, as had been done originally, direct the bhikkus and chiefs to hold a meeting to select a High Priest; their nomination should then be submitted to the Governor for confirmation.³ Anderson had no practical objection to this course of action but he could not decide on it finally without consulting his Executive Council. At a meeting of the Executive Council, on 15th July 1852, the issue of warrants of appointment was again debated.⁴ With one exception the councillors were agreed that the appointments in question, and indeed all appointments must be made both because of the hardship caused to the Buddhists and because it was an obligation assumed at the Kandyan convention. The exception was H. C. Selby the Queen's Advocate who argued that it was not necessary for the Government to sign warrants of appointment and recommended that they should not be signed in future. However, he saw the need for legislation of some sort. All that was necessary, he believed, would be the appointment of a Trustee for the property of the Temples, with some provision made for the election of his successors. The advantage of this plan in Selby's

1. *The Examiner*, 4-9-52; see also the issues of 25-2-1852, and 7-8-1852.

2. Co. 54, 291. Anderson to Pakington, 92 of 11-8-52, enclosed petition.

3. Co. 54, 290. Anderson to Pakington. 61 of 6-8-52. C. R. Buller's letter of 20-3-52 enclosed; also enclosed was, letter of chief priest of Asgiriya Temple of 5-2-52.

4. Co. 54, 290. Anderson to Pakington, 61 of 6-8-52.

view was that it would satisfy the bhikkus, and that it would enable the Government to dissociate itself from Buddhism.¹ Selby's plan was likely to achieve this second objective; it could not have achieved the first. At any rate, Selby was more interested in the second. He was a great supporter of the view that the state should have no connection with any religion, let alone Buddhism. He was a strong advocate of the "dis-establishment of the Anglican Church."²

More constructive was the plan submitted to Anderson as early as March 1852, by C. R. Buller. He suggested the establishment of an ecclesiastical court of 20 bhikkus (chiefs were to be excluded) to administer all the properties of the temples, and to adjudicate on religious issues. Provision was to be made for the inclusion, at some future date, of a clause which was to declare that where two-thirds of the tenants of any temple property desired to utilize the lands for some other purpose than the support of the temples, they should have the right to do so. Buller who had great hopes for the ultimate replacement of Buddhism by Christianity, hoped by means of this clause to accelerate the process.³

His other aim was to prevent the formation of a close corporation of chiefs and bhikkus. His scheme—and he pronounced it his main aim—sought to make each Temple a separate incumbency, wholly independent of the two main colleges,⁴ with each incumbent having full power to name his successor. (The Basnayake Nilames were to be elected in the same way). Thus each Temple would be a private incumbency. He hoped by this means to divide the interests of the chiefs and the bhikkus.

It was obvious that legislation would be necessary to create this court. Buller suggested that any such legislation should be as brief as possible—no more legislation in fact than was absolutely necessary. In his view his scheme had the advantage that it could, by effecting the dissociation quietly, and without any unnecessary

-
1. Co. 54, 290. Anderson to Pakington 61 of 6-8-52. H. C. Selby's minute of 1-7-52.
 2. See Chapter I.
 3. Co. 54, 290. Anderson to Pakington, 61 of 6-8-52. Co. 57, 18, meeting of the Executive Council. 15-7-1852. C. R. Buller was not a member of the Executive Council but he was invited to attend this and other meetings because of his knowledge of the intricacies of the problem, gained presumably by virtue of his long stay as Government Agent of the Central Province.
 4. It is difficult to see what Buller was aiming at here, for the individual Temples had always been separate incumbencies, with very little control by the two colleges of Asgiriya and Malwatta.

display of ordinances and proclamations, avoid increasing the strong feeling among the Kandians against the policy of dissociation.¹ But Anderson disregarded Buller's scheme as he disregarded Selby's, and relied heavily on Macarthy's advice.

Naturally *The Ceylon Times* and the missionaries made much of these developments, but Anderson was less amenable to missionary influence in this matter than any of his predecessors. His approach to this problem was pragmatic and his motives were practical and political, hardly ever religious.

At this stage Earl Grey resigned from office. And with his resignation there was every possibility that the settlement that Grey and Anderson were slowly but deliberately working out would be upset. Grey's successor at the Colonial Office was Sir John Pakington, who did not have either Grey's wide knowledge and experience of colonial affairs — or his enormous capacity for work. But Pakington had the quality of resolution; he was determined to settle the Buddhist problem. This he left in Merivale's capable hands, thus ensuring — even if he did not intend it — that there would be unchanged continuity in Colonial Office policy on Buddhism. Strachey was given the task, under Merivale's supervision, of bringing the controversy on Buddhism to an end. He produced a despatch which was to prove the final solution of this vexed problem. Pakington had as little to do with the actual drafting of this despatch, as Grey had with his first despatch on Buddhism. It was Strachey's work, and — surprisingly enough — Tennent's. It is curious that Tennent's greatest influence on Buddhist policy may have come at a time when he was no longer in the colonial service.² Pakington and Merivale had the highest regard for his abilities and consulted him on many matters affecting Ceylon, but most of all on Buddhism. Strachey's draft despatch was ready by 16th September 1852, and he was all for sending it to Anderson but it was delayed because Tennent had chosen this particular moment to send Merivale a copy of a memorandum on Buddhism originally prepared for the Parliamentary Committee on Ceylon.³ Never reluctant to praise his own efforts he informed Merivale that the facts in his memorandum "have all the

1. Co. 57, 18. Meeting of the Executive Council of 15-7-52.

2. Co. 54, 296. Tennent's letter to Pakington, 30-9-52.

Torrington had always treated Macarthy's views on Buddhism with more respect than Tennent's. In a letter to Grey (Grey MSS. Torrington to Grey 14-10-47) he commented that Tennent's opinions on this matter were "more showy than practical." There is little evidence to suggest that he ever changed this view.

3. Co. 54, 296. Tennent's "Memorandum on Buddhism and the means of severing the connexion between the British Government and the Buddhist rites and Temples in Ceylon".

authenticity of an official enquiry conducted with the sanction and under the authority of the Governor (Torrington)."¹ He suggested that Merivale should send a copy of this memorandum to Ceylon "as I am enabled to assure you that *much* of its contents are wholly new and unknown to the officials there; and it will facilitate their execution of your orders and to have the facts and to be able to verify them . . ."² The officials in Ceylon could have done without Tennent's memorandum for it contained nothing that was not known there. But Merivale did study it carefully and held up Strachey's despatch till he had had time to digest this memorandum. At Tennent's suggestion Strachey's despatch was amended; but the amendments added little of value to that document. This was an indication of the extent to which Merivale—and Pakington—was willing to use Tennent's experience. For it must be kept in mind that Strachey's original draft itself had been prepared with the assistance of Tennent, who had gone over every point in that despatch with great deliberation.³

The amended draft was adopted as Pakington's own despatch to Anderson on the solution of the Buddhist problem. This despatch, unlike Stanley's and Grey's major despatches on Buddhist policy, was a compromise between the views of the missionaries and the evangelicals on the one side, and those of the Kandyans and the traditionalists on the other. (Anderson could have recognized in it many of his own suggestions). It was also a superb piece of fence straddling, seeking to re-assure the Buddhists, while at the same time appeasing the missionaries.

The details of the settlement were—perhaps deliberately—vague. It declared that the system of warrants of appointment constituted "an admission by the Government of responsibility for the person appointed;" and that this gave offence to the Christians in Ceylon. Therefore, it was recommended that these warrants of appointment should be abolished.⁴ "Instead the present system of recognizing by diploma or certificate, the priests or lay chiefs elected by their own organizations should continue but it would be best to organize a regular electoral body either by agreement among the Buddhists or by arrangement in the first instance, and no attempt should be made to get rid of any part of the present Government's functions

1. Co. 54, 296. Tennent to Pakington, 30-9-52.

2. Ibid. Tennent to Merivale. (n.d.).

3. Co. 54, 290. Anderson to Pakington, 61 of 6-8-52. Strachey's minute (n.d.) to Pakington.

4. Co. 54, 294. Pakington to Anderson, 123 of 4-12-52, para. 2.

until such a body has been organised." ¹ This seemed clear and sensible enough; but he was much less clear when it came to instructing Anderson on what he was to do on the next occasion that he was faced with a specific request for a warrant of appointment. The despatch instructed him "on the next vacancy, if possible, if not as soon as possible, to cease to issue an appointment; to dispense (if safe and injurious to no rights of property) with any certificates; if this cannot be done, to substitute either a simple certificate, or a grant of temporal rights." ² To have extracted any positive directions from this mass of contradictory and conditional directions would have taxed the energies of any but the most sagacious and experienced administrator. Anderson, fortunately, was up to the mark.

This despatch, which Anderson was asked to publish, declared firmly that the guarantees of 1815 and 1818 would be honoured in the future too; then, in the same breath it added that this declaration did not mean that the British Government was bound "to preserve untouched the particular forms of temple appointments, and the like, at present in use, if the substantive object the protection of the rights themselves, is equally attainable without them." ³ The Government was asked to assure the Buddhists that "no representation from other portions of the community will induce H.M.'s Government to permit any withdrawal of the protection or any infringement of the immunities guaranteed to the Buddhist religion by the Convention of 1815." ⁴ But the Buddhists were at the same time to be told that it would be in their own interests that some change should be made in the relationship between the "Buddhist establishments" and the "executive authority"; the despatch hinted that this change had to be made to satisfy the "Christian portion of the community" and to prevent the continuation of "inconvenient controversies" between Buddhists, Christians and the Government. ⁵

On two aspects of policy the despatch was clear enough—the Tooth Relic was to be handed over as it was in 1847 to the representatives of the Buddhists; and the annual grant of money stopped in 1847 was to be restored as "an act of justice,"—if possible to

1. Ibid para. 13.

2. Ibid para. 24. The same policy was to be followed in the case of lay chiefs of Dewales. (para. 26).

3. Para. 2.

4. Para. 30.

5. Ibid.

coincide with the change in the system of appointments, and thus make this latter step more palatable to the Buddhists.¹

Pakington's despatch indicated that legislation would be necessary to give effect to these changes. If there was no elective body, legislation would be necessary to give validity and permanency to such a body when it was created. It would also be necessary to legislate for any certificate or instrument that may be devised as substitutes for the present certificates.² But these matters of detail were left to Anderson's discretion with a strong recommendation "not to legislate unless on an established case of necessity."³

Anderson was informed that these new arrangements should constitute "an entire cessation of interference in Buddhist affairs." The despatch instructed him that "if there is at present any interference otherwise than by appointments, such other interference is also to be made to cease either by simply withdrawing it, or transferring the functions to be discontinued to the proper Buddhist agency."⁴

If Pakington had hoped that his policy of compromise would be hailed in Ceylon as an act of statesmanship he was mistaken. None of the missionary organizations was satisfied; *The Ceylon Times* was as violent in its condemnation as it ever was on matters concerning Buddhism. But most significant was the fact that the sober and moderate *Colombo Observer* was calling his despatch a disappointment. It declared that "a document more unsatisfactory

-
1. In para 8, Anderson was informed that one aim of his policy should be to make Buddhists "rely upon the powers of self-government which are preserved by any religious community or may by proper arrangements be developed in it." It is not clear what Pakington intended here. On the one hand it may be that he was asking Anderson to convert the loose collections of temples in Ceylon into a centrally controlled organization. This would be a revolutionary process easy to suggest but exceptionally difficult to achieve. Again it may be that all Pakington intended was to revive a procedure (said to have been followed in Ceylon) which resembled the capitulary elections of western monasticism. There was to be no central organisation involved but each vihara would chose its own head. It would have been very difficult to make either practice uniformly accepted as practice evidently varied a great deal.
 2. Para 26
 3. Ibid.
 4. Para. 27

and uncertain as regards the action contemplated, more involved in sense and imperfect in style, scarcely ever proceeded from a high public officer. It is a perfect contrast to the beautiful compositions on the same subject which have proceeded from the pens of Mr. Macarthy and Sir Emerson Tennent; and whatever may be thought of some parts of the policy of Earl Grey or whatever estimate may be formed of his temper, he must be at least allowed the merit of making himself acquainted with his subject and conveying his meaning in clear and vigorous phraseology." ¹ It was on the whole a fair criticism.

Anderson however decided to make the most of the concessions to his opinions that Pakington had made, and the discretion allowed him by the ordinance. His first task was to organize the new electoral college and to devise a method of election. In the main he followed the principles laid down in paragraph 24 of Pakington's despatch. ² It was originally intended that the electoral college should consist of Temple tenants and officers of each temple and devale, but Anderson decided ultimately to devise an electoral college in which the chiefs would have the controlling vote. He felt that an electoral college in which the temple tenants had a majority would in the long run "be fatal to the integrity of the property belonging to the different temples, as the majority of the electors would have a direct interest in the election of a temple officer who would not be faithful to his trust, i.e., the maintenance of temple rights, and the application of property to Temple purposes." ³

Once the electoral college had elected an individual the question of Government recognition arose, and here Anderson considered it neither just nor safe to deprive the managers of these temporalities of such legal documents as would guarantee their undisturbed possession of these properties. For these reasons he decided to substitute for Acts of Appointment a simple certificate of a purely declaratory form recognizing the validity of the election. He decided to hand over the Tooth Relic to the Committee who held it from October 1847 to July 1848. And the question of a grant

1. *The Colombo Observer*, 7-2-53.

2. Co. 54, 298. Anderson to Pakington, 22 of 24-3-53.

Co. 57, 19, Minutes of the Executive Council meeting of 9-3-53.

3. Co. 54, 298. Anderson to Pakington, 22 of 24-3-53,
Anderson's minute of 18-2-53.

of lands as compensation for the monastery grant terminated in 1847 did not prevent any difficulties.

Once he had made up his mind on these various problems he issued specific instructions to the Government Agent of the Central Province, explaining to him the composition of the electoral colleges, the mode of election, and the nature of the certificate of recognition. The Tooth Relic was to be handed over to the Committee with a clear warning that they would be held responsible for the property handed over to their care, and that Government would not hesitate to resume possession of it, if the Tooth Relic was used for anything other than religious purposes. He was to submit as soon as possible a statement of the extent of compensation to be given in lieu of the grant stopped in 1847. ¹

On the very day that these instructions were issued, Anderson (in a Minute drawn up with the assistance of MacCarthy) ² made a policy declaration of the utmost significance. He declared that "our sole motive should be that of support and protection to what exists (Buddhism) and . . . we have nothing to do with anything else". Nor would he accept the view that in the event of the ultimate collapse of Buddhism, Buddhist property should be used for the purposes of education. On the contrary Anderson insisted that Government was bound to help to protect these lands "on all principles of honesty and justice, and (we) ought to repudiate every idea that it is our purpose sooner or later to possess ourselves of these lands for objects different from the original purpose of the Grants, however these objects in themselves may be virtuous, good and excellent". ³ This was nothing less than the rejection of the whole basis of the Buddhist policy of his predecessors (not even Torrington—chastened by the events of 1848—went as far as this). To a large extent this attitude to Buddhism explains the virulence of the missionary opposition to Anderson's policies.

This time there was no unanimity in the Executive Council. Three Executive Councillors—H. C. Selby, the Queen's Advocate, W. C. Gibson the Auditor-General, and J. Caulfield, the Acting Treasurer—presented a joint minute which recommended a course

-
1. Co. 54.298. Anderson to Pakington 22 of 24-3-53. Anderson's Minute of 18-2-53.
 2. Anderson's Minute of 18-2-53. It was on the basis of this minute that these instructions were issued to the Government Agent of the Central Province.
 3. Anderson's minute of 18-2-53.

of action rather different from Anderson's.¹ (On certain matters there was indeed a measure of agreement but these were generally matters of lesser importance). The difference of opinion came on the major issue of temple appointments and temple lands. The suggestions of the three Executive Councillors were briefly that the chief bhikkus and Basnayake Nilames were to be elected (they were not clear as to who should elect them); the person so elected was to be granted a certificate of recognition; and thereafter a grant was to be made to the persons so elected and recognised of all the lands belonging to the temples and these lands were to be held on a tenure known as "sisya paramparawa" that is, a grant in perpetuity from priest to pupil.

At the same time, they introduced the argument, for which there was no support in the facts of the situation, that the property of temples should revert to the Crown on the death of the bhikkus; they believed that such property was not vested in the Buddhist community, the successive chief priests being merely its administrators. Now these arguments could hardly be reconciled with their recommendation that temple lands should be granted in perpetuity.² And Anderson was to show that this was all based on an idea of C. R. Buller's that temple property belonged to the Crown, and was granted by the Crown to the appointed priests for the time being, reverting to the Crown on their deaths. Anderson explained that this view was certainly not held by the bhikkus themselves, and that the Mahanayake of Malwatta whose opinion Buller had quoted as the basis of his argument had declared that Buller had completely misunderstood him.³

There were two other points on which the three Executive Councillors differed from Anderson. First, they believed that it was necessary to issue a Proclamation setting out clearly the terms of the settlement. Anderson objected to the idea of a Proclamation as being too ostentatious and likely to prove unpopular among the Kandyan. Secondly, Anderson insisted that legislation was necessary to effect the settlement. Pakington had given him a free hand in this matter. (Indeed paragraph 26 of his despatch had recognised that legislation would be necessary—if there was

1. Co. 54.298. Anderson to Pakington, 22 of 24-3-53. Joint minute of 9-3-53. It must be noted that these three officials did not form any permanent opposition 'bloc' in the Executive Council. Even on this question there was the significant difference that while Selby's opposition to Anderson's policy was based on his view that the state should have no connection with any religion at all, the other two appear to have shared some at least of the opinions of the missionary opposition.
2. The fact is that none of the local civil servants had any clear idea of the tenure of temple lands. From the records only one thing is clear—there was no uniform practice.
3. Co. 54.300. Anderson to Newcastle, 70 of 10-6-53.

no elective body, legislation would be necessary to give validity and permanency to such a body when it was created, and it would also be necessary to legislate for the certificate of recognition). The Executive Councillors on the other hand, insisted that " . . . that no new law is required to enable them (the Buddhists) effectually to manage their own concerns, and to maintain their just rights before the tribunals".

The fact however is, that basically the differences between Anderson (and MacCarthy) and the three Executive Councillors stemmed from different views on the extent to which the separation of state and Buddhism should be taken. For Anderson, and indeed for Pakington—the compromise settlement of 1852 was to constitute "an entire cessation of interference in Buddhist affairs".¹ But in this settlement the Government still had certain minor functions and there was still some very tenuous connection. The Executive Councillors wanted a total separation,² which in the circumstances of the day was both impossible and undesirable. Their arguments were to be taken a stage further by men like Strachey in the Colonial Office, and the missionaries and the more articulate members of the Christian community in Ceylon who looked upon such matters as the certificate granted by the Government and the presence of native Government officials in the electoral colleges created by Anderson, as positive evidence of continued Government interference.

Anderson realising that speed was essential if he was to thwart the missionaries and the opposition in the Executive Council, persuaded C. R. Buller to carry out his instructions with all possible speed. In June 1853 he sent the Colonial Office a copy of the instructions he had sent Buller, and along with it he sent the news that the separation between Buddhism and the state had been effected without much trouble; that the Tooth Relic had been handed over on 20th May 1853; that the first elections under the new system had already taken place; and the certificate of recognition had been granted to the new Mahanayaka of Asgiriya, the new Diyawadana Nilame of the Temple of the Tooth and the new Basnayaka Nilame of the Kataragama Dewale in Kandy³ In presenting the Colonial Office with an accomplished fact, Anderson perhaps believed that there would be less likelihood of their over-ruling him altogether.⁴ He realised that the Colonial

1. Co. 54.294. Pakington to Anderson, 123 of 4-12-52. para 26.

2. This probably explains why they were so vague about the electoral college, its composition and functions.

3. Co. 54.300. Anderson to Newcastle, 70 of 10-6-53.

4. Pakington had left the Colonial Office at this stage, and Anderson could never be certain about the views and attitudes of Pakington's successor, the Duke of Newcastle.

Office was more diffident now on Buddhist policy than it had been earlier.

Nevertheless, it was necessary—particularly because Pakington had left the Colonial Office—to explain why he had found it necessary to reject the recommendations of Selby, Caulfield and Gibson. The bulk of these were concerned with temple appointments and the tenure of temple lands. Anderson explained that the three Executive Councillors had based their recommendations on certain mistaken notions of C. R. Buller. The Mahanayaka of Malwatta whom Buller quoted as his authority for these views informed Anderson that Buller had completely misunderstood him.¹ And with that the arguments of the three Executive Councillors were considerably weakened.

Anderson believed that these suggestions would lead to a revolutionary change in the existing tenure of temple properties. He was certain that the property of the temples could never revert to the crown. “. . . Temple property once dedicated to religious purposes (was inalienable); and again, if the property was made to descend, as is proposed from priest to pupil, this practice would set aside succession of election, which is certainly on all hands admitted to be the mode in which priest should succeed priest in their temples”.² He had grave misgivings on some of the other recommendations of the three Executive Councillors particularly on their suggestion of a proclamation embodying the terms of the settlement. Such a proclamation would be too ostentatious and was certain to be unpopular among the Kandyan,

Only one concession was made to the three Executive Councillors on their suggestion, a new electoral college was devised for the purpose of electing the Basnayake Nilames. (This electoral college was to consist of the Rate Mahatmayas and Basnayaka Nilames). Anderson realised that this electoral machinery was likely to increase the power and influence of the headmen among the people, “which it has not been the policy of the English Government to augment”, but he accepted it, because it was the least objectionable method that could have been devised.³

At the Colonial Office only Strachey had any objections to Anderson's policies; but these were confined to the proposal to have the Rate Mahatmayas and Korales in the electoral college,

1. See above, page 153.

2. Co. 54,330. Anderson to Newcastle, 70 of 10-6-53.

3. *ibid.*

to which he took objection on the grounds that this would strengthen "the hands of the native official aristocracy".¹ The presence of these men in the electoral college would be the substitution of an "indirect for a direct system of Government nomination,"² since they were after all Government officials. Besides, though these men were all Buddhists, they may in future be converted to Christianity, in which event they may have objections to serve on that electoral college. To obviate all this he suggested as a "far better plan" an electoral college consisting merely of Temple officers—the Basnayaka Nilames of the districts with the addition perhaps of the Kapuwas and other dewale officials, the Government giving a Certificate of election as in the case of the bhikkus of Vihares.

But Strachey's suggestions did not meet with the approval of his superiors. Merivale, clearly anxious to be rid of this problem, was satisfied that Anderson had "very fairly carried out instructions".³ He noted the difference of opinion between Anderson and MacCarthy, on the one hand and Selby, Caulfield and Gibson on the other, but he would not let it stand in the way of a settlement, shrewdly remarking that the difference "turns on rather a refined point of Sinhalese jurisprudence, and the variety of opinion respecting it seems to indicate how little is known after 35 years of the conquest of the fundamental usages and notions of the Kandyan".⁴ The Duke of Newcastle who had replaced Pakington at the Colonial Office, also approved of Anderson's policy though he had doubts on one point—the new constituencies created for the election of the Diyawadana Nilames and the Basnayake Nilames.⁵ Like Strachey, he felt that the presence of Government officials in the electoral colleges would substitute an indirect for a direct connection with the Government. But he conceded generously that any other arrangement would likewise be open to criticism and that "no arrangement appears to have been suggested nor could (he) suggest any, free from objections".⁶ Newcastle approved Anderson's settlement with the comment that it was "good compromise between the demands of the Buddhists and Christians".

Newcastle and Merivale wholly misjudged the temper of the Christian Community in Ceylon. When Anderson's instructions

1. Co. 54.298. Anderson to Pakington, 22 of 24-3-53. Stanley's Minute of 5-5-53.
2. Strachey's Minute of 5-5-53.
3. Co. 54.298. Merivale's minute of 4-5-53. in Anderson to Pakington, 22 of 24-3-53.
4. *ibid.*
5. *Ibid.* Newcastle's minute of 13-7-53.
6. Co. 54.300. Newcastle to Anderson. 103 of 18-8-53.

to Buller were published in the local newspapers, it raised a storm of protest.¹ The press was unanimously against it; the missionary groups—united on this as on no other issue—added their criticisms. In the Legislative Council two non-officials, E. J. Darley and James Swan presented a petition declaring their opposition to the new settlement. The main theme of their criticism was that Anderson's instructions to the Government Agent were contrary to Pakington's despatch, and that he had not effected a complete break with Buddhism. They suggested that since the sole use of the new certificate was to secure recognition of the election in the Courts of Justice, the same object could be secured with greater certainty by simple registration in the courts. That the Tooth Relic was no longer in the possession of the Government was a matter of great satisfaction to them but they objected to the receipt obtained by the Government for the property handed over with it. The new electoral colleges were condemned particularly because native Government officials had the right to vote in them; the petitioners looked upon this as an indirect connection between the Government and Buddhism. Fears were expressed that this would exclude the appointment of Christians to posts of Rate Mahatmaya and Korale; or that by appointing Christians, it would give Buddhists a handle for complaint.²

Anderson defended his policy as best as he could, explaining that the certificates merely gave the bhikkus and Basnayaka Nilames their secular rights to temple property; that the treasures of the Temple of the Tooth included jewellery valued at £60,000 or so and that the receipt had been taken in order to prevent a dispute in future as to the extent of the property handed over; and that the electoral college was a temporary device till something better could be devised. He explained that the native officials would not wield any influence for the Government at these elections and therefore their presence in the electoral college could not compromise the Government. And he pointed out that if Christians held these posts, it was optional for them to vote; and that, in any case, it was not supposed that they would want to. He made it clear that he would not change his plans to accommodate these criticisms.³

But his firmness only strengthened the opposition to these policies among the various Christian groups in Ceylon. This time they petitioned the Queen, declaring that while they concurred in the statement of policy made in Pakington's despatch of 4th

1. *The Colombo Observer*, 20-4-1854. Petition of E. J. Darley, James Swan and others dated 20-3-1854.
2. Petition of E. J. Darley, James Swan and others, dated 20-3-1854.
3. *The Colombo Observer*, 20-4-1854. Anderson's reply of 8-4-54.

December 1852, they regretted that Anderson's instructions to the Government Agent of the Central Province violated the principles as well as the spirit of that despatch.¹ (At about the same time, the Secretary of the S.P.G., E. Hawkins, submitted a petition to the Colonial Office making much the same complaint).²

These petitions did not impress Merivale. He realised that the petitioners wanted the elimination of all Government connection with the Buddhist religion and that it would be impossible to concede this demand for that would be an act of injustice towards the Kandyan.

Merivale stood loyally by Anderson and defended him against all his critics. He noted with approbation that Anderson's "part of the correspondence (with the petitioners) seems to have been conducted with much moderation and propriety"³ The petition itself, he dismissed with the sagacious comment that "... much is said in Sir J(ohn) P(akington) despatch of ulterior measures as desirable, and ulterior objects to be kept in view, and these expressions are treated by the memorialists as directions, which when taken along with the context they clearly are not".⁴ Above all that was a firm determination that there should be no disturbance of the settlement made by Pakington and Anderson.

"As to the general question, I am by no means sanguine enough to believe it set at rest for ever; But I hope nothing short of very strong grounds will be allowed to cause the re-opening of a matter which Lord Grey endeavoured for years to settle, which were reputed not the least significant among the causes of rebellion in 1847 and which Sir J. Pakington arranged at last only on the footing of a compromise".⁵

1. *The Colombo Observer*, 14-12-54; Co. 54.310. Anderson to Sir George Grey. 74 of 25-12-54. This petition dated 4-12-54 was signed by 2 members of the Legislative Council, E. J. Darley and James Swan, the Archdeacon and 9 other clergymen of the Church of England, 2 Presbyterian Chaplains, 7 Wesleyans and Baptist missionaries, several merchants and planters, some civil servants and army officers and over 500 others. This new petition embodied most of the criticisms made in the earlier one.
2. Co. 54.312. Hawkins' petition Dec. (n.d.) 1854. Hawkins actually asked for an interview on this subject but Merivale refused him this request, asking him to put his suggestions on paper.
3. Co. 54.310. Merivale's minute of 9-1-55 in Anderson to Sir George Grey 74 of 25-12-54.
4. *Ibid.*
5. *Ibid.*

The Pakington-Anderson settlement, ungainly compromise though it was, lasted practically unchanged into the twentieth century. And missionary interests which had been so largely responsible for the original severance of the connection between the State and Buddhism, had little influence on this settlement which was dictated largely by practical considerations of politics. In the circumstances of the nineteenth century, this compromise settlement was the best possible; like all compromises it disappointed everybody. But it must not be forgotten that if the missionaries had their way the settlement would have been far less generous to the Buddhists. And Anderson deserves to be remembered as a man of sterling integrity, and rare tolerance who fought tenaciously to secure to the Buddhists as honourable a settlement as he could.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH: A HISTORICAL RETROSPECT*

By

SIR FREDERICK REES

The Commonwealth by strict definition only includes those territories which have achieved independence—the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Union of South Africa, New Zealand, India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Ghana and Malaya. There is no common authority over them. Great Britain itself is simply one of them. They are bound together by a variety of ties and by the recognition of the Queen as Head of the Commonwealth, a term necessary because some of them are Republics. But I do not wish to confine this brief survey to the Dominions and their inter-relations, important as they are. I want to take a comprehensive view of all the territories which recognise some relation to the British Crown. Some of them are clearly on their way to become independent self-governing Dominions, as, for instance Nigeria and the West Indian Federation; others have serious internal problems to settle before they can qualify for independence, such as the Federation of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland. Then, there are widely scattered colonies which for one reason or another cannot hope to become sovereign independent states; for we have to recognise that the objective cannot in every case be Dominion Status. There is not, as seems sometimes to be supposed, a necessary evolution from Crown Colony to Dominion. What will the commonwealth look like when all the territories which can qualify for Dominion Status have achieved it? Inevitably there will be a wide assortment of remnants. How are they to be governed? This is a question which has not been seriously faced. Great Britain can rightly claim the credit for evolving Commonwealth out of Empire as far as the larger territories are concerned. That is a notable achievement and has been acclaimed by Mr. Adlai Stevenson as among the finest fruits of Britain's political genius; but she still remains a colonial power in a world in which opinion has become markedly hostile to colonialism.

The colonial powers have been on the defensive since the end of the Second World War. The objection to the political dependence of one people on another, the relation of a subordinate people to a metropolitan power, is constantly finding expression in the discussions of the United Nations. The critical attitude is

* The Synopsis of a lecture in the University of Edinburgh's 'Town and Government' series delivered on 20th January, 1956.

also expressed both by the United States and by the Soviet Union, though for different reasons. The Americans are descendants of colonists who fought for their freedom and they have a deep-seated and emotional antipathy towards colonialism. They have traditionally fostered a liberal attitude towards dependent peoples and have as far as possible avoided becoming a colonial power, as, for instance, in their treatment of Cuba and the Philippines. George III is not dead. A young American recently expressed to me his surprise that Great Britain had attained so much freedom despite the handicap of being a monarchy. Chester Wilmot has told us that even such a good friend of Britain as President Roosevelt was somewhat suspicious of the 'Imperial' aims of Winston Churchill. Mr. Cordell Hull actually proposed that dates should be fixed on which all colonial people should be granted their full independence. At the height of the Suez crisis Vice-President Nixon, with the approval of President Eisenhower, declared that America showed its independence of Anglo-Saxon policies towards Asia and Africa for they seemed to reflect the colonial tradition. Russia, on the other hand, realises that the accusation of being 'colonial' is a powerful weapon to employ against the Western democracies and does not hesitate to use it. She affects to sympathise with any disruptive movements in the colonies, though herself allowing no degree of political freedom to her satellites. For the American 'colonial' is a term of reproach: for the Russian it is a term of abuse.

In December, 1955 an Afro-Asian Conference was held in Cairo. It agreed to form an Afro-Asian Peoples Solidarity Council and a Russian was included among its members. The Conference demanded self-determination for colonies and enumerated in the resolution the Cameroons, Kenya, Somaliland, Uganda, Madagascar, South Yemen, (*i.e.*, the Aden Protectorate) and Cyprus.

To sum up—in the United Nations the United States, Russia, the Latin American Republics, the Arab and Asian States, would all be found in the lobby against colonialism. Colonists themselves, or at any rate the politically-conscious elements among them, are well aware of the attitude of world opinion and naturally attempt to profit from it. This has been particularly marked in the East. There are the difficulties which the Dutch have had, in the East Indies, the French had in Indo-China and the British had in Malaya. Great Britain has also been faced with a succession of problems in Kenya, Guiana, Honduras, Cyprus and Malta, all of which illustrate in different degrees resistance to colonial control.

If, as seems to be assumed by world opinion, there is something objectionable, or even discreditable, in being a 'colonial' power, three questions appear to arise. How did Great Britain get involved

in colonialism? How has she conducted herself as a colonial power? What has she done and what can she do to rid herself of her commitments? It is impossible to understand the problems of the British Commonwealth in its present phase unless they are viewed in their historical perspective. This is an appeal to history, not to defend or apologise, but to explain how the problems arose.

We can, I think, distinguish four main phases.

I. The first is quite well marked. After the discovery of the New World the West European States vied with one another in exploiting its resources, the British share fell into two main divisions—the thirteen colonies on the mainland of America which were colonies of settlement—literally in Sir John Seeley's phrase an expansion of England—and the plantation colonies in the West Indies, where exotic products, mainly sugar, were cultivated by means of slave labour imported from West Africa. The latter were highly valued because they were not competitive with the Mother Country as the mainland colonies threatened to be. So far from encouraging emigration to America, it was regarded as a serious loss of people, a regrettable overspill which some writers tried to reconcile themselves to by saying that the Puritans who went to the Northern Colonies were a troublesome lot who might otherwise have gone to Holland and that the vagrants who went to the Southern Colonies might have been hanged had they stayed at home. But to compensate for the loss, such as it was, the Mother Country tried to bind the colonists to her by commercial bonds. They were to be prevented from developing certain industries and their trading was restricted. Friction engendered by this policy led to the revolt of the American Colonies in 1776 and the consequent break-up of the Old Colonial Empire. Had this not occurred—and nothing is more fascinating than conjectures about the might-have-beens of history—the Commonwealth would be ruled today from America. Indeed some people seem to suspect that it is! But was the loss of the American Colonies a loss? Adam Smith, writing in the year of the Revolt, declared that the 'rulers of Britain have, for more than a century past, amused the people with the imagination that they possessed a great empire on the west side of the Atlantic. This empire, however, has hitherto existed in imagination only'. Had Great Britain, he went on to say, not been involved in wars and other expenses on account of the American Colonies it might have been possible to pay off the whole of the National Debt. A solemn thought!

So the Empire was reduced to Canada and Newfoundland, both then undeveloped, the West Indian Islands and the strategic post at Gibraltar; while the trading centres established by the

East India Company, though not colonies, were a matter of increasing concern to the British Government. How concerned public opinion was about the conduct of members of the Company in India is illustrated by the trial of Warren Hastings.

The dismemberment of the Old Empire led to a certain disillusionment about colonies and a tendency to accept Turgot's dictum that colonies are like fruit and fall from the tree when ripe. Experience also revealed that trade with America did not suffer after political separation from Great Britain; and trade was the dominant consideration as the country was becoming thoroughly industrialised.

II. The second phase is not so easy to summarize. It stretches from 1783 to 1874—nearly a hundred years—and it is only possible to mention a few outstanding events. In these years Great Britain won a leading position as a manufacturing nation with command of the seas of the world. She had such advantages that active colonisation was not so important, provided she could maintain the principle of the Open Door: trading posts were more profitable than territorial acquisitions. It was the great era of Free Trade. The growing volume of trade with the Far East required ports of call on the long sea route. Cape Colony was acquired from the Dutch and Mauritius and the Seychelles from the French in 1814. Ceylon had been taken from the Dutch in 1796 to get control of the excellent harbour of Trincomalee. To these were added Singapore (1819), Aden (1839) and Hong Kong (1842). In all these cases the motive was strategic and commercial. Little interest was taken in the development of the hinterland; there was no urge to govern subject peoples.

In these years, indeed, the humanitarian movement in Great Britain attacked the institution of slavery in the West Indies. The slave trade was abolished in 1807 and British gun-boats patrolled the coast of West Africa to prevent infringements of the law. Slavery itself was abolished within the Empire in 1834, Great Britain paying the planters £20,000,000 in compensation. Emancipated slaves left the plantations in large numbers and the sugar islands suffered a relative decline.

During this phase migration from Great Britain continued, but with little or no encouragement from the Government, taking all destinations some three millions left between 1847 and 1856. The English, Scots and Welsh went in large numbers to Natal, Australia and New Zealand; but in even larger numbers to the United States to which the majority of the Irish after the Famine of 1846 migrated. It was in the main a filling up of empty spaces by individual initiative.

Looking back over this period the most significant event was the granting of representative government to Canada. This arose out of a conflict between the Governor and the Assembly; extremists in Upper Canada (Ontario) and Lower Canada (Quebec) actually broke out into rebellion. Lord Durham's Report on the situation which he made in 1839 is one of the great state papers of the Commonwealth. He proposed that the Governor should no longer attempt to rule with the advice of a nominated Executive Council, but that responsibility should be transferred to a Cabinet of Ministers representing the majority party in the House of Assembly. This was the first step towards representative government which led in due course to responsible government and ultimately to Dominion Status. It marked the starting-point of the evolution which has been followed by the countries which now constitute the Commonwealth proper.

III. Throughout this phase there was a marked disinclination to undertake new commitments by fresh territorial acquisitions or treaties of protection. It is the third phase (1874-1914) which is the great imperial phase of British policy. Between 1884 and 1890 territorial acquisitions amounted to 37,000,000 square miles with a population of 57,000,000 people, mainly in Africa. Benjamin Disraeli accused the Liberals of attempting for the previous forty years to liquidate the overseas Empire. After he won the Election of 1874 he responded to the appeals of the Fiji chiefs for annexation to the British Crown; appeals which had previously been refused. He also took four of the Malay Sultanates under formal British protection. These were indications of a new outlook. It gathered strength with the 'scramble for Africa', in which the colonial interests of the Great Powers came into conflict.

Tropical Africa was practically an unknown country until the second half of the nineteenth century. From the later years of the fifteenth century Europeans, especially the Portuguese, had been exploring the coast line. Bartholomew Diaz rounded the Cape of Good Hope in 1486 and Vasco da Gama made his way up the east coast as far as Mombasa, crossed the Indian Ocean, and anchored off Calicut in 1497. The Portuguese were followed by the Dutch and English in the next century. The first English voyage to West Africa was in 1553, but it was not until 1618 that they founded Fort James on the Gambia river. None of the Europeans took any interest in attempting to penetrate inland; in fact, the difficulties of doing so were almost insuperable. They traded with the coast, mostly in slaves, ivory and gold dust, establishing forts to protect their warehouses. It was not until the 'seventies of the nineteenth century that the principal facts of African geography were revealed by the exploration of the great river systems — the Zambesi, Congo, Niger and Nile.

The 'scramble for Africa' was an international contest which often led to dangerous rivalry. The French were the first in the field. They occupied Algeria as early as 1847 and later acquired vast areas in North and West Africa. King Leopold of Belgium gained the great Congo Basin for his country and it became the Congo Free State in 1885. Germany, a new-comer in the colonial field, declared a Protectorate over Togoland, the Cameroons and South-West Africa in 1884. Great Britain, for her part, granted Royal Charters to Companies—the Royal Niger Company in 1886, the Imperial East Africa Company in 1888 and the British South Africa Company in 1889. This proved a temporary arrangement. The territories of the Niger Company passed to the Crown in 1900: the East Africa Company came to an end in 1895 and so Kenya and Uganda likewise passed to the Crown. Cecil Rhodes, the moving spirit in the British South Africa Company, pressed north, induced Portugal to renounce all claims to Nyasaland and negotiated concessions in what are now North and South Rhodesia. By the end of the century the partition of tropical Africa was complete. In the north-east an Anglo-Egyptian condominium was established in the Sudan. The Somali coast was divided between Great Britain, France and Italy. Abyssinia remained an independent state.

The Boer War was the high-water mark of popular support for British Imperialism. At its conclusion the creation of the Union of South Africa, including the Transvaal and the Orange Free State, was a great stroke of statesmanship. But in spite of the noble efforts of Botha and Smuts the wounds have never been completely healed. South Africa joined in the Second World War by a narrow vote of 80 to 67 and the native policy of the present Government there appears to opinion in Great Britain as illiberal and even dangerous for the future.

IV. The two World Wars ushered in a new phase—the fourth in our rapid survey. As a result of the First War the German colonies were forfeited. Great Britain became the mandatory authority for the Cameroons, Tanganyika and Togoland. She was also entrusted with the mandates for Palestine, Transjordan and Iraq. The Empire had reached its widest extent. Writing in 1926 the late Sir Alfred Zimmern said:—'The British Empire is the largest political community in the world. It includes within its borders one quarter of the inhabitants of the world of which the vast majority are governed from London'. The structure, however, had many features of instability. In due course the mandates for Palestine, Transjordan and Iraq were surrendered. Burma became an independent State outside the Empire, as did Britain's nearest neighbour Eire. But the greatest changes came after the Second War with the extension of Dominion Status to India (1947), Pakistan

(1947) and Ceylon (1948). The responsibility which Great Britain had assumed for India after the Mutiny in 1858 thus came to an end. For nearly a century the British administration had endeavoured to make India an economic and political unit. In this it failed. Religious sentiment was so strong that the solution was two separate States and these have proved incapable of settling the vexed question of the status of Kashmir.

Ceylon was a different problem. On the face of it we seem to have in Ceylon a perfect example of the evolution from the status of a Crown Colony to that of a Dominion, a pattern to which colonial development should conform. But it is not so simple as that. Each case has its own particular problems. At first Ceylon had a Governor with extensive powers, administrative, legislative and judicial. He could consult a Chief Justice, a Commander-in-Chief, and a Chief Secretary; but he was under no obligation to do so. These powers were adjudged to be too autocratic and consequently in 1833 an Executive Council was formed consisting of five official members with the Governor as Chairman. A Legislative Council was also set up with nine official and six unofficial members, all of them nominated. A Sinhalese, a Tamil and a Burgher accepted nomination, a recognition of the fact that Ceylon is a plural society consisting of well-marked communities. This form of the constitution actually survived until 1910. Until then there was no election in any sense. There was much agitation in favour of an unofficial majority on the Legislative Council. The number of unofficial members was increased to eight in 1889 and in 1910 the official majority was reduced to one. Up to this point change had been gradual and there was no clear objective. After the First World War, and the enunciation of the principle of self-determination as one of its general objects, the agitation in favour of a majority of unofficials, elected by territorial constituencies, became strong. This was granted in 1920 when the unofficials were at last given a majority and eleven of them were to be elected territorially on a franchise based on property and literacy qualifications. The enlarged Legislative Council with a substantial majority of unofficials did not work well. The unofficials, who had little responsibility for administration tended to regard themselves as an opposition and hampered the work of the Executive Council as far as they could. A Commission was appointed in 1927 under the chairmanship of Lord Donoughmore to attempt to resolve the deadlock. It fell upon the ingenious idea of forming a single Chamber — a State Council — with both executive and legislative powers. The members — apart from a few nominated members — were to be elected by universal suffrage. The first election took place in 1931 and the Sinhalese secured a large majority. The new constitution revealed weaknesses in action. It was based on the principle that after a General Election the members of the State

Council were to be divided into a number of Executive Committees, the Chairmen of which formed an administration. But there was no sense of ministerial responsibility. Each Chairman fought for his own Committee and often openly criticised his colleagues of other Committees.

There were so many complaints that Great Britain promised to consider a further revision of the constitution. A Commission was appointed in November 1944 under the Chairmanship of Lord Soulbury. The problem was not an easy one because Ceylon is a plural society as so many parts of the Empire are. The Sinhalese are about 66 per cent, the Tamils 25 per cent, the Muslims 6 per cent, the Burghers .5 and the Europeans .15 per cent. The Commission recommended a House of Representatives consisting of 101 members, 95 elected territorially by universal suffrage and 6 nominated by the Governor (otherwise, Burghers and Europeans would have no representation). It also recommended a Second Chamber, to be called the Senate, of 30 members, 15 to be elected by the House of Representatives and 15 by the Governor. This was designed to meet the possibility that the Sinhalese majority in the House of Representatives might be tempted to pack the Senate. A Delimitation Commission was to determine the boundaries of the constituencies and to see whether certain areas would provide the possibility of minority community representation. The Report was accepted by the British Government and referred to the State Council. It was approved by a vote of 51 to 3. The Ceylonese leader, Mr. D. S. Senanayake, was determined to follow up this success by claiming Dominion Status, which was beyond the terms of reference of the Soulbury Commission. He could point to the recognition of India and Pakistan and the independence of Burma. Fully responsible status within the Commonwealth was conferred on Ceylon in 1948. The points worthy of note is that the evolution from Crown Colony to Dominion Status was slow and that it was accelerated by the two World Wars.

The normal form of Colonial Government is by Executive and Legislative Councils. The problem is at what stage unofficials are admitted, and how many and on what principle, nominated or elected; and if elected, on what franchise. In a plural society the different communities will demand representation as communities; but communalism is not a good basis for government. It perpetuates sectionalism. In Ceylon the Soulbury Commission did what it could to eliminate communalism from political life. Unfortunately the issue has been inflamed by the proposal to make Sinhalese the official language. This has alienated the Tamils and raised an emotional issue difficult to deal with rationally.

We are, then, in what I have called the fourth phase in the evolution of the Commonwealth. The larger units of the Empire have become, or are in process of becoming, independent sovereign states. Under the terms of the Statute of Westminster they may, if they wish, secede from the Commonwealth. Whether any of them will do so remains to be seen.

If we take the Commonwealth in the strict sense each member of it is represented in the capitals of the others by a High Commissioner. They deal with day to day questions in much the same way as Ambassadors of foreign states do. In London the channel of information is the Commonwealth Relations Office with a Minister in the Government. The separation from the Colonial Office took place in 1925 and recognises the distinction between the Dominions and the Colonies. Meetings of Commonwealth Prime Ministers have been held periodically since 1944 in which there is opportunity for exchange of views. Commonwealth Finance Ministers and Ministers of External Affairs also meet from time to time. It was at such a meeting in Ceylon in 1950 that the Colombo Plan was launched to help in the development of South-East Asia.

As I have indicated, however, the problems which are becoming more insistent are those of the dependent territories. We are reminded of them by what has happened or is happening in Cyprus and Malta, in Kenya and Nyasaland, in Honduras and the Bahamas. Incidentally, it should be noticed that the problems of the colonies in West Africa differ in an important respect from those in East Africa. In West Africa, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Gambia and the Gold Coast (now Ghana) have no significant number of whites, while in East Africa there are areas of white settlement, as in Kenya and the Rhodesias. Here the question of inter-racial understanding arises in an acute form; in fact, of white domination in the government.

A Committee was appointed in 1949 to enquire into the Constitutional Development of the Smaller Colonial Territories. Its Report was printed in 1951; but its findings were not made public. It suggested that a new constitutional status should be established between that of a dependency and that of an independent member of the Commonwealth. This should involve the greatest possible degree of internal self-government vested in a local State Council. The basis of the membership of the State Council should be either by direct election or by indirect election through local government bodies, where such bodies exist. The idea behind this was to lessen, as far as possible, the distinction between dependent and independent membership of the Commonwealth. To put it more concretely, to remove the ambition to pass

from the Colonial Office to the Commonwealth Relations Office and to suggest that that should not be a normal expectation. The Colonies under consideration ranged from Hong Kong with a population of about two and a quarter millions to Pitcairn with a population of less than two hundred. They were scattered over the Mediterranean, Africa, the Indian Ocean, the Atlantic Ocean and the Pacific Ocean—so scattered that the opportunity for federation did not exist, except in the case of the Caribbean Colonies. These are to form the West Indian Federation, but here it should be noticed that Bermuda and the Bahamas are not included nor at present Honduras and Guiana. There is the possibility of transferring responsibility to other members of the Commonwealth, for example, islands in the Pacific to Australia, but such transfers would have to be mutually agreed. The suggestion of integration with the United Kingdom has been made in the case of Malta, perhaps rather ill-advisedly. Integration would involve questions of taxation and welfare services difficult to solve. The concern of Malta is that the future of the dockyard is threatened there and indeed much nearer home by changes in defence policy. Political integration hardly offers a solution.

One thing should be made clear to critics of colonialism; the possession of colonies is not a source of profit to the metropolitan country. The relative backwardness of many colonies is not due to imperialist exploitation, but to natural inequalities of endowment, whether material or human. Political leaders in the colonies who press for self-determination press no less strongly for financial help. There are constant appeals. They have been responded to within the limits of Great Britain's resources. Since 1929 machinery has existed for making grants for colonial development. This has been extended by the Colonial Development and Welfare Act of 1940. Expenditure up to £5,000,000 has been provided for development schemes. Subsequent legislation has made further provision. It now amounts to £220,000,000 over the period 1946-1961, with a maximum of £30,000,000 in any one year. Approved expenditure has covered irrigation schemes, roads, water and sanitation, agricultural and veterinary services and education. There is now a general acceptance of the view that help to the underdeveloped areas of the world is an obligation which the more advanced countries should recognise.

It would be wrong to assume that the problem is merely one of the expenditure of money and the provision of technical advice. Regard must be had to the potentialities of each area; schemes of development require careful investigation and planning. The standard of living over vast areas of the world is deplorably low. No one who has any knowledge of South-East Asia will deny that attempts to raise it may be frustrated by the growth of population.

To return to Ceylon, it has a population of over ten millions and it is increasing at the rate of 2.3 per cent per annum. The fight against disease has reduced the death-rate while the birth-rate remains abnormally high. This is the fundamental question facing the Island and South-East Asia generally.

Enough has been said to show that what I have called the remains of Empire present a vast variety of problems. There are the European Colonies of Gibraltar, Malta and Cyprus¹ with a European standard of living, and there are the primitive communities of the Gilbert and Ellice Islands. What, one may ask is the future of the Commonwealth? Is it in process of disintegration? Perhaps this rapid survey has shown that in all phases it has been subject to change. It has survived because it has exhibited a flexibility which we do not find in the other Empires in history. It has responded in a remarkable way to changing circumstances. It is obviously doing so to-day. Historians do not forecast the future: they attempt to record and interpret the past. What then is the value of the study of History? It is that, while it does not answer questions about the future, it teaches us what questions to ask about the present. That may be the beginning of wisdom.

1. Now independent (1960).

WRITINGS ON CEYLON EPIGRAPHY

A bibliographical guide

H. A. I. GOONETILEKE

PREFACE

"Here are some *antient writings* engraven upon Rocks which poseth all that see them. There are divers great Rocks in diverse parts in *Cande Uda* and in the *Northern Parts*. These rocks are cut deep with great letters for the space of some yards, so deep that they may last to the worlds end. No body can read them or make anything of them. I have asked *Malabars*, *Gentuses* as well as *Chingulays* and *Moors*, but none of them understood them. You walk over some of them. There is an antient temple, *Goddiladenni* in *Yattanour* stands by one place where there are of these letters. They are probably in memorial of something, but of what we must leave to learned men to spend their conjectures". (Robert Knox—*An Historical Relation of the Island Ceylon in the East Indies*. London, Robert Chiswell, 1681. pp. 112, 113).

Epigraphy, by which is meant the discovery, collection, decipherment and study of inscriptions, generally engraved on stones and metal-plates, serves as a singular and unparalleled source for the reconstruction of the past history of Ceylon. In few other countries, is there such a valuable source of information, very often buttressing, sometimes supplementing and in a few cases correcting and modifying the evidences of the chronicles. Archaeological studies in Ceylon, especially the dating and identification of antiquities, have depended to a large degree on the evidence of epigraphy. Where identification and dating of monuments on grounds of architectural style and development alone, are at best hesitant and hazardous, the authority of the inscriptions overrides other considerations in helping to reach a decision with much greater exactitude. They also provide an almost complete epigraphical record of the development and gradual evolution of Sinhalese characters from the Brahmi script to the present form. In the words of Paranavitana, "These inscriptions, as well as the others which are not of particular historical significance, are also interesting in another respect. They add a large number of words to the known vocabulary of the old Sinhalese language, supply us with grammatical forms not forthcoming in other documents, give information regarding important points in the phonetic changes which the Sinhalese language has undergone during the course of centuries, and also elucidate many an obscure point in the evolution of the Sinhalese script" (*A.S.C.A.R.* 1934, p. J. 19).

“Epigraphs or inscriptions abound in Ceylon, the total number already discovered exceeding 2,500. The vast majority were inscribed in various situations on rock, namely, below the drip-edges of caves, on the smooth surfaces of slab rocks, on dressed pillars, stone walls and stone tablets. The earliest inscriptions are contemporary with the introduction of Buddhism in the 3rd century B.C. Well over 1,000 epigraphs, mostly inscribed on caves, belong . . . to the third, second and first centuries B.C. . . . When the cave monastery went out of vogue about the first century, inscriptions began to be inscribed on natural rock surfaces, alongside dagabas, monastic buildings and rock-cut steps. In the fifth, sixth and seventh centuries, inscriptions become much fewer, and no satisfactory explanation has been offered for this break in the epigraphical continuity. They recur, now inscribed on pillars, tablets and slabs in the eighth century, and become prolific again in the ninth, tenth and twelfth centuries, the interruption in the eleventh century being due to the Cola conquest and internal turmoil. In the period of decline beginning in the thirteenth century, they become once again very rare. The subject matter of the inscriptions of all periods is almost invariably connected with a religious benefaction . . . The donors belonged to all classes of society, from kings and royalty to the nobility, district and village chiefs, householders, soldiers, artisans, artists, craftsmen and lay-devotees of both sexes. . . .

The inscriptions of Ceylon constitute a very valuable source of information on dynastic succession, taxation, land tenure and administration. They enable us to form a broad picture of the social order and the everyday life of the people. They are an invaluable source of ancient place-names. Above all, they are the best evidence of the reliability of the chronicles, because, over and over again, they corroborate statements made in the literary sources”. (C. W. Nicholas. *A Concise History of Ceylon*, by C. W. Nicholas and S. Paranavitana (1961). pp. 13-15).

“Hardly less important than stone inscriptions are the many genuine *sannas* (or royal grants used for recording grants of land to persons or institutions) held by vihares, dewales and private individuals. The majority are engraved on copper-plates, elongated and smoothed to receive the writing; a few are written on olas. Some are richly ornamented . . . presenting beautiful specimens of Sinhalese calligraphy . . . The value of these old grants in supplementing the lithic records cannot well be exaggerated. Many side lights of history may not infrequently be gleaned from them; epigraphically they exhibit with faithfulness

the gradual development of the Sinhalese character from the period when writings on stone begin to fail; of the philology of the language itself, they help to build up our knowledge". (H. C. P. Bell, *A.S.C.A.R. Report on the Kegalla District* (1904) p. 68).

"The more important of these inscriptions are being gradually published, with introductory remarks, translations and critical notes, in the pages of the *Epigraphia Zeylanica*", of which periodical the first part appeared in 1904, and since then at fairly regular intervals until 1955, after which nothing has been published. "In the *Epigraphia*, the inscriptions are not published in any chronological or other order. They are dealt with as material for study comes to hand and the inscriptions of various periods have, therefore, not received equal treatment. The tendency also has been to publish only the better preserved inscriptions leaving the short and fragmentary ones. But, for the linguist, these fragmentary and short epigraphs also contain very valuable data, sometimes furnishing him with indisputable evidence for deciding the interpretation of a certain word or the solving of a philological difficulty. A comprehensive view of the whole range of the epigraphical literature available in Ceylon is also not possible from the present method of publishing only selected inscriptions in the *Epigraphia Zeylanica*. For a scientific study of the inscriptions, it would therefore be better to publish all the known records, chronologically arranged, in a *Corpus*, on the same lines as the *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum* published by the Indian Archaeological Survey. Such an undertaking would, of course, be a laborious task, taking at least ten years to complete. All the known inscriptions in Ceylon, to be dealt with properly, would require three volumes of about 500 quarto pages each, excluding the plates. Before starting the real work in the preparation of such a *Corpus*, it is absolutely essential to have satisfactory estampages of all the inscriptions known to exist in the island". (Senerat Paranavitana, *A.S.C.A.R.* 1934 p. J. 19). Paranavitana suggests that all the Brahmī inscriptions, i.e. from the earliest period up to about the 4th century A.D. would form the material for the first volume of the proposed *Corpus*. Since these words were written, the passage of years has rendered the undertaking even more formidable and time-consuming, but not a whit less urgent.

This bibliography is designed to present a simple and straightforward guide to the literature, both books and articles, relating to the inscriptions of Ceylon. It does not pretend to be exhaustive, but it aims to include with something approaching completeness all specialised contributions to the subject. It is confined to publications in the English language, though some monographs

in Sinhalese have been included in the General Section. Reviews, and articles in newspapers and other ephemeral media have been excluded. The material has been divided into three sections: General, Individual sites, and Miscellaneous. An appendix on European inscriptions closes the bibliography. There is an author index. In each of the sections the arrangement is alphabetically by authors, except in the largest of them, dealing with individual sites where the principle of division is by the name of the site alphabetically and within each such sub-division alphabetically by author. As each article in *Epigraphia Zeylanica* is illustrated by a plate containing the inscription discussed, this detail has been omitted in the listing. The compiler will be grateful if omissions and other flaws are kindly brought to his notice. It is hoped that this bibliography will be of some value to students and scholars by serving as a convenient pathway to the subject, and above all, saving everyone concerned a great deal of time in tracking down references.

THE BIBLIOGRAPHY

GUIDE TO PERIODICALS ABBREVIATED

A.B.I.A.	... Annual Bibliography of Indian Archaeology (Leiden)
A.S.C.A.R.	... Archaeological Survey of Ceylon. Annual Report
B.S.O.A.S.	... Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, London University
C.A.L.R.	... The Ceylon Antiquary and Literary Register
C.H.J.	... The Ceylon Historical Journal
C.J.H.S.S.	... The Ceylon Journal of Historical and Social Studies
C.J.S. (G)	... The Ceylon Journal of Science (Section G)
C.L.R.	... The Ceylon Literary Register
C.T.	... Ceylon Today
E.I.	... Epigraphia Indica
E.Z.	... Epigraphia Zeylanica, being lithic and other inscriptions of Ceylon
I.A.	... Indian Antiquary
J.A.	... Journal Asiatique
J.A.S. (Bengal)	... The Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal
J.D.B.U. (Cey.)	... The Journal of the Dutch Burgher Union of Ceylon

J.R.A.S. (C.B.)	...	The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (Ceylon Branch)
J.R.A.S. (G.B. & I)	...	The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland
M.L.R.	...	The Monthly Literary Register and Notes and Queries for Ceylon
N.L.	...	The New Lanka: a quarterly review
S.Z.	...	Spolia Zeylanica: bulletin of the National Museums of Ceylon
Taprobanian	...	The Taprobanian, a Dravidian Journal of Oriental Studies in and around Ceylon
Trans. R.A.S. (G.B. & I)	...	Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland
U.B.A. (P)	...	The University Buddhist Annual (Peradeniya)
U.C.R.	...	The University of Ceylon Review

General

1. AMARAVAMSA *Sthavira*, Kotmale. *Lakdiva sel lipi*. (Rock inscriptions of Ceylon). Part 1. Colombo, M. D. Gunasena and Co., 1959, iv(2), 107 p. ("Malaya" series—1).
2. AMERESEKERE, H. E. Sinhalese chronology of the 14th and 15th centuries A.D. recast according to Sinhalese inscriptions and contemporary annals. *C.L.R.* (3rd series) Vol. 1, No. 4, April 1931, pp. 158-160
3. BELL, H. C. P. & CODRINGTON, H. W. Critical notes on the "Epigraphia Zeylanica". Nos. 1-8, *C.A.L.R.* Vol. 4, Part 1, July 1918, pp. 19-35, 3 pl.
4. BELL, H. C. P. Inscriptions in the North-Central, Northern, North-Western, Central, Sabaragamuwa, Western, Southern and Eastern provinces, examined between 1906 and 1912 inclusive. (286 inscriptions). *A.S.C.A.R.* 1911-12. Appendix F. pp. 116-123.
5. ————North-Central, North-Western and Northern provinces. Inscriptions examined between 1901 and 1905. (Nos. 1-165). *A.S.C.A.R.* 1905, pp. 39-42.
6. ————Tamil inscriptions. *A.S.C.A.R.* 1911-12. Appendix E. pp. 109-115, classified table of 48 inscriptions, (Containing "Notes on Tamil inscriptions from Ceylon" by H. Krishna Sastri, pp. 109-112).
7. BRODIE, A. O. Notice of various rock inscriptions in the North-Western province. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)* Vol. 2, No. 8, 1855, pp. 181-184, 4 pl.
8. CANDAJOTI *Thera*, Kotaneluve. *Silalekhana malava*. (Collection of rock inscriptions). Kurunegala, Sampata Mudranalaya, 1952. xlv, 109 p.

9. CEYLON. Archaeological Survey of Ceylon. *Annual Reports of the Archaeological Commissioner, 1890—*
 Not all the reports contain epigraphical data. The data when it occurs can be divided into: (a) Notice of epigraphical discoveries with location, probable date and name of king when given; (b) Brief notes and comments on these discoveries, especially after 1930 by S. Paranavitana; (c) Texts and sometimes the translation of some of the shorter records.
10. CEYLON. Archaeological Survey of Ceylon. *Epigraphia Zeylanica, being lithic and other inscriptions of Ceylon*; ed. and tr. by Don Martino de Zilva Wickremasinghe Vol. 1, 1904-1912. London, published for the Government of Ceylon by Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press, 1912. vi, (2), 274 p., 30 pl.
11. CEYLON. Archaeological Survey of Ceylon. *Epigraphia Zeylanica, being lithic and other inscriptions of Ceylon*; ed. and tr. by Don Martino de Zilva Wickremasinghe. Vol. 2, 1912-1927. London, published for the Government of Ceylon by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1928. xvi, 322 p., 38 pl.
12. CEYLON. Archaeological Survey of Ceylon. *Epigraphia Zeylanica, being lithic and other inscriptions of Ceylon*. Vol. 3, 1928-1933; ed. by S. Paranavitana. London, published for the Government of Ceylon by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1933. xvi, 358 p., 38 pl.
13. CEYLON. Archaeological Survey of Ceylon. *Epigraphia Zeylanica, being lithic and other inscriptions of Ceylon*. Vol. 4, 1934-1941; ed. by S. Paranavitana. London, published for the Government of Ceylon by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1943. viii, (4), 328 p., 28 pl.
14. CEYLON. Archaeological Survey of Ceylon. *Epigraphia Zeylanica, being lithic and other inscriptions of Ceylon*. Vol. 5, Part 1; ed. by S. Paranavitana. Colombo, printed at the Government Press, Ceylon, 1955. 176 p., 7 pl.
15. CEYLON. Historical Manuscripts Commission. *First Report* (June 1933). 22 p. (Sessional paper X-1933); *Second Report* (September 1935). 65 p., 2 pl. (Sessional paper XXI-1935); *Third Report* (September 1951, 132 p. (Sessional paper XIX-1951)).
16. Ceylon inscriptions (Texts). *South Indian Inscriptions (Texts)*. Vol. 4; Miscellaneous inscriptions from the Tamil, Telugu, and Kannada countries and Ceylon; ed. by H. Krishna Sastri. Madras, Government Press, 1923. Nos. 1388-1415 (pp. 489-496), 1 pl. (Pl. xi. Anuradhapura inscriptions of Sri Sanghabodhi-Maharaja, p. 493).
17. CHATTERJEE, Charandas. Some Sinhalese words traced. *Proc. & Trans. of the Second Oriental Conference, Calcutta, 1922*. Calcutta University, 1923. pp. 507-513.
 An attempt to trace the origin of five Sinhalese words through the ancient inscriptional as well as the Sanskritic dialects.
18. CODRINGTON, H. W. Inscriptions. *Ceylon coins and currency*. Colombo (A.C. Richards, Acting Government Printer) 1924. Appendix D, pp. 193-201.
 Extracts from inscriptions of the 1st-16th centuries A.D., relating to coinage.

19. DEVENDRA, D. T. The Archaeological Survey of Ceylon, 1890-1960. *C. T.* Vol. 9, No. 7, July 1960, pp. 13-18, illus.
20. ————Seventy years of Ceylon archaeology. *Artibus Asiae*. Vol. 22, Nos. 1 and 2, 1959, pp. 23-40, 10 illus.
21. FERNANDO, P. E. E. Palaeographical development of the Brahmi script in Ceylon from the 3rd century B.C. to the 7th century A.D. *U.C.R.* Vol. 7, No. 4, October 1949, pp. 282-301.
22. ————Development of the Sinhalese script from the 8th century A.D. to 15th century A.D. *U.C.R.* Vol. 8, No. 4, October 1950, pp. 222-243, 2 fold tables.
23. GEIGER, WILHELM. Königsnamen in den Brahmi-Inschriften Ceylons. *Festschrift Moriz Winternitz, 1863-23 December-1933*; ed. by Otto Stein and Wilhelm Gampert. Leipzig, Otto Harrassowitz, 1933. pp. 313-321.
24. GOLDSCHMIDT, PAUL. Notes on ancient Sinhalese inscriptions. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 6, No. 20, 1879, pp. 1-45.
25. ————*Report on the inscriptions found in the North-Central province*. Colombo, G. J. A. Skeen, Government Printer, Ceylon, 1875. 4 p. (Sessional Paper IX—1875) Reprinted in: *I.A.* Vol. 5. 1876, pp. 189-192.
26. ————*Further report on the inscriptions found in the North-Central Province*. Colombo, G. J. A. Skeen, acting Government Printer, Ceylon, 1875. 4 p. (Sessional Paper XXIV—1875).
27. ————*Report on inscriptions found in the North-Central province, and in the Hambantota district*. Colombo, William Henry Herbert, Government Printer, Ceylon, 1876. 14 p. (Sessional Paper XI—1876) Reprinted in: *I.A.* Vol. 6, 1877, pp. 318-329.
28. GUNASEKARA, A. M. Palikada or Halikada? *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 26, No. 70, 1917, Notes and Queries, pp. 45-47.
29. INDRAPALA, KARTHIGESU. Hinduism in ancient Ceylon: epigraphic sources of its history. *Hindu Dharma (Magazine of the Hindu Students' Union, University of Ceylon, Peradeniya)*. Vol. 6, 1961. pp. 15-18.
30. JAYAWARDENA, W. A. Some observations on the nature and contents of the 4th-6th century inscriptions of Ceylon. *C.H.J.* Vol. 1, No. 2, October 1951, pp. 120-121.
31. KARUNARATNE, W. SADDHAMANGALA. Archaeology in Ceylon: Part 2. The history of epigraphical research. *Ceylon Today*. Vol. 4, No. 11, November 1955, pp. 12-17, 5 illus.
32. ————*A Critical Edition of Unpublished Brahmi Inscriptions of Ceylon (including two revised inscriptions)*. With transliteration, translation and notes, and commentary on orthography, palaeography, language and grammar. 2 vols. Vol. 1 Text. 217, xiv p.; Vol. 2. Plates: Pt. 1. The evolution of the Brahmi script in Ceylon (35 charts); Pt. 2. Photoprints of the inscriptions, maps. (Unpublished typescript. Ph. D. thesis. Cambridge University, 1960).
33. ————Early inscriptions of Ceylon and Buddhist monastic establishments. *C.T.* Vol. 5, Nos. 5 and 6, May-June 1956, pp. 33-37, 2 illus.
34. ————(a) New inscriptions copied in 1951. (Nos. 1-21). *A.S.C.A.R.* 1951. Appendix F, pp. G. 64-65; (b) 1952. (Nos. 1-21). *A.S.C.A.R.* 1952. Appendix II, pp. G. 40-43; (c) 1953. (Nos. 1-31). *A.S.C.A.R.* 1953. Appendix II, pp. G. 26-28; (d) 1954. (Nos. 1-51). *A.S.C.A.R.* 1954. Appendix II, pp. G. 35-39; (e) 1955. (Nos. 1-19). *A.S.C.A.R.* 1955. Appendix I, pp. G. 34-35; (f) 1956. (Nos. 1-36). *A.S.C.A.R.* 1956, pp. G. 10-12; (g) 1957. (Nos. 1-9). *A.S.C.A.R.* 1957, p. G. 32; (h) 1960. (Nos. 1-11) *A.S.C.A.R.* 1960, p. G. 99.

35. ————*Sinhala sila lekha* (Rock inscriptions of Ceylon) 2nd ed. Colombo, M. D. Gunasena & Co., 1960. 60 p.
36. KARUNATILAKE, W. S. Mahayanism in Ceylon during the Anuradhapura period: epigraphical evidence. *U.B.A. (P)* Vol. 9, 1958-59, pp. 17-20.
37. KRISHNA SASTRI, H. Notes on Tamil inscriptions from Ceylon. *A.S.C.A.R.* 1911-12. Appendix E, pp. 109-112.
38. LIYANAGAMAGE, A. A peep into the earliest phase of Buddhist activities in Ceylon through the Mahavamsa and inscriptions. *U.B.A. (P)* Vol. 8, 1957-58, pp. 45-51.
39. MEHENDALE, M. A. Some phonetic peculiarities of early Ceylonese Lena inscriptions. *Bharatiya Vidya (Bombay)*. Vol. 10, 1949, pp. 35-41.
40. MODDER, FRANK, H. A note on the ancient inscriptions in the North-Western Province. *The Kandyan*. Vol. 2, No. 2, August 1905, pp. 131-133.
41. MULLER, EDWARD. *Ancient inscriptions in Ceylon*, collected and published for the Government by Dr. Edward Muller. London, Trubner & Co., 1883. 2 vols. Vol. 1. Text, 219 p.; Vol. 2. Plates, 151 pl. A general account of 172 inscriptions, with romanized texts, translations and lithograph plates.
42. ————Notes on ancient Sinhalese inscriptions. *J.R.A.S. (CB.)*. Vol. 8, No. 26, 1883, pp. 18-43.
43. ————*Report on ancient inscriptions in the North-Western province*. Colombo, William Henry Herbert, Government Printer, Ceylon, 1879. 7 p. (Sessional Paper XI-1879). Reprinted in: *I.A.* Vol. 9, 1880, pp. 8-14.
44. ————*Report on ancient inscriptions in the North-Western province and in the districts of Matale and Trincomalee*. Colombo, William Henry Herbert, Government Printer, Ceylon, 1880. 7 p. (Sessional paper II-1880). Reprinted in: *I.A.* Vol. 9, 1880, pp. 268-274.
45. ————*Report on the inscriptions in the Hambantota district*. Colombo, William Henry Herbert, Government Printer, Ceylon 1878. 7 p. (Sessional paper XXV-1878).
46. ————*Translations of ancient inscriptions from the Anuradhapura and Hambantota districts, now in the Colombo Museum*. Colombo G. J. A. Skeen, Government Printer, Ceylon, 1881, 2 p. (Sessional paper XXV-1881). Reprinted in: *A Guide to the Colombo Museum*: ed. by A Haley. Colombo, 1895. Appendix, pp. 25-29.
47. NEVILL, HUGH. Inscriptions in Asokha's alphabet, reading from right to left. *Taprobanian*. Vol. 1, February 1886, p. 69.
48. ————On inscriptions in Ceylon in the "Asokha" alphabet Nos. 1-3. *Taprobanian*. Vol. 1, October 1885, pp. 5-8. (1. Paruma Kanda (N.W.P.); 2. Gal-lena Wihara; 3. Dambul).
49. ————Inscriptions in Ceylon (Asokha)—Dynastic. Nos 4-5. *Taprobanian* Vol. 1, December 1885, pp. 38-40; Nos. 7-9, Vol. 1, June 1886; pp. 149-152; Nos. 10-11, Vol. 2, April 1887, pp. 52-55. (4. Henane Gala, Lower Bintenne (E.P.); 5. Aembul-amba, Galgamuwa and Ponikulam; 7. Mulgiri Gala; 8. Nuwara Gala (Lower Bintenne); 9. Jaya Abisawarayalena; 10. Bowata; 11. Ten miles west of Maha Lenama).
50. ————The Southern Asokha character J. *Taprobanian*. Vol. 1, April 1886, pp. 98-99.
51. ————The U and E in Asokha inscriptions in Ceylon. *Taprobanian*. Vol. 1, April 1886, p. 98.

52. NICHOLAS, C. W. Epigraphical map of Ceylon, 3rd century B.C. to 3rd Century A.C. *U.C.R.* Vol. 7, No. 2, April 1949, pp. 142-144, fold map.
53. ———— Epigraphical sources. *A Concise History of Ceylon from the Earliest Times to the Arrival of the Portuguese in 1505*, by C. W. Nicholas and S. Paranavitana. Colombo, Ceylon University Press Board, 1961. Ch. 1. Introduction, pp. 13-15.
54. ———— Historical topography of ancient and medieval Ceylon. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 6 (new series), Special Number. 1959, pp. 1-223.
55. ———— Additions and amendments to the historical topography of ancient and medieval Ceylon. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 7 (new series), Part 2, 1961, pp. 225-230.
56. ———— Palaeographical development of the Brahmi script in Ceylon from the 3rd century B.C. to the 7th century A.C. *U.C.R.* Vol. 7, No. 1, January 1949, pp. 60-64, fold. chart.
57. ———— Some lesser-known Pre-Christian ruins. Parts 1-3. Rohana, Rajaratha, and Malaya. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 5 (new series), Part 2, 1958, pp. 138-159.
58. ———— The titles of the Sinhalese Kings as recorded in the inscriptions of the 3rd century B.C. to the 3rd century A.C. *U.C.R.* Vol. 7, No. 4, October 1949, pp. 235-248.
59. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Brahmi inscriptions in Sinhalese verse. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 36, No. 98, 1945, pp. 58-66.
60. ———— Brahmi inscriptions recently discovered in Ceylon. *A.B.I.A.* Vol. 9, 1934, pp. 18-19.
61. ———— Epigraphical discoveries in Ceylon during the year 1935. *A.B.I.A.* Vol. 10, 1935, pp. 37-38.
62. ———— Epigraphical summaries. *C.J.S. (G)*. Vol. 1, Part 4, February 1928, pp. 165-173; Vol. 2, Part 1, December 1928, pp. 17-29; Vol. 2, Part 2, August 1930, pp. 99-128; Vol. 2, Part 3, October 1933, pp. 175-228.
Each article contains a tabulated list of the inscriptions copied by the Archaeological Department in the period surveyed. Brief notes on the more important records of those which have been copied for the first time precede the table.
63. ———— The history of inscriptions in Ceylon. *Buddhist*. Vol. 9 (new series), No. 6, October 1938, pp. 96-99.
64. ———— Interpretation of "Vaharala" *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Part I, 1955, pp. 35-65.
65. ———— Recent epigraphical discoveries in Ceylon. *A.B.I.A.* Vol. 7, 1932, pp. 33-35.
66. ———— Sanskrit in Ceylon epigraphy. *Bharati: Annual of the Indological Society. University of Ceylon, Peradeniya.* 1957-58, pp. 3-7.
67. ———— Seven Sinhalese inscriptions of the Seventh and Eighth centuries. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 3, 1936, pp. 142-150.
- 67a. ———— Some Sinhalese inscriptions of circa sixth century, *U. C. R.* Vol. 20, No. 1, 1962, pp. 1-11, 2 pl.
68. PARKER, HENRY. The earliest inscriptions. *Ancient Ceylon*. London, Luzac, 1909. Part 3, pp. 415-458, illus.
69. ———— Some early inscriptions in Ceylon. *C.L.R.* Vol. 2, No. 51, July 6, 1888, p. 408.
70. PERERA, LAKSHMAN, S. The Brahmi inscriptions as a source for the study of the early history of Ceylon. *C.H.J.* Vol. 1, No. 2, October 1951, pp. 78-96.
71. ———— *The institutions of ancient Ceylon from inscriptions: (from earliest times to 1016 A.D.)*. 3 vols. cv. 1611 p. (Unpublished typescript. Ph. D. thesis, University of Ceylon, June 1949).

72. ————Proprietary and tenurial rights in ancient Ceylon. *C.J.H.S.S.* Vol. 2, No. 1, January 1959, pp. 1-36, 1 diagr. A connected account of the nature of land ownership and rights of tenure up to the 8th century A.D., based mainly on epigraphic evidence.
73. ————The Royal lineage in the Prasastis of the 8th-10th century inscriptions. *C.H.J.* Vol. 2, Nos. 3 and 4, January and April 1953, pp. 230-236
74. ————The sources of Ceylon history. *University of Ceylon History of Ceylon.* Ceylon University Press Board, 1959. Vol. 1, Part 1, Book 1, Ch. 4, pp. 46-73. (3. Epigraphical sources, pp. 66-72).
75. PRINSEP, JAMES. Facsimiles of ancient inscriptions (from Ceylon), lithographed by James Prinsep. *J.A.S. (Bengal).* Vol. 5, September 1836. pp. 554-556, 2 pl. (8 inscriptions from Fort Ostenburgh, (Trincomalie), Haburenni, Sigiri, Damboul, Alue Vihari).
76. REIMERS, EDMUND. Ancient sannas: the work of the Historical Manuscripts Commission. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.).* Vol. 33, No. 87, 1934, pp. 40-46.
77. RHYS DAVIDS, T. W. On methods of taking impressions of inscriptions. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.).* Vol. 5, No. 16. 1870-71, pp. 1-3.
78. STILL, JOHN. Northern province: Inscriptions. *A.S.C.A.R.* 1905, pp. 43-50. (Maha-kachat-kodi; Erupotana; Periya Puliyankulam; Vedakunari-malai; Kal-niravi; Manal-keni; Periyakulam).
79. TURNOUR, GEORGE. Translations of inscriptions, to serve as an appendix to the "Epitome of the history of Ceylon", with an introduction by George Turnour. *Ceylon Almanac 1834.* Part 3, pp. 171-192. (Introduction, pp. 171-178; Nos. 1 and 2, Inscriptions at Mihintele, pp. 178-184; Nos. 3 and 4. The inscriptions on the Great Tablet at Pollonnarowe, pp. 184-188; No. 5. Inscription on the Dambulla Rock—A.D. 1200, pp. 189-190; No. 6, Engraven on a tablet formed on a rock at Pollonnarowe, pp. 190-192. Reprints: (1) *Eleven years in Ceylon*, by Major Jonathan Forbes. 2 vols. London, Richard Bentley, 1840. Vol. 2, pp. 324-356. (2) *C.L.R.* Vol. 5, No. 16, November 18, 1890, pp. 127-128; Vol. 5, No. 17, November 25, 1890, p. 136; Vol. 5, No. 18, December 2, 1890, pp. 143-144; Vol. 5, No. 19, December 9, 1890, pp. 150-152; Vol. 5, No. 20, December 16, 1890, pp. 157-158.
80. VIMALAKITTI Thera, MADAUYANGODA. *Sila lekhaṇa saṅgraha* (Collection of rock inscriptions) Moratuwa, D. P. Dodangoda & Co., Part 1. (1951). (4), iii, (29, numbered ၄-၆၁) vi, 128, v. p.; Part 2 (1953). (2), (4, numbered ၄-၄၃) iv, lxxii, 73-174, vii p.; Part 3 (1954). (4), (5, numbered ၄-၅) ii, 216, viii p.; Part 4 (1956). (1) 7, numbered ၄-၆) ii., 215, vii p.; Part 5 (1958) (2), (9, numbered ၄-၉) iii, 300, viii p.
81. VIMALANANDA, TENNEKON. *The Epigraphy and Palaeography of Ceylon down to the 10th century A.D.* (Unpublished typescript. Ph.D. Thesis. London University, 1952).
- 81a. VIMALANANDA, TENNEKON. *The lithic records of Ceylon.* Colombo, Colombo Plan Exhibition (Ceylon University Press, printers), 1952. 4 p.
82. ————*Parani Lamkava ha sila lipi.* (Ancient Ceylon and its rock inscriptions). Colombo, M. D. Gunasena & Co., 1957. vi., 179 (2), xlix, lxxxix, xix, xxxvi, vi, iii, (1) iv p. (Plates in separate folding satchel).
83. ————Two pioneers of epigraphy in Ceylon. (Goldschmidt and Muller). *C.H.J.* Vol. 1, No. 4, April 1952, pp. 358-360.
84. VIMALAVAMSA *Sthavira*, BADDEGAMA. *Sellipi samajaya.* (Sinhalese society through inscriptions). Colombo. W. D. J. Ratnayaka Appuhamy (Anula Press, printers), 1959. 248 p., 17 illus.

85. WARNASURIYA, W. M. A. Inscriptional evidence bearing on the nature of religious endowment in ancient Ceylon. *U.C.R.* Vol. 1, No. 1, April 1943, pp. 69-74; Vol. 1, No. 2; November 1943, pp. 74-82; Vol. 2, Nos. 1 and 2, October 1944, pp. 92-96.
86. WIJAYARATNE, D. J. *History of the Sinhalese noun: a morphologica l study based on inscriptions*. Peradeniya, University of Ceylon Press Board, 1956. xxv, 217 p.
- 86a. WIJAYARATNE, D. J. Interpretation of *Vaharala*, etc. in Sinhalese inscriptions. *U.C.R.* Vol. 10, No. 1, January 1952, pp. 103-117.
87. ————— Some observations on the intervocalic sonant in Sinhalese inscriptions. *U.C.R.* Vol. 1, No. 1, April 1943, pp. 102-107.
88. ————— The use of the "Inanimate" noun with "Animate" significance in Sinhalese inscriptions. *U.C.R.* Vol. 12, No. 3, July 1954, pp. 177-181.
89. WIJERATNE, P. B. F. *Phonology of the Sinhalese inscriptions up to the end of the 10th century A.D.* (Unpublished typescript. Ph.D. thesis. London University, 1944).
90. ————— Phonology of the Sinhalese inscriptions up to the end of the 10th century A.D. *B.S.O.A.S.* Vol. XI, 1943-1946, pp. 580-594; 823-836; Vol. 12, 1947-1948, pp. 163-183; Vol. 13, 1949-1951, pp. 166-181; Vol. 14, 1952, pp. 263-298.

Contains an alphabetic and a chronological list of inscriptions with references to the texts of translations in the *Epigraphia Zeylanica*.

Individual Sites

This section contains articles dealing with inscriptions at specific sites and localities. The material is arranged alphabetically by the name of the place.

Alutnuvara (Kagalla district devale)

91. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Alutnuvara slab-inscriptions. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 6, 1943, pp. 261-270.

Alutvava

92. WICKREMASINGHE, D. M. de Z. Alutvava pillar inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 5, 1923, pp. 229-235.

Ambagamuva

93. ————— Ambagamuva rock-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 5, 1923, 202-218.

Ampitiya

94. CODRINGTON, H. W. The Ampitiya rock-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 6, 1943, pp. 271-273.

Andaragollava

See No. 323

Anuradhapura

95. BELL, H. C. P. Inscribed pillar at Anuradhapura. *C.A.L.R.* Vol. 4, Part 2, October 1918, pp. 102-108, 2 pl. (Introduction to text and transcript, by Muhandiram D. A. L. Perera, pp. 105-6).
96. CODRINGTON, H. W. The Daladage inscription. *Ancient land tenure and revenue in Ceylon*. Colombo, Ceylon Government Press, printers, 1938 (1950 reprint). Appendix II, pp. 65-66.
97. GUNASEKARA, B. Two Sinhalese inscriptions. (No. 1). At the Ruwanweli Dagaba. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 7, No. 25, 1882, pp. 181-186.
98. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Anuradhapura: slab-inscription of Khudda-Parinda. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 3, 1936, pp. 111-115.
99. ————A fragmentary inscription from Jetavanarama now in the Colombo Museum. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 6, 1943, pp. 273-285.
100. ————A fragmentary inscription on a pillar discovered near Jaffna Road, Anuradhapura. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 3, 1930, pp. 126-131.
101. ————A fragmentary slab-inscription found at the "Buddhist railing", Anuradhapura. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 5, 1932, pp. 226-229.
102. ————Inscriptions on the steps near "Burrows Pavilion" at Anuradhapura. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 3, 1936, pp. 136-141.
103. ————Inscriptions on the stone canoe within the citadel, Anuradhapura. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 3, 1930, pp. 131-137.
104. ————Kaparama Sanskrit inscription at Samghanandin. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Part 1, 1955, pp. 162-169.
105. ————A note on the "Abhayagiri" copper-plate inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 3, 1930, pp. 169-171.
106. ————Pillar-inscription of Bhuvanaikabahu Mahapa from Anuradhapura. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 5, 1932, pp. 286-288.
107. ————Rock-inscription of Dathopattissa near Dakkhina Thupa Anuradhapura, *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Part 1, 1955, pp. 65-72.
108. ————Ruvanvalisaya pillar-inscription of the reign of Buddhadasa (388-416 A.D.). *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 3, 1930, pp. 120-126.
109. ————The Ruvanvalisaya slab-inscription of Queen Kalyanavati. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 5, 1939, pp. 253-260.
110. ————Tamil householder's terrace, Anuradhapura. *A.B.I.A.* Vol. 13, 1938, pp. 13-14. *Reprinted in: J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 35, No. 93, 1940, pp. 54-56. (Earliest epigraphical record of the Tamils in Ceylon).
111. ————Thuparama slab-inscription of Gajabahu I. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 3, 1930, pp. 114-119.
112. RHYS DAVIDS, T. W. Two old Sinhalese inscriptions. (B) The Ruwanweli inscription found in 1874 by Naranwita Unnansc, at the S.E. entrance to the terrace round the Ruwanweli Dagaba at Anuradhapura. *J.R.A.S. (G.B. & I.)*. Vol. 7 (new series) 1874-75. Introduction pp. 353-355; 360-364; Notes. pp. 372-375.
113. WICKREMASINGHE, D. M. de Z. Abhayagiri copper-plate inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 1, Part 1, 1904, pp. 39-40.
114. ————Anuradhapura: slab-inscription of Kassapa V. *E.Z.* Vol. 1, Part 1, 1904, pp. 41-57.
115. ————Anuradhapura: slab-inscription of Mahinda IV, near the "Stone-canoe". *E.Z.* Vol. 1, Part 3, 1907, pp. 113-120.
116. ————Jetavanarama Sanskrit inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 1, Part 1, 1904, pp. 1-9.
117. ————Jetavanarama inscription of Malu-Tisa. *E.Z.* Vol. 1, Part 6, 1912, pp. 252-259.

118. ————Jetavanarama slab-inscription (No. 1) of Mahinda IV.
E.Z. Vol. 1, Part 6, 1912, pp. 213-229.
119. ————Jetavanarama slab-inscription (No. 2) of Mahinda IV.
E.Z. Vol. 1, Part 6, 1912, pp. 230-241.
120. ————Kiribat—Vehera pillar-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 1, Part 4,
1909, pp. 153-161.
121. ————The slab-inscription of Kirti-Nissanka-Malla (1187-1196
A.D.) at Ruvanvali-Dagaba, Anuradhapura, *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 2,
1914, pp. 70-83.

Ataviragollava

122. ————Ataviragollava pillar-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 1,
1912, pp. 44-49.

Ayitigevava

123. ————Ayitegevava pillar-inscription *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 1, 1912,
pp. 34-38.

Badulla

124. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Badulla pillar-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 3,
Part 2, 1929, pp. 71-100.

Batalagoda-vava

125. ————Batalagoda-vava slab-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 2,
1935, pp. 73-82.

Batticaloa

126. COLEBROOKE, W. M. G. A letter from Lt. Col. W. M. G. Colebrooke
of the Royal Artillery, F.R.S., M.R.A.S., etc. transmitting three
facsimiles of inscriptions discovered on the island of Ceylon. *Trans.*
R.A.S. (G.B. & I.), Vol. 3, 1835, pp. 383-384.
127. NEVILL, HUGH. Tamil inscriptions in Ceylon (Tirukovil). *Taprobanian*.
Vol. 1, October 1885, p. 4.
128. ————Tamil inscriptions in Ceylon. No. 3 Verukal Temple.
Taprobanian. Vol. 2, December 1887, p. 163.
129. ————Tamil inscriptions in Ceylon. No. 4. Tambiranar
Kona Nathan Kovil. *Taprobanian*. Vol. 3, April 1888, p. 26.
130. The Tirukoyil inscription, by Historicus. *C.L.R. (3rd series)*. Vol. 3,
No. 12, December 1934, pp. 551-553.

Bilibava

131. WICKREMASINGHE, D. M. de Z. Bilibava pillar-inscription. *E.Z.*
Vol. 2, Part 1, 1912, pp. 38-43.

Bopitiya

132. ————Bopitiya slab-inscription of Kalyanavati. *E.Z.* Vol. 2,
Part 4, 1917, pp. 190-192.

Buddhannehala

133. ————Buddhannehala pillar-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 1, Part 5,
1911, pp. 191-200.

Budumuttava

134. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Two Tamil pillar-inscriptions from Budumuttava. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 6, 1933, pp. 302-312.

Dadigama

135. —————Dadigama slab-inscription of Bhuvaneka Bahu VI. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 5, 1932, pp. 278-286.

Dambulla

136. RHYS DAVIDS, T. W. The cave of the Golden Rock, Dambulla, Ceylon. *I.A.* Vol. 1, May 1872, pp. 139-141. (Inscription under the katara (ledge) of Dambulla cave temple).
137. WICKREMASINGHE, D. M. de Z. Dambulla rock-inscription of Kirti Nissanka Malla. *E.Z.* Vol. 1, Part 4, 1909, pp. 121-135.

Dehigama

138. Translation of the Dehigama sannas. *M.L.R.* Vol. 1, No. 5, May 1893, p. 105.

Demaladuva

139. PIERIS, PAUL E. The date of King Bhuvaneka Bahu VII *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 22, No. 65, 1912, pp. 267-280, 3 pl. (Appendix C. by H. C. P. Bell, pp. 283-295, 3 pl.; Appendix E, by the author. pp. 297-8 The Demaladuva and Mampe sannas.

Devanagala

140. Dewanagala inscription. *The Friend (2nd series)*. Vol. 1, No. 5, April 1870, pp. 57-60.
141. GUNASEKARA, B. Devanagala inscription. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 10, No. 34, 1887. pp. 103-105.
142. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Devanagala Rock-inscription of Parakramabahu I. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 6, 1933, pp. 312-325.

Devundara (Dondra)

143. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Inscriptions. *The Shrine of Upulvan at Devundara*. Colombo, Ceylon Government Archaeological Dept., 1953. Ch. 5, pp. 60-80.
144. —————The Upulvan Shrine at Devinuvara. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 38, No. 106, 1948, pp. 37-41.
145. RHYS DAVIDS, T. W. Dondra inscription. *I.A.* Vol. 1, November 1872, pp. 329-331.
146. —————Dondra inscription No. 1: Text, translation and notes. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 5, No. 16, 1870-71, pp. 25-28.
147. —————On an inscription at Dondra. No. 2, *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 5, No. 17, 1871-72, pp. 57-66.

Dimbulagala

148. BELL, H. C. P. Dimbulagala: its caves, ruins and inscriptions. Parts 1 and 2. *C.A.L.R.* Vol. 3, Part 1, July 1917, pp. 1-12, 6 pl.; Vol. 3, Part 2, October 1917, pp. 69-79, 6 pl.
149. ————Dimbulagala: Maravidiye cave inscription. *C.A.L.R.* Vol. 10, Part 1, July 1924, pp. 1-14, 3 pl.
150. WICKREMASINGHE, D. M. de Z. Dimbulagala: Mara-vidiye rock inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 4, 1917, pp. 184-189.
151. ————Dimbulagala Mara-vidiye rock-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 5, 1923, pp. 194-202.

Doratiyawa

152. CODRINGTON, H. W. AND MIRIHILLE, D. P. D. The Doratiyawa sannasa *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 29, No. 77, 1924, pp. 307-322.

Embekke

153. NEVILL, HUGH. Inscription in Sinhalese of A.D. 1400. (Kataragama Deva Devale). *Taprobanian*. Vol. 2, October 1887, 132-133.

Eppavala

154. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Two inscriptions from Eppavala. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 4, 1931, pp. 188-194.

Gadaladeniya

155. CODRINGTON, H. W. The Gadaladeniya inscription of Senasammata Vikrama Bahu. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 1, 1934, pp. 8-15.
156. ————The Gadaladeniya 'slab-pillar inscriptions. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 1, 1934, pp. 16-27.
157. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Gadaladeniya rock-inscription of Dharmmakirti Sthavira. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 2, 1935, pp. 90-110.

Galapata Vihara (Bentota)

158. BELL, H. C. P. Galapata Vihare inscription. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 23, No. 67, 1914, Notes and Queries, Part IV, No. 29, pp. lxix-lxxvii, 13 pl.
159. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Galapata Vihara rock-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 5, 1939, pp. 196-211.

Galle

160. ————The Tamil inscription on the Galle trilingual slab. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 6, 1933, pp. 331-341. (Appendix A. Translation of the Chinese version, pp. 337-338; B. Text and translation of the Persian inscription, by Khwaja Muhammad Ahmad, pp. 338-340; C. Katti, by H. W. Codrington, pp. 340-341).
161. PERERA, E. W. The Galle trilingual stone. *S.Z.* Vol. 8, Part 30, June 1912, pp. 122-132. 2 pl.

Garandigala

162. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Garandigala rock-inscription of Kassapa III. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 4, 1931, pp. 195-199.

Giritale

163. —————Giritale pillar inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 3, 1930, pp. 138-148.

Gonnava

164. —————Inscription on a pillar-fragment at the Gonnava Devale. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 4, 1937, pp. 186-191.

Gurugoda

165. BRODIE, A. O. Rock inscription at Gooroo Godde Wihare in the Magool Korle, Seven Korles. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 2, No. 6, 1853, pp. 51-54.

Habassa

166. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Habassa rock-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 5, 1939, pp. 213-217.

Handagala

167. NICHOLAS, C. W. Texts of the cave inscriptions at Handagala Vihara. *C.H.J.* Vol. 2, Nos 3 and 4, January and April 1953, pp. 221-224.

Hindagala

168. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. The Hindagala rock-inscription. *U.C.R.* Vol. 16, Nos. 1-2, January-April, 1958, pp. 1-5.

Hinguregala

169. —————Hinguregala rock-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Part 1, 1955, pp. 111-119.

Ihala Puliyankulama

170. CODRINGTON, H. W. The Ihala Puliyankulama pillar. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)* Vol. 30, No. 79, Parts I-IV, 1926, pp. 271-279.

Iripinniyava

171. WICKREMASINGHE, D. M. de Z. Iripinniyava pillar-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 1, Part 5, 1911, pp. 163-171.

Kadirana

172. DE ZOYSZ, LOUIS. Transcript and translation of an ancient copper-plate sannas. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 5, Part 1, No. 18, 1873, pp. 75-79.

Kagalla

173. BELL, H. C. P. Inscriptions. *A.S.C.A.R. Report on the Kegalla District of the province of Sabaragamuwa*. Colombo, G. J. A. Skeen, Government Printer, 1904. Part III: Epigraphical, pp. 68-107. (Inscriptions, pp. 69-90, 3 pl.; Sannas, pp. 91-105, 7 pl.; Treasure and boundary marks, pp. 106-107).

The texts and translations of inscriptions in nearly thirty sites, (ranging from before the 5th c. to the 19th c. A.D.) are given and discussed. The following are worthy of mention: Yatahalena, pp. 71-72; Dewanagala No. 1, pp. 73-76; Naranbedda, pp. 77-78; Alutnuwara, pp. 80-81; Waharakgoda, pp. 81-83; Dedigama, pp. 83-85; Kotagama, p. 85; Dewanagala No. 2, pp. 87-88; Selawa, pp. 89-90.

A tabulated list of all the *sannas* in the Kagalla district is given on pp. 104-105. The texts and translations of seven typical examples representing different periods are given with illustrations and discussed at length. They are: Ganegoda, pp. 91-94; Beligala, pp. 94-96; Devundara Devale, pp. 96-97; Medagoda Devale, pp. 97-98; Mangalagama, pp. 98-99; Getaberiya, pp. 99-101; Molligoda, pp. 101-103.

Kaludiyapokuna

174. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Kaludiyapokuna inscriptions. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 5, 1932, pp. 253-269.

Kandakadu

175. —————Kandakadu rock-inscription of Upatissa II. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Part 1, 1955, pp. 73-80.

Kandy

176. CODRINGTON, H. W. The Kandy Natha Devale inscriptions. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 1, 1934, pp. 27-34.

Kantalai

177. SWAMINATHAN, K. D. An inscription of Gaja Bahu II at Kantalai. *C.H.J.* Vol. 10, Nos. 1-4, July 1960-April 1961, pp. 44-47, 1 pl.
- 177a. WICKREMASINGHE, D. M. de Z. Kantalai Gal-asana inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 6, 1927, pp. 283-290.

Kapuru Vedu Oya (Matale district)

178. CODRINGTON, H. W. An inscription of Gaja Bahu II. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)* Vol. 26, No. 71, 1918, pp. 53-60, 1 pl.

Katagamuva

179. KARUNARATNE, W. SADHAMANGALA. Katagamuva slab-inscription of Manabharana *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Part 1, 1955, pp. 142-146.

Kataragama

180. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Kataragama inscriptions. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 4, 1931, pp. 212-225.

Katugaha-galge

181. —————Katugaha-galge pillar-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 6, 1933, pp. 325-331.

Kelaniya

182. BELL, H. C. P. Kit-Siri-Mewan Vihare inscription: rejoinder to paper of Simon de Silva, Mudaliyar. *C.A.L.R.* Vol. 2, Part 3, January 1917, pp. 182-190.
183. ————AND GUNASEKERA, A. M. Kelani Vihara and its inscriptions. *C.A.L.R.* Vol. 1, Part 3, January 1916, pp. 145-161, 3 pl.
184. DE SILVA, SIMON. The inscription at Kit-Siri-Mewan Kelani Vihara. *C.A.L.R.* Vol. 2, Part 3, January 1917, pp. 149-155, 1 pl.
185. ————The inscription at Kitsirimewan Kelani Vihara. *C.A.L.R.* Vol. 3, Part 2, October 1917, pp. 101-105.
186. DE ZOYSA, LOUIS. Text and translation of a rock inscription at the Buddhist temple at Kelaniya. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 15, No. 17, 1871-72, pp. 36-44.
187. GUNAWARDHANA W. F. The inscription at Kitsirimewan Kelani Vihara. *C.A.L.R.* Vol. 3, Part 2, October 1917, pp. 105-109.

Keragala

188. DE SILVA, SIMON. Inscription at Keragala. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 22, No. 65, 1912, pp. 404-421. (Appendix A. by H. C. P. Bell, pp. 410-414; B. by E. W. Perera, pp. 414-415; C. by W. F. Gunawardhana, pp. 415-417; D. by the author, pp. 417-421).
189. ————Vijaya Bahu VI. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 22, No. 65, 1912, pp. 316-332. (Appendix D. by H. C. P. Bell, pp. 340-366, 4 pl.; Appendix E. by the author. pp. 367-372).

Kevulgama

190. CODRINGTON, H. W. The Kevulgama inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 5, 1932, pp. 230-235.

Kirigallava

191. WICKREMASINGHE, D. M. de Z. Kirigallava pillar-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 1, 1912, pp. 1-5.

Kirinda

192. GODAKUMBURA, C. E. (An inscription of Apa Mihindu on an inscribed pillar near Kirinda). *A.S.C.A.R.* 1960 pp. G. 97-98. (Text published with introduction and notes in the *Buddhalokaya* (Sinhala journal), June, 1960).

Kivulekada

193. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Two inscriptions of Sena I. (1) Kivulekada. (N.C.P.) *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 6, 1933, pp. 289-291.

Kondavattavan

194. ————Kondavattavan pillar-inscription of Dappula IV. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Part 1, 1955, pp. 124-141.

Koratota

195. DEVENDRA, D. T. Koratota: its caves and Brahmi inscriptions. *Young Ceylon*. Vol. 4, Nos. 7 and 8, November-December 1953, pp. 263-265.

Kotabogoda

196. Translation of the sannas of the Kotabogoda Vihara in Yatinuwara. *C.L.R.* Vol. 5, No. 18, Dec. 2, 1890. p. 138.

Kotagama

197. CODRINGTON, H. W. The problem of the Kotagama inscription. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 32, No. 85, 1932, pp. 214-225.

Kottange

198. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Two rock inscriptions at Kottange. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 2, 1935, pp. 82-90.

Kuccaveli

199. —————Kuccaveli rock-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 3, 1930, pp. 158-161.

Kuda-Ratmale

200. —————Kuda-Ratmale rock-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Part 1, 1955, pp. 30-34.

Kudumirisa

201. GUNASEKARA, B. Inscription at Kudumirisa. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 10, No. 34, 1887, pp. 95-102.

Kukurumahan-Damana

202. WICKREMASINGHE, D. M. de Z. Kukurumahan-Damana pillar-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 1, 1912, pp. 19-25.

Kusalana Malai (E.P.)

203. FESTING, R. A. G. Kusalana Malai inscriptions. [*C.A.L.R.* Vol. 4, Part 4, October 1918, p. 113.

Labuatabandigala

204. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Two rock-inscriptions from Labuatabandigala. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 5, 1932, pp. 247-253.

Lankatilaka

205. GUNASEKARA, B. Lankatilaka inscription. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 10, No. 34, 1887, pp. 83-95.
206. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Lankatilaka inscriptions. *U.C.R.* Vol. 18, No. 1 and 2, January-April 1960, pp. 1-45, 2 pl.

Mada-Ulpota

207. ————— Mada-ulpota pillar-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 1, 1934, pp. 54-58.

Madavala

208. CODRINGTON, H. W. The Madavala rock-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 5, 1932, pp. 235-240.

Madirigiriya

209. BELL, H. C. P. Medirigiriya pillar-inscription. No. 2. *C.A.L.R.* Vol. 10, Part 2, October 1924, pp. 76-87, 3 pl.
210. WICKREMASINGHE, D. M. de Z. Madirigiriya pillar-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 1, 1912, pp. 25-33.

Magul-Maha-Vihara (Batticaloa district)

211. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Two inscriptions of Vihara-Maha-Devi from Magul-Maha-Vihara. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 4, 1937, pp. 161-169.

Maha Ratmale

212. WICKREMASINGHE, D. M. de Z. Maha Ratmale rock-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 1 Part, 2, 1907, pp. 58-65.

Makulemada (Matale district)

213. FORBES, Major JONATHAN. Notes by the author on Mr. Turnour's Epitome. (Translation of an inscription in the ancient Cingalese characters . . . copied from a rock . . . near the bank of the stream below Makulemadda, in Matale, A.D. 1359). *Eleven years in Ceylon*. London, Richard Bentley, 1840. Vol. 2, Appendix pp. 322-3.

Malagane

214. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Malagane pillar-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 4, 1937, pp. 180-186.

Mampe

PIERIS, PAUL E. (The Mampe copper sannasa). See No. 139.

Mandagala

215. ROBERTSON, J. W. Ancient inscriptions at Mandagala, S.P. *C.L.R.* Vol. 6, No. 35, March 29, 1892. pp. 277-278.

Mannar

216. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Mannar kacceri pillar-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 2, 1929, pp. 100-113.

Mayilagastota

217. WICKREMASINGHE, D. M. de Z. Mayilagastota pillar-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 2, 1914, pp. 57-63.

Mihintale

218. BELL, H. C. P. Inscriptions at Mihintale. *A.S.C.A.R.* 1911-12. Appendix B. pp. 93-99.
219. MULLER, E. Text and translation of the inscription of Mahinda III at Mihintale. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 6, No. 21, 1880, pp. 5-36.
220. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Indikatusaya copper plaques. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 4, 1931, pp. 199-212.
221. ———— A note on the Indikatusaya copper-plaques. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 5, 1939, pp. 238-242.
222. ———— The Trikayastava in an inscription at Mihintale. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 5, 1939, pp. 242-246.
223. WICKREMASINGHE, D. M. de Z. The two tablets of Mahinda IV at Mihintale. *E.Z.* Vol. 1, Part 3, 1907, pp. 75-113.

Minipe

224. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. The Minipe slab-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Part 1, 1955, pp. 146-161.

Molahitivyavelegala

225. ———— Two rock-inscriptions of Bhatika Abhaya and Mahanaga at Molahitivyavelegala. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 3, 1930, pp. 153-157.

Moragahawela

226. KANAPATHI PILLAI, KANDASAMY. A pillar-inscription from Moragahawela. *U.C.R.* Vol. 18, Nos. 1 and 2, January-April, 1960, pp. 46-49.

Moragoda

227. WICKREMASINGHE, D. M. de Z. Moragoda pillar-inscription of Kassapa IV. *E.Z.* Vol. 1, Part 5, 1911, pp. 200-207.

Munnsvaram

228. FOWLER, G. M. Translation of an inscription at the temple at Monnisvaram. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 10, No. 35, 1887, pp. 118-119.

Murutava

229. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Murutava rock-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Part 1, 1955, pp. 27-29.

Nagama

230. WICKREMASINGHE, D. M. de Z. Nagama pillar-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 1, 1912, pp. 14-19.

Nagirikanda

231. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Nagirikanda rock-inscription of Kumaradasa. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 3, 1936, pp. 115-128.

Naimmana

232. —————The Tamil slab inscription from Naimmana. *The Shrine of Upulvan at Devundara*, Colombo, Ceylon Government Archaeological Dept., 1953. Ch. 5. Inscriptions No. 3, pp. 70-74.

Nainativu (Nagadipa)

233. INDRAPALA, KARTHIGESU. The Nainativu Tamil inscription of Parakrama Bahu I. *U, C. R.* Vol. 20, No. 2, 1962 (*Forthcoming*)
- 233a. RASANAYAGAM, C. Nainativu (Tamil) inscription of Parakrama Bahu I. Text and translation. *Ancient Jaffna*. Madras, Everymans Publishers Ltd., 1926. pp. 208-209.

Nilagama

234. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Nilagama rock-inscription of Dala Mugalan. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 6, 1943, pp. 285-296.

Niyangampaya

235. POHATH-KEHELPANNALA, T. B. A Sannasa. A translation of a copper sannasa granted by the last king of Kandy to the celebrated Niyangampaye Wihare in Gampola. *M.L.R.* Vol. 4, No. 8, August 1896. pp. 182-183.

Noccipotana

236. WICKREMASINGHE, D. M. de Z. Noccipotana pillar-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 1, 1912, pp. 5-8.

Nuvara Eliya

237. BELL, H. C. P. Inscribed pillar-slab at Nuvara Eliya. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)* Vol. 26, No. 71, Part 1, 1918, Notes and Queries, pp. 61-64, 1 pt.

Nuvara—Kalaviya

238. —————Lithic inscriptions of Nuvara-Kalaviya exhibited at Anuradhapura. *A.S.C.A.R.* 1911-12. pp. 73-74.

Oruvala

239. CODRINGTON, H. W. Oruvala Sannasa. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 2, 1929, pp. 51-73.

Padakada

240. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. The Padakada sannasa. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)* Vol. 36, No. 99, 1945, pp. 130-133.

Padaviya

241. BELL, H. C. P. Inscribed pillar at Padaviya. *M.L.R.* Vol. 2, No. 4, April 1894, pp. 75-78.
242. NEVILL, HUGH. The slab at Padavia. *M.L.R.* Vol. 2, No. 2, February 1894, pp. 46-47.

Pahala Kayinattama

243. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Rock-inscriptions at Pahala Kayinattama. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 3, 1930, p. 162.

Palamottai

244. ————A Tamil slab-inscription from Palamottai. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 4, 1937, pp. 191-196.

Palkumbura

245. CODRINGTON, H. W. The Palkumbura sannasa. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 5, 1932, pp. 240-247.

Palu Makiccava

246. WICKREMASINGHE, D. M. de Z. Palu Makiccava rock-inscription of Gaja Bahu I. *E.Z.* Vol. 1, Part 5, 1911, pp. 208-211.

Panakaduva

247. DE SILVA, C. M. AUSTIN. The copper-plate charter (1084 A.D.) of Vijayabahu I. (1058-1114 A.D.). *N.L.* Vol. 2, No. 4, July 1951, pp. 39-44.

248. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. The Panakaduva copper-plate charter of Vijayabahu I. (1058-1114 A.D.). *A.S.C.A.R.* 1949, pp. G. 28—G. 32. "In many ways the most valuable historical document that Ceylon possesses—the oldest known Sinhalese copper-plate charter . . . For palaeography as well as for philology, the document has preserved points of great interest. The document also throws light on the procedure adopted in drafting legal documents in the chancelleries of Sinhalese Kings".

249. ————Panakaduva copper-plate charter of Vijayabahu I. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Part 1, 1955, pp. 1-27.

- 249a. ————The Panakaduva copper-plate of Vijayabahu I. *J.R.A.S. (G.B. & I.)* 1957, pp. 213-214.

Panduvassuvara

250. KANAPATHIPILLAI, KANDASAMY. A Tamil inscription from Panduvassuvara. *U.C.R.* Vol. 18, Nos. 3 and 4, July-October 1960, pp. 157-162.

- 250 a. KRISHNAN, K.G. Notes on the Tamil inscription from Panduvassuvara. *U.C.R.* Vol. 20, No. 1, 1962, pp. 15-16.

Paneliya

251. WOODHOUSE, G. W. Inscription of the Paneliya Raja Maha Vihare. *C.A.L.R.* Vol. 6, Part 4, April 1921, pp. 226-227.

Papiliyana

252. GUNASEKARA, B. Two Sinhalese inscriptions. No. 2, Inscription at Papiliyana. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)* Vol. 7, No. 25, 1882, 181-207.

Perimiyankulam

253. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Perimiyankulam rock-inscription of Vasabha. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*, Vol. 5 (new series) Part 2, 1958, pp. 129-137, 1 pl.
254. WICKREMASINGHE, D. M. de Z. Perumaiyan-Kulam rock-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 1, Part 2, 1907, pp. 66-74.

Piramanankandel (Puttalam district)

255. CASIE CHITTY, SIMON. Rock inscription at Piramanankandel. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*, Vol. 2, No. 7, 1853, p. 90.

Polonnaruwa

256. BELL, H. C. P. Critical notes on the *Epigraphia Zeylanica* No. 9—Polonnaruwa inscriptions. *C.A.L.R.* Vol. 5, Part 1, July 1919, pp. 20-30, 2 pl. (Appendix by T. A. Gopinatha Rao, pp. 28-30).
257. ————Inscriptions at Polonnaruwa. *A.S.C.A.R.* 1911-12. Appendix C. pp. 99-105.
258. BURROWS, S. M. A year's work at Polonnaruwa. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 10, No. 34, 1887, pp. 46-82.
Texts and translations of the twelve inscriptions discovered in 1886 and notes by the author.
259. CODRINGTON, H. W. The Council Chamber inscriptions at Polonnaruwa. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 29, No. 77, 1924, pp. 304-306.
260. KRISHNA SASTRI, H. Tamil inscriptions at Polonnaruwa. (Mandapam near Yoda-ela and Siva Devale No. 6). *A.S.C.A.R.* 1908, Appendix A, pp. 15-16.
261. ————Tamil inscription of Vijayabahu I, at Polonnaruwa, *A.S.C.A.R.* 1911-12. Appendix E, pp. 111-112.
262. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Polonnaruwa: Council Chamber pillar-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 1, 1934, pp. 34-49.
263. ————Polonnaruwa: fragmentary slab-inscription of Sundaramahadevi. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 2, 1935, pp. 67-72.
264. ————An inscription of Nissamka Malla, found near the Vanala, Polonnaruwa. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 3, 1930, pp. 149-152.
265. ————Polonnaruwa inscription of Vijayabahu I. *E.I.* Vol. 18, Parts 7 and 8, July-October 1926, pp. 330-338, 1 pl.
266. ————Polonnaruwa: pillar inscription of Mahinda V. *E.Z.*, Vol. 4, Part 2, 1935, pp. 59-67.
267. ————Two inscriptions of Sena I. (2) Vata-da-ge (Polonnaruwa). *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 6, 1933, pp. 291-294.
268. RASANAYAGAM, C. Vijaya Bahu's inscription at Polonnaruwa. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*, Vol. 29, No. 77, 1924, pp. 266-279.
269. RHYS DAVIDS, T. W. Inscriptions at the Audience Hall of Parakrama Bahu, Pulastipura, Ceylon. *I.A.* Vol. 2, September 1873, pp. 246-249, 1 pl.
270. ————The Sigiri stone-book at Pulastipura. *in: Sigiri, the Lion Rock, near Pulastipura, Ceylon. J.R.A.S. (G.B. & I.)* Vol. 7 (new series) 1874-75. Appendix. Note E. pp. 216-217.
271. ————Three inscriptions of Parakrama Bahu the Great from Pulastipura, Ceylon. (Date circa 1180 A.D.). *J.R.A.S. (G.B. & I.)* Vol. 7 (new series) 1874-75, pp. 152-171, 3 pl., 1 text fig.
272. ————Two old Sinhalese inscriptions. (A) The Sahasa Malla inscription on the upright slab north of the Haeta-da-ge, found whilst cutting the new path to the Rankot. *J.R.A.S. (G.B. & I.)*, Vol. 7 (new series). 1874-75. Introduction, pp. 353-355; 356-360; Notes, pp. 365-372.

273. **SENAVERATNE, JOHN M.** The "Galpota" or "Stone-book" of Polonnaruwa. *C.A.L.R.* Vol. 1, Part 4, April 1916, pp. 232-236, 1 pl.
274. ———— Tamil inscription at Polonnaruwa. *C.A.L.R.* Vol. 1, Part 4, April 1916, pp. 262-264.
275. **WICKREMASINGHE, D. M. de Z.** The 'Galpota' inscription at Polonnaruwa. *C.A.L.R.* Vol. 2, Part 3, January 1917. pp. 175-176. (Reply by John M. Senaveratne, pp. 176-178).
276. ———— Polonnaruwa: Anaulundava slab-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 5, 1923, pp. 235-237.
277. ———— : Gal-vihara rock-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 6, 1927, pp. 256-283.
278. ———— : Hata-dage inside wall-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 2, 1914, pp. 96-98.
279. ———— : Hata-dage portico. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 2, 1914, pp. 84-90, fold map.
280. ———— : Hata-dage vestibule wall-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 2, 1914, pp. 91-96.
281. ———— : Kala-krida-vinoda Gal-asana inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 3, 1915, pp. 128-130.
282. ———— : Kalinga forest Gal-asana inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 3, 1915, pp. 125-127.
283. ———— : Kalinga Park Gal-asana inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 3, 1915, pp. 130-134.
284. ———— : Kiri-Vehera slab-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 4, 1917, pp. 148-152.
285. ———— : Lankatilaka guard-stone inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 2, 1929, pp. 48-50.
286. ———— : Nissanka-Dana-Vinoda-Mandapa inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 3, 1915, pp. 123-125.
287. ———— : Nissanka-Malla slab-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 4, 1917, pp. 153-156.
288. ———— : North-gate of the citadel slab-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 4, 1917, pp. 157-164.
289. ———— : Potgul-vehera inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 5, 1923, pp. 238-241.
290. ———— : Priti-Danaka-Mandapa rock-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 4, 1917, pp. 165-178.
291. ———— : Raja-Maligava pillar-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 2, 1914, pp. 49-57.
292. ———— : Rankot-Dagaba Gal-asana inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 3, 1915, pp. 134-137.
293. ———— : Rankot-Dagaba pillar-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 3, 1915, pp. 137-142.
294. ———— : Siva-Devalaye slab-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 4, 1917, pp. 146-148.
295. ———— : Slab-inscription of Sahasa-Malla *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 5, 1923, pp. 219-229.
296. ———— : Slab-inscription of the Velaikkaras. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 6, 1927, pp. 242-255.
297. ———— : Stone-bath slab-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 3, 1915, pp. 143-145.
298. ———— : Vijaya-Bahu II slab-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 4, 1917, pp. 179-184.

Puliyankulam

299. —————Puliyankulam slab-inscription C/8 of Uda Mahaya.
E.Z. Vol. 1, Part 5, 1911, pp. 182-190.
300. —————The slab-inscription marked D/8 of Queen Lilavati.
E.Z. Vol. 1, Part 5, 1911, pp. 176-182.

Puttalam district

301. BRODIE, A. O. Rock inscriptions (from Puttalam district). *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 2, No. 7, 1853, pp. 81-82 (1. Koodawewe; 2. Moolegame Kande)

Rakitipe

302. WICKREMASINGHE, D. M. de Z. Rakitipe pillar inscription of Lilavati.
E.Z. Vol. 2, Part 4, 1917, pp. 192-193; Vol. 2, Part 5, 1923, pp. 193-194.

Rambava

303. —————Rambava pillar inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 1, Part 5, 1911, pp. 172-175.
304. —————Rambava slab-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 2, 1914, pp. 64-70.

Rassahela

305. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Three rock-inscriptions at Rassahela *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 4, 1937, pp. 169-176.

Ratnapura

306. BELL, H. C. P. Maha Saman Devale and its sannasa. *C.A.L.R.* Vol. 2, Part 1, July 1916, pp. 36-46, 2 pl.
307. FERGUSON, D. W. The inscribed mural stone at the Saman Devale, Ratnapura. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 16, No. 50, 1899, pp. 84-114, 1 pl.
308. PERERA, S. G. Fr. The Saman Devale inscription *C. A. L. R.* Vol. 8, Part 1, July 1922, pp. 1-5, 1 pl.

Ritigala

309. WICKREMASINGHE, D. M. de Z. Etymological and historical notes on Ritigala. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*, Vol. XI, No. 39, 1889, pp. 160-166.
310. —————Ritigala inscriptions. *E.Z.* Vol. 1, Part 4, 1909, pp. 135-153.

Sabaragamuwa

311. COLLINS, C. H. The archaeology of the Sabaragamuwa Bintenna. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 32, No. 85, 1932, pp. 158-183, 8 pl. 2 plans.

Sagama

312. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Sagama rock-inscription of Bhuvanaikabahu V. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 6, 1943, pp. 296-312.

Sangamu

313. ———— Sangamu Vihara rock-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 1, 1934, pp. 1-8.

Sigiriya

314. BELL, H. C. P. Inscriptions at Sigiriya. *A.S.C.A.R.* 1911-12. Appendix D, pp. 106-109.
315. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. The graffiti of Sigiriya. *A.B.I.A.* Vol. 12, 1937, pp. 34-37.
316. ———— *Sigiri graffiti, being Sinhalese verses of the eighth, ninth and tenth centuries.* London, published for the Government of Ceylon, by Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, 1956. 2 vols. Vol. 1. Introduction and plates, xiv, ccxxi p., 55 plates; Vol. 2. Texts and translations, with notes and glossary index, 472 p.
317. ———— Sigiriya graffiti: earliest extant specimens of Sinhalese verse. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 34, No. 92, 1939, pp. 309-346.
318. REYNOLDS, C. H. B. Sigiri graffiti and Sinhalese phonology. *B.S.O.A.S.* Vol. 20, 1957. (In honour of Sir Ralph Turner), pp. 481-486.
319. RHYS DAVIDS, T. W. Inscriptions on Sigiri Hill. in *Sigiri the Lion rock, near Pulastipura, Ceylon.* *J.R.A.S. (G.B. & I.)*. Vol. 7 (new series). 1874-75. Appendix, note D, p. 215.

Tangoda

320. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Tangoda Vihara pillar-inscription of Sirmegha. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Part. 1, 1955, pp. 80-111.

Tantrimalai

321. DE SILVA, SIMON. Inscriptions at Tantrimalai. in: *Tantri-Malai: some archaeological observations and deductions*, by John Still. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 22, No. 63, 1910. Appendix B, pp. 88-89.

Timbiriavava

322. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. A rock-inscription of the reign of Gothabhaya at Timbiriavava. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 5, 1939, pp. 223-228.
323. ———— Rock inscriptions at Timbiriavava and Andaragollava in the Vilpattu Sanctuary. *U.C.R.* Vol. 19, No. 2, October 1961 pp.95-104, 2 pl.
324. WICKREMASINGHE, D. M. DE Z. Timbiriavava pillar inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 2, Part 1, 1912, pp. 9-14.

Tiriyay

325. CHHABRA, B. CH. Text of the Tiriyay rock-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 6, 1943, pp. 312-319.
- 325a. ———— A note on the Tiriyay rock inscription *E.I.* Vol. 23, 1935-36, No. 32, pp. 196-7.
326. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Tiriyay rock-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 3, 1936, pp. 151-160.
327. ———— Tiriyay Sanskrit inscription of the reign of Aggabodhi VI. *E.Z.* Vol. 5 Part 1, 1955 pp. 174-176.

Tonigala

328. BOYER, A. M. Sur quelques inscriptions de L'Inde: (Tonigala) *J. A.* Vol. 11 (9th series), November-December, 1898, pp. 463-477.
329. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Tonigala rock-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 4, 1931 pp. 172-188.

Trincomalee

330. CODRINGTON, H. W. The inscription at Fort Frederick, Trincomalee. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*, Vol. 30, No. 80, 1927, pp. 448-451, 1 pl.
Tamil inscription believed to have been originally part of the temple of Konesvara.
331. JOHNSTON, ALEXANDER. An account of an inscription found near Trincomalee, in the Island of Ceylon. *Trans. R.A.S. (G.B. & I.)* Vol. 1, 1827, pp. 537*-540*, 1 fold pl.
332. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Fragmentary Sanskrit inscription from Trincomalee. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Part 1, 1955, pp. 170-173.

Valigama (Weligama)

333. RHYS DAVIDS, T. W. Inscription at Waeligama Wihare: text, translation and notes. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*, Vol. 5, No. 16, 1870-71, pp. 21-24.

Vallipuram

334. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Vallipuram gold-plate inscription of the reign of Vasabha. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 5, 1939, pp. 229-237.

Velmilla

335. ————Velmilla slab-inscription of Sena III. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 6, 1933, pp. 294-302.

Vessagiriya

336. ————Four rock-inscriptions from Vessagiriya at Anuradhapura. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 3, 1936, pp. 128-136.
337. ————Vessagiriya rock-inscription of Srinaga II. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 5, 1939, pp. 218-222.
338. WICKREMASINGHE, D. M. DE Z. Vessagiri inscriptions. *E.Z.* Vol. 1, Part I, 1904, pp. 10-39.

Vevalkatiya

339. ————Vevalkatiya slab-inscription of Mahinda IV. *E.Z.* Vol. 1, Part 6, 1912, pp. 241-251.

Viharegala

340. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Two rock-inscriptions at Viharegala. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 3, 1930, pp. 163-169.

Viharegama

341. ————Viharegama pillar-inscription, *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 1, 1934, pp. 50-54.

Virandagoda

342. —————Virandagoda pillar-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Part I, 1955, pp. 119-124.

Viyaulpata

343. —————Viyaulpata rock-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 4, 1937, pp. 176-180.

Yala (Ruhunu National Park)

344. NICHOLAS, C. W. Brahmi inscriptions in the Yala East Wild Life Reserve. *Sir Paul Pieris Felicitation Volume, presented by his friends and admirers.* Colombo, 1956, pp. 56-68.
345. —————Texts of the Brahmi inscriptions in the Ruhunu National Park. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 2 (new series). Part 2, 1952, pp. 126-140. (1. Situlpavuva Vihara, pp. 126-134; 2. Magulmahavihara, pp. 134-136; 3. Silavakanda, pp. 136-137; 4. Gonagala and Pimburamalgala, pp. 137-138; 5. Akasa Cetiya, pp. 138-139; 6. Moderagala, pp. 139-140).

Miscellaneous

346. BELL, H. C. P. Prince Tanjivavalla Bahu of Madampe. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 28, No. 73, 1920, pp. 36-53.
Six *sannas* professed to emanate from "King Tanivella Bahu" and all indubitably spurious documents.
347. FERNANDO, P. E. E. India Office Land Grant of King Kirti Sri Rajasimha. *C.J.H.S.S.* Vol. 3, No. 1, January-June 1961, pp. 72-81.
348. JOHNSTON, ALEXANDER. (a) A Cufic inscription found in Ceylon, with a translation by the Rev. Samuel Lee; (b) A letter to the Secretary relating to the preceding inscription. *Trans. R.A.S. (G.B. & I.)*. Vol. 1, 1827, (a) pp. 545-548, 1 fold pl.; (b) pp. 537[†]-548[†].
Supposed to be the most ancient Mohammedan inscription on the island.
349. Kandyian *Sannas* to a Court lady (by the Editors). *C.L.R.* Vol. 3, No. 41, May 3, 1889, p. 328.
350. LEE, LIONEL F. Notes on a *Sanna*. (A Kandyian copper-plate land grant). *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 5, No. 16, 1870-71, pp. 8-10, 1 pl.
351. NEVILL, HUGH. An inscription by Ceylonese princes at Junnar. *Taprobanian*. Vol. 2, Part 2, June 1887, pp. 65-66.
352. PARANAVITANA, SENERAT. Colombo Museum pillar-inscription of Kassapa IV. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Part 5, 1932, pp. 270-277. (Provenance not recorded).
353. —————A fragmentary pillar-inscription in the Colombo Museum. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Part 5, 1939, pp. 246-252. (Provenance not recorded).
354. —————The Sinhalese inscription of Nissamka Malla at Ramesvaram. *E.I. (Forthcoming)*.
355. POHATH-KEHELPAUNALA, T. B. Two ola grants of the seventeenth century: (texts, translations and notes). *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 18, No. 54, 1903, pp. 10-16.

356. WEDDERBURN, M. M. An inscribed pillar. *C.A.L.R.* Vol. 4, Part 2, October 1918, p. 111.
357. WICKREMASINGHE, D. M. DE Z. Note on a Sinhalese inscription of 1745-46 A.D. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 13, No. 45, 1894, pp. 133-134, 1 pl. Engraved on an old cannon, presented by Lewuke Dissawe to the Dutch, and now in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.
358. ———— Sinhalese copper-plate grants in the British Museum. *J.R.A.S. (G.B. & I.)*, 1895. Art XIX, pp. 639-647.
Three *sannas*, presented by J. Barlow Hoy in 1839, among manuscripts in the B.M. Press-marks: Add II, 555, a,b,c.

APPENDIX

European Inscriptions

These are mainly found on the tombs, monuments and memorial tablets of Europeans, chiefly civil and military officials of note and their relations. The oldest Portuguese inscription is that engraved on a boulder now in Gordon Gardens, Colombo and dated 1501. Only an extremely small number of Portuguese inscriptions has survived the ravages of time, the degradations of the vandal and reckless use both by the knowing and unknowing. The Dutch inscriptions have suffered a kinder fate, though the same causes have also led to their widespread destruction and disappearance. The extant ones number nearly 250, and range from 1662 to 1836. "The oldest English inscription is that commemorating a captain of the Navy, whose ship, the *Princess Mary* called at Trincomalee in 1748, possibly for the purpose of his burial on shore". (Lewis See No. 400. p. vi).

Portuguese inscriptions

359. DE VOS, F. H. The Portuguese tombstone. *C.L.R.* Vol. 3, No. 35, March 22, 1889, p. 278.
- FERGUSON, D. W. The inscribed mural stone at the Saman Devale. Ratnapura. (See No. 307).
360. JOSEPH, GERARD A. Antiquarian discovery relating to the Portuguese in Ceylon. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)*. Vol. 16, No. 50, 1899, pp. 15-28, 1 pl. Refers to the discovery in 1898 of a Portuguese coat of arms with date 1501 inscribed on a rock at the site of the old Breakwater office in Colombo Fort. Appendices I-IX contain selected examples of the ensuing correspondence on the subject. See also Nos. 363 and 364.
- LEWIS, J. P. List of inscriptions on tombstones and monument in Ceylon. (See No. 400).
361. ———— Portuguese inscriptions in Ceylon. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)* Vol. 18, No. 56, 1905, pp. 350-366, 12 pl.

362. An old Portuguese tombstone, (by the Editors, A.M. and J. Ferguson) *M.L.R.* Vol. 1, No. 1, January 1893, p. 14; Vol. 1, No. 3, March 1893, p. 72.
363. An old Portuguese tombstone (in Colombo Fort, by the Editors, A.M. and J. Ferguson). *C.L.R.* Vol. 2, No. 45, May 25, 1888, pp. 358-359. (See also: Nos. 359 and 368).
364. PERERA, S. G. *Fr.* The first Portuguese inscription in Ceylon. *C.A.L.R.* Vol. 9, Part 4, April 1924, pp. 202-211, 2 pl.
365. ————The Portuguese boulder (in Gordon Gardens, Colombo) *Ceylon Causerie.* Vol. 2, No. 3, July 1930, pp. 11, 52, illus.
- The Saman Devale inscription. (See No. 308.)
366. PIERIS, PAUL E. Inscriptions at St. Thomas's Church, Colombo, *J.R.A.S. (C.B.).* Vol. 22, No. 65, 1912, pp. 385-390, 5 pl.
367. A Portuguese monumental tablet—where isi t? (a) by Nemo, (b) by X *C.L.R.* (a) Vol. 1, No. 1, August 13, 1886, p. 8; (b) Vol. 1, No. 4, September 3, 1886, p. 32.
368. SMITH, CECIL AND NORONHA, I. F. The Portuguese mortuary inscription. *C.L.R.* Vol. 3, No. 2, August 10, 1888, p. 15.

Dutch Inscriptions

369. ANTHONISZ, R. G., DE VOS, F. H. AND SUETER, E. B. F. Dutch inscription, Colombo. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.).* Vol. 23, No. 67, 1914, Notes and Queries, Part 2, pp. xxxi-xxxiii.
370. ————Heraldry as represented in Dutch seals and monuments in Ceylon. *J.D.B.U. (Cey.).* Vol. 2, No. 1, March 1909, pp. 33-40; Vol. 2, No. 2, June 1909, pp. 56-62.
371. BROHIER, R. L. Armorial bearings of Ceylon in the Dutch era. *Times of Ceylon Annual 1956.* (5p.), 12 illus. (col.). Reprinted in: *J.D.B.U. (Cey.).* Vol. 50, Nos. 3-4, July-October 1960, pp. 65-71, 2 pl.
372. DE VOS, F. H. Dutch inscription in Galle Fort. Anthony Johannes *J.R.A.S. (C.B.).* Notes and Queries. Part V, March 1916, No. 3, pp. lxxxii-lxxxiii.
373. ————Monumental remains of the Dutch East India Company in Ceylon. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.).* Vol. 15, No. 49, 1898, pp. 213-290, 12 pl.
374. ————Note on a Dutch medal. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.).* Vol. 18, No. 56, 1905, pp. 408-410, 1 pl.
375. ————Old Dutch epitaphs (on tombstones). *C.L.R.* Vol. 3, No. 47, June 7, 1889, pp. 374-375; Vol. 3, No. 48, June 14, 1889, 383-384.
376. ————Supplementary papers on the monumental remains of the Dutch East India Company in Ceylon. Parts 1-4, *J.R.A.S. (C.B.).* Vol. 17, No. 52, 1901, pp. 12-72; Vol. 18, No. 54, 1903, pp. 51-80, 8 pl.; Vol. 18, No. 56, 1905, pp. 393-396; Vol. 22, No. 63, 1910, pp. 63-69, 2 pl.

377. Dutch inscription in the Bentota church. *C.L.R.* Vol. 1, No. 9, October 8, 1886, p. 72.
378. Dutch inscriptions. *C.L.R.* Vol. 2, No. 15, November 11, 1887, p. 116.
379. Dutch inscriptions on gold medals in Ceylon. *C.L.R.* Vol. 2, No. 36, March 23, 1888, pp. 284-286.
380. ENRIQUEZ, C. M. (Theophilus *pseud*) Tombstones in Ceylon. *Times of Ceylon Christmas Number 1928*. (3 p.), illus.
381. KURUPPU, S. B. A Dutch inscription on a medal. *C.L.R.* Vol. 2, No. 25, January 6, 1888, p. 195.
382. LEWIS, J. P. Calpenty (Kalutara) inscriptions. *M.L.R.* Vol. 4, No. 12, December 1896, pp. 291-293.
383. —————Dutch inscriptions—Negombo. *C.L.R.* Vol. 3, No. 44, May 17, 1889, pp. 342-343.
- List of inscriptions on tombstones and monuments... (See No. 400).
384. LEWIS, J. P. & ANTHONISZ, R. G. Tombstones in the cemetery of the Parish of Colpetty *J. D. B. U. (Cey.)* Vol. 6; Pt. 1, 1913, pp. 43-44.
385. LUDOVICI, LEOPOLD. *Lapidarium Zeylanicum, being a collection of monumental inscriptions of the Dutch Churches and churchyards of Ceylon*. Colombo, J. Maitland & Co., 1877. (8) 17 (2) p., 97 pl. A notable pioneer attempt. The omissions and errors have been supplied and corrected by F. H. de Vos in his contributions to the subject.
386. Monumental inscription of Francina van Rheede. *C.L.R.* Vol. 1, No. 14, November 19, 1886, p. 112.
387. Old Dutch tombstones at Galle, by V. *M.L.R.* Vol. 1, No. 2, February 1893, p. 31.
388. PIERIS, PAUL E. A Dutch gold medal. *S.Z.* Vol. 8, No. 30, June 1912, pp. 146-147, 1 pl.
389. —————Notes on a Dutch medal. Parts 1 and 2. *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)* Vol. 18, No. 54, 1903, pp. 130-135, 1 pl.; Vol. 22, No. 65, 1912, pp. 260-264, 1 pl.
390. —————Some Dutch medals. *S.Z.* Vol. 8, No. 32, January 1913, pp. 296-298, 5 pl.
391. SUEYER, E. B. F. Dutch inscription (in Colombo). *J.R.A.S. (C.B.)* Vol. 24, 1916, Notes and Queries. Part VI, No. 6, p. cix.
392. VANDERWALL, E. H. The Dutch cemetery at Kalutara. *J.D.B.U. (Cey.)* Vol. 23, No. 2, October 1933, pp. 87-89.
393. —————The Dutch cemetery at Matara. *J.D.B.U. (Cey.)* Vol. 22, No. 1, July, 1932, pp. 1-5

394. —————A Dutch tombstone (at Kalutara.) *J. D.B.U.*, (Cey.), Vol. 23, No. 4, April 1954, pp. 234—5.
395. The Wolvendal Dutch Church, Colombo. *C.L.R.* Vol. 6, No. 12, October 20, 1891, pp. 95—96.
396. YOUNG, J. D. Dutch epitaphs. *C.L.R.* Vol. 3, No. 49, June 21, 1889, p. 389.
397. De Zilveren Brui loft. *J.D.B.U.* (Cey.). Vol. 2, No. 1, March 31, 1909, pp. 1—7, 1 pl.

English Inscriptions

398. The inscription on the tomb of Sir John D'Oyly. *C.L.R.* Vol. 2, No. 47, June 8, 1888, p. 374.
399. JOSEPH, GERARD A. The inscription on the tablet to Sir John D'Oyly's memory in St. Peter's Church, Fort, Colombo. *M.L.R.* Vol. 1, No. 1, January 1893, p. 12.
400. LEWIS, J. P. *List of inscriptions on tombstones and monuments in Ceylon of historical or local interest, with an obituary of persons uncommemorated.* Colombo, H. C. Cottle, Government Printer, Ceylon, 1913. x, 462 p., 1 pl. (front).
Deals in the main with English inscriptions. All the Dutch inscriptions have been transcribed by F. H. de Vos, who was also responsible for writing the notes on most of them.
401. MASSIE, ROBERT. *Inscriptions and tombstones at Trincomalee (up to 1871).* Privately printed 1887.
No copies have been located in the libraries of the Colombo Museum, Ceylon Government Archives, Ceylon University, R.A.S. (Ceylon Branch), British Museum and Royal Empire Society. Lewis on p. v of his "List of inscriptions . . ." (See No. 400) refers to it as "Trincomalee inscriptions to 1871". The title listed is taken from *Annals of the Ceylon Civil Service*, by J. R. Toussaint (1935), p. 146.
402. MODDER, FRANK, H. Kurunegala cemeteries. *C.L.R.* Vol. 4, No. 2, August 9, 1889, pp. 13—14, 2 illus.
403. Mural and monumental tablets of a great scholar, a great engineer and a distinguished soldier (George Turnour, Capt. Dawson and Capt. James McClashan), by Antiquarian. *C.L.R.* Vol. 1, No. 7, September 24, 1886, p. 55.
404. The tomb of Mrs. Wilson in the old Badulla graveyard (by the Editors, A.M. and J. Ferguson). *C.L.R.* Vol. 2, No. 37, March 30, 1888, pp. 292—294.
405. Tombs in Uva: Major Rogers and others; by a correspondent at Badulla. *M.L.R.* Vol. 3, No. 4, April 1895, p. 94.

ADDENDA

General

406. CEYLON. Archaeological Survey of Ceylon. *Epigraphia Zeylanica being lithic and other inscriptions of Ceylon*. Vol. 5, Pt. 2; ed. by S. Paranavitana and C.E. Godakumbura, Colombo, Archaeological Dept., Ceylon, (Ceylon Govt. Press, printers) 1963. pp. 177-314, pl. nos. 8-37.
407. CEYLON. Archaeological Survey of Ceylon. *Lakdiva Paraniliyavili Sangarava*. Vol. 1, Parts 1 & 2. Ceylon. Govt. Press, printers, 1937, 1938. vii, 90 p. The first seven inscriptions in *Epigraphia Zeylanica*. Vol. 1; ed. by D. M. de. Z. Wickremasinghe were published in Sinhalese translation in the above. They are Nos. 116, 338, 113, 114, 212, 254 & 223 in the bibliography and appeared in that order.
408. LAW, B.C. Early kings of Ceylon as given in the chronicles and inscriptions. *Colombo Y.M.B.A. Golden Jubilee Souvenir*. December 1948, pp. 9-10.

INDIVIDUAL SITES

Badulla

409. BARANAVITANA, S. A revised edition of the Badulla (Horabora) pillar-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Part 2, 1963, No. 16, pp. 177-195.

Dorabawila

410. GODAKUMBURA, C.E. Two pillar inscriptions from Dorabawila (Dorabavila). *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Part 2, 1963, No. 25, pp. 288-307.

Gallena-Vihara

411. PARANAVITANA, S. Gallena-Vihara inscriptions. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Part 2, 1963, No. 20, pp. 252-259.

Kadadora

412. GODAKUMBURA, C.E. Kadadora grant; an ola leaf manuscript from the Kadadora Vihara in the Central Province; ed. & tr. by C.E. Godakumbura. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)* Vol. 2 (new series) Part 2, 1952, pp. 141-158
413. ——— Postscript to the Kadadora grant *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)* Vol. 3, (new series) Part. 1, 1953, pp. 72-79.

Kalkulam

414. PARANAVITANA, S. Kalkulam rock-inscription of the 10th year of Sirisangabo. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Part. 2, 1963 No. 21, pp. 259-265.

Kirinda

415. GODAKUMBURA, C.E. Kirinda pillar inscription of Apa Mihindu. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Part 2, 1963, No. 23, pp. 270-280.

Kotagama

416. PROCTOR, R.C. The Tamil inscription at Kotagama in Kegalle. *C.L.R. (3rd. series)*. Vol. 2, No. 5, May 1932, pp. 238-239.
417. RASANAYAGAM, C. Kotagama Tamil inscription. *C.L.R. (3rd series)*. Vol. 2, No. 7, July 1932, pp. 333-335.

Mankanai

418. KANAPATHI PILLAI KANDASAMY. Mankanai inscription of Gajabahu II. *U.C.R.* Vol. 20, No. 1, April 1962, pp. 12-14, 1 pl.

Mihintale

419. PARANAVITANA, S. Brahmi inscriptions in caves at Mihintale. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Part. 2, 1963, No. 18, pp. 209-234.

Panduvassuvara

420. PARANAVITANA, S. Notes on the Tamil inscription from Panduvassuvara. *U.C.R.* No. 20, No. 1, April 1962, pp. 16-18. (See also No. 250a.)

Polonnaruwa

421. GODAKUMBURA, C.E. Polonnaruwa slab-inscription of A.D. 1105. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Part 2, 1963, No. 26, pp. 308-314.
422. PARANAVITANA, S. An inscription of Nissamkamalla on a pillar near the Rankot Vehera at Polonnaru. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Part. 2, 1963, No. 22 pp. 266-269.
423. ————A slab-inscription of Nissamkamalla at Ponnaru wrongly attributed to Vijayabahu II, *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Part 2, 1963, No. 17, pp. 196-208.
424. PROCTOR, R.C. The Tamil inscription at Polonnaruwa. *C.L.R. (3rd series)*. Vol. 2, No. 1, January 1932, pp. 94-95.

Rajagala (or Rassahela—Batticola District)

425. PARANAVITANA, S. An inscription of circa 200 B.C. at Rajagala commemorating Saint Mahinda. *U.C.R.* Vol. 20, No. 2, October 1962, pp. 159-162, 1 pl.

Tamaravaya

426. GODAKUMBURA, C.E. Tamaravaya pillar inscription *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Part 2, 1963, No. 24, pp. 280-288.

Vavuniya

427. PARANAVITANA, S. Brahmi inscriptions in caves at three sites in the Vavuniya district. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Part 2, 1963, No. 19, pp. 234-252. (A Mahakaccatkodi, 236; B. Erupotana, 237-239; C. Periya-Puli-yankulam, 239-248).

EUROPEAN INSCRIPTIONS**Portugues :**

428. A Portuguese monumental tablet. *J.D.B.U. (Cey.)*. Vol. 44, No. 2, April 1954, pp. 48-51.

Dutch

429. JURRIA NSE, M.W. The story of Francjna van Reede, *J. D. B. U. (Cey.)* Vol. 32, No. 1, July 1942, pp. 1.11, pl.; Vol 32, No. 3, January 1943, pp. 126-127.

AUTHOR INDEX

The numbers attached to the authors' names refer to the serial number in the bibliography.

- AHMAD, Khwaja Muhammad., 160.
 AMARAVAMSA *Sihavira*, Kotmale. 1
 AMERESKERE, H. E., 2
 ANTHONISZ, R. G., 369, 370, 384.
 ANTIQUARIAN, 403.
 Archaeological Survey of Ceylon.
 See Ceylon. Archaeological Survey of Ceylon.
 ARMOUR, Andrew, 79.
 BELL, H. C. P., 3-6, 95, 139, 148, 158, 172, 182, 183, 188, 189, 209, 218, 237, 238, 241, 256, 257, 306, 314, 346.
 BOYER, A.-M., 328
 BRODIE, A. O., 7, 165, 301.
 BROHIER, R. L., 371.
 BURROWS, S. M., 258.
 BUULTJENS, A. E., 360.
 CANDAJOTI *Thera*, Kotaneluve, 8.
 CASIE CHETTY, Simon, 255.
 Ceylon. Archaeological Survey of Ceylon, 9-14, 406, 407.
 Ceylon. Historical Manuscripts Commission. Reports, 15.
 CHATTERJEE, Charandas 17.
 CHHABRA, B. CH., 325, 325a.
 CODRINGTON, H. W., 3, 18, 94, 96, 152, 155, 156, 160, 170, 171, 178, 190, 197, 208, 239, 245, 259, 330.
 COLBROOKE, W. M. G., 126.
 COLLINS, C. H., 311.
 DAVIDS, T. W. RHYS
 See RHYS DAVIDS, T. W.
 DE SILVA, C. M. Austin, 247.
 DE SILVA, Simon, 184, 185, 188, 189, 321.
 DEVENDRA, D. T., 19, 20, 195.
 DE Vos, F. H., 359, 360, 369, 372-376, 395.
 DE ZOYSA, Louis 172, 186.
 ENRIQUEZ, C. M., 380.
 FERGUSON, D. W., 307, 360.
 FERNANDO, P. E. E., 21, 22, 347.
 FESTING, R. A. G., 203.
 FORRES, Jonathan, 213.
 FOWLER, G. M., 228.
 GEIGER, Wilhelm, 23.
 GODAKUMBURA, C. E., 192, 406, 410, 412, 413, 415, 421, 426.
 GOLDSCHMIDT, Paul, 24-27.
 GOPINATHA RAO, T. A., 256.
 GUNASEKARA, A. M., 28, 183.
 GUNASEKARA, B., 97, 141, 201, 205, 252.
 GUNAWARDHANA, W. F., 187, 188.
 Historical Manuscripts Commission
 See Ceylon. Historical Manuscripts Commission.
 HISTORICUS, 130.
 INDRAPALA, Karthigesu, 29, 233.
 JAYAWARDENA, W. A., 30.
 JOHNSTON, Alexander, 331, 348.
 JOSEPH, Gerard A., 360, 399.
 JURRIAANSE, M. W., 429.
 KANAPATHIPILLAI, Kandasamy, 226, 250, 418.
 KURUNARATNE, W. Saddhamangala, 418, 31-35, 179.
 KARUNATHAKE, W. S., 36.
 KEHELANNALA, T. B. POHATH--
 See POHATH-KEHELANNALA, T. B.
 KRISHNAN, K. G., 250a.
 KRISHNA SASTRI, H. 16, 37, 260, 261.
 KURUPPU, S. B., 381.
 LAW, B. C., 408.
 LEE, Lionel F., 350.
 LEE, Samuel *Rev.*, 348.
 LEWIS, J. P., 361, 381, 383, 384, 400.
 LIYANAGAMAGE, A., 38.
 LUDOVICI, Leopold, 385.
 MASSIE, Robert, 401.
 MEHENDALE, M. A., 39.
 MIRIHILLE, D. P. D., 152.
 MODDER, Frank H., 40, 402.
 MULLER, Edward, 41-46, 219.
 NEMO., 367.
 NEVILL, Hugh, 47-51, 127-129, 153, 242, 351.
 NICHOLAS, C. W., 25-58, 167, 344, 345.
 NORONHA, I. F., 368.

- PARANAVITANA, Senerat, 12-14, 59-67,
 67a, 91, 99-111, 124, 125, 134, 135,
 142-144, 154, 157, 159, 160, 162-
 164, 166, 168, 169, 174, 175, 180,
 181, 193, 194, 198-200, 204, 206,
 207, 211, 214, 216, 220-222, 224,
 225, 229, 231, 232, 234, 240, 243,
 244, 248-249a, 253, 262, 267, 305,
 311, 312, 313, 315, 317, 320, 322,
 323, 326, 327, 329, 332, 334-337,
 340-343, 352-354, 406, 409, 411, 414,
 419, 420, 422, 423, 425, 427.
- PARKER, Henry, 68, 69.
 PERERA, D. A. L., 95.
 PERERA, E. W., 161, 188.
 PERERA, Lakshman S., 70-74.
 PERERA, S. G. *Fr.* 308, 364, 365.
 PIERIS, Paul E., 139, 366, 388-390.
 POHATH-KEHELPANNALA, T. B., 235,
 355.
 PRINSEP, James, 75.
 PROCTOR, R. C., 416, 424.
- RAO, T. A. GOPINATHA
See GOPINATHA RAO, T. A.
 RASANAYAGAM, C., 233 a, 268, 417.
 REIMERS, Edmund, 76.
 REYNOLDS, C. H. B., 318.
 RHYS DAVIDS, T. W., 77, 112, 136,
 145-147, 269-272, 319, 333.
 ROBERTSON, J. W., 215.
- SASTRI, H. KRISHNA
See KRISHNA SASTRI, H.
 SENAVERATNE, John M., 273-275.
- SMITH, Cecil, 368.
 STILL, John, 78.
 SUETER, E. B. F., 369, 391.
 SWAMINATHAN, K. D., 177.
- THEOPHILUS *pseud.*
See ENRIQUEZ, C. M.
 TURNOUR, George, 79.
- V., 387.
 VANDERWALL, E. H., 392-394.
 VIMALAKITTI *Thera*, Madayyangoda,
 80.
 VIMALANANDA, Tennekoon, 81-83.
 VIMALAVAMSA *Sthavira*, Baddegama,
 84.
- WARNASURIYA, W. M. A., 85.
 WEDDERBURN, M. M., 356.
 WICKREMASINGHE, D. M. DE Z., 10, 11,
 92, 93, 113-123, 131-133, 137, 150,
 151, 171, 177a, 191, 202, 210, 212,
 217, 223, 227, 230, 236, 246, 254,
 275-300, 302-304, 309, 310, 324,
 338, 339, 357, 358.
 WHAYARATNE, D. J., 86-88.
 WHERATNE, P. B. F., 89, 90.
 WOODHOUSE, G. W., 251.
- X., 367.
 YOUNG, J. D., 396.
 ZALESKI, L. M. *Monsignor*, 360.

Price Rs. 12/-

Digitized by Noolaham Foundation.
noolaham.org | aavanaham.org