THE CEYLON JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL STUDIES

NEW SERIES
Vol. I January-June 1971 No. 1

CONTENTS

Annual Subscription Rs. 15-00. Single Copy Rs. 7-50.
Published twice a year by the Ceylon Historical and Social Studies Publications Board.

Price Rs. 7.50

THE CEYLON HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL STUDIES PUBLICATIONS BOARD

The Ceylon Journal of Historical and Social Studies is published twice a year by The Ceylon Historical and Social Studies Publications Board which was constituted in 1958. The months of publication are usually June and December, and copies will be sent post-free to subscribers.

The Journal is intended to cover the entire range of the social sciences—economics, political science, law, archaeology, history, geography, sociology, social psychology and anthropology. The articles will relate mainly, but not exclusively, to Ceylon.

Articles, books for review, editorial and business communications should be addressed to K. M. de Silva, Department of History, University Park, Peradeniya, Ceylon.

Back numbers, Vols. VI to IX are available at publication prices. Vols. I, II and V are out of print; a few copies of Volumes III and IV are still available.

Remittances should be made payable to The Ceylon Journal of Historical and Social Studies. Rates of subscription (inclusive of postage): Annual—Rupees Fifteen; 1·5 pounds sterling; U.S. Three dollars. Single copies—Rupees Seven Fifty Fifteen shillings; U.S. One dollar fifty cents. A trade discount of 20% is allowed to booksellers in Ceylon. All payments from foreign countries must be made by International money order, cheques with 1 sh., 6 d. or $ 0·25 cents added for collection charges, or direct to the Boards a/c at the Bank of Ceylon, Kandy, Ceylon.

THE CEYLON JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL STUDIES

NEW SERIES
Vol. 1 January-June 1971 No. 1

Printed at The Colombo Apothecaries' Co., Ltd., Colombo, for
The Ceylon Historical and Social Studies Publications Board, Peradeniya.

11237—1

THE CEYLON
JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL STUDIES

NEW SERIES
Vol. 1 January-June 1971 No. 1

CONTENTS

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

T. J. Barron, B.A. (Aberdeen) Ph.D. (London), Lecturer in Commonwealth History, Edinburgh University.

W. M. Sirisena, B.A. (Ceylon,) Ph.D. (Australian National University, Canberra) Lecturer in History, University of Ceylon, Peradeniya.

W. I. Siriweera, B.A. (Ceylon), Ph.D. (London), Lecturer in History, University of Ceylon, Peradeniya.

W. A. Wiswa-warnapala, B.A. (Ceylon), M.A. (Pittsburgh), Ph.D. (Leeds) Lecturer in Political Science, University of Ceylon, Peradeniya.

H. A. I. Goonetileke, B.A., Dip., Lib., (London). Dip. Lib., (Madras), F.L.A., Librarian, University of Ceylon, Peradeniya.

MR. MOTHER COUNTRY AND THE "ORIENTALS" OF CEYLON

T. Barron

James Stephen, satirised as 'Mr. Mother Country' and 'Mr. Over-Secretary' by his enemies, was successively legal counsel and permanent under-secretary at the Colonial Office from 1813 to 1847. To his contemporaries Stephen was, what he remains to historians, an elusive and highly controversial figure. As a bureaucrat protected by the official doctrine of ministerial responsibility, he was never allowed to defend himself against the allegations or criticisms made of his work, his personal opinions or his administrative policies. Edward Gibbon Wakefield and his sympathisers accused Stephen of being the vacillating agent of imperial despotism, a charge which passed largely unanswered, almost unchallenged, until in the 1920s Paul Knaplund's researches began to reveal the weaknesses in Wakefield's case. Subsequently historians have been less outspoken in their criticisms but few are as convinced as Knaplund was of Stephen's moral rectitude or of his claims to be regarded as an enlightened humanitarian.[1]

Nowhere is the controversy more intense than over Stephen's attitude to the peoples of Asia. Some years ago in a pioneering study of the emigration of Indians to overseas British territories, Dr. I. M. Cumpston tried to present Stephen as a paractitioner of benevolent paternalism, a supporter of the rights of the subject peoples of the Empire and as an extremely suspicious critic of white-dominated colonial legislatures.[2] This portrait is not unlike that drawn by Professor E. F. C. Ludowyk in his popular history of Ceylon where Stephen appears as 'a man of outstanding ability and integrity . . . . to whom justice in the abstract and the rule of law were positive values.'[3] These view are in marked contrast to those of Manning Clark who has claimed to detect a highly racist streak in Mr. Mother Country's regard for his daughters. Clark draws attention to two official minutes which Stephen wrote in 1843 on a proposal to send indentured labourers from India to New South Wales:

1. The case for Stephen is well presented in Paul Knaplund, *James Stephen and the British Colonial System*, 1813-1847 (Madison, Wisconsin, 1953). The case against is touched on in Oliver MacDonagh, *A Pattern of Government Growth*, 1800-1860 (London, 1961), p. 86.

2. I. M. Cumpston, *Indians Overseas in British Territories*, 1834-1854 (London, 1953), pp. 1—8, 174.

3. E. F. C. Ludowyk, *The Modern History of Ceylon* (London, 1966), p. 63.

> To expedite augmentation of wealth in New South Wales by introducing the black race there from India would, in my mind, be one of the most unreasonable preferences of the present to the future . . . There is not on the globe a social interest more momentous, if we look forward five or six generations, than that of reserving the Continent of New Holland as a place where the English race shall be spread from sea to sea unmixed with any lower castes . . . . We now regret the folly of our ancestors in colonizing North America from Africa.

and, later that year, he added: 'They [the black race] would debase by their intermixture the nobler European race'.[4]

These comments on Indians would appear to have some relevance for Ceylon since Stephen does not seem to have distinguished between Ceylonese and Indian peoples. Indeed with reference to British social policy in Ceylon Professor K. M. de Silva has already expressed distinct reservations about both the breadth of Stephen's sympathies and his supposed universal and untiring regard for abstract justice.[5] But de Silva and the other scholars already cited have looked principally at Mr. Mother Country's attitude to one specific problem. Stephen's views on Ceylon and its administration generally have never been explored although in the official Colonial Office minutes Stephen left behind him a documentary legacy of almost embarrassing proportions. Considering the range of his writings, it is no surprise to discover that he was not always consistent in his views nor, in fact, did he make his opinion clear on every problem that arose in his years as under-secretary. Nonetheless, some tentative conclusions can be offered as a starting point for future research and discussion.

When Stephen looked at Ceylon what he saw was what he called an 'Oriental' or 'Asiatic' society (the terms are inter-changeable) with very definite characteristics, closely resembling India.[6] The Oriental society seemed to have three basic features: autocratic government; idolatrous religions; and entrenched social inequalities. These three characteristics put a peculiar stamp on the mind and outlook of the Ceylonese peoples. The people of Ceylon, for example, were 'accustomed to depend upon the Government to an extent unknown in the other colonial possessions of the crown and habituated to consider the governor as invested with an authority to which all other public functionaries are subjected and which is and ought to be the object of peculiar respect and deference'.[7] This dependence extended to 'the protection against wrong [and]

4. Manning Clark, *A Short History of Australia* (New York, 1963), p. 103, quoting from P. Knaplund, 'Sir James Stephen on a White Australia', *Victorian Historical Magazine*, 12, June 1928, pp. 240-242.
5. K. M. de Silva, *Social Policy and Missionary Organisations in Ceylon* (London, 1965).
6. E.g., Stephen's memorandum 30 June 1830, C.O. 323/47, f. 198; Stephen's memo. 10 Feb. 1847, C.O. 323/63, f. 362.
7. Stephen's memo. 14 Sept. 1837 on Horton to Glenelg, 7 April 1837, No. 64, C.O. 54/154.

. . . the suggestion of whatever is necessary for maintaining or improving as well as for conducting all social institutions'.[8] A people who had never participated in their own government, who had no tradition of representative or responsible institutions, seemed to Stephen 'not sufficiently civilised or cultivated to appreciate and perform the responsibilities and the duties of civil liberties.[9]

Similar deficiencies were attributed to Ceylonese religions where again the Indian and Ceylonese practices were considered identical. At a popular level Hinduism and Buddhism seemed to Stephen characterised by a vulgar pandering to the credulousness and superstition of an uneducated people. At a higher, philosophical level he could occasionally see 'an admixture of truth' but this was vitiated by the tortuous doctrines of the transmigration of the soul or by the manner in which Buddhist priests deceived their faithful by foisting upon them spurious religious relics as objects of veneration and devotion (a criticism which, incidentally, he levelled with even more venom against Roman Catholics).[10] But the gravest weaknesses were attributed to the social system for he regarded Ceylonese society as caste-ridden from top to bottom. The caste system was objectionable as it denied individual freedom and opportunity and used both civil and religious sanctions to reconcile the individual to his fate.[11] In addition to all these deficiencies, perhaps as a direct result of them, the people of Ceylon were also regarded as weak in character—they were mainly 'of relaxed fibre and irritable nerves' or, in other words, lethargic and volatile—the standard caricature of the oriental.[12] Occasionally the references are even less flattering, to 'the submissiveness and languour of their national character', for example, or to 'a people proverbial for their timidity and falsehood', characterised by 'indolence, craft and falsehood'.[13]

It is difficult, however, to reconcile this conception of Ceylonese society with Stephen's actual administrative policies. He refused absolutely to act, on his views of Ceylonese character, arguing that no one who had not lived in Ceylon for a considerable period and diligently studied the subject could

8. Stephen's memo. 25 Oct. 1842 on Campbell to Stanley, 13 July 1842, No. 108, C.O. 54/197.

9. Stephen's memo. 14 Jan. 1847 on Campbell to Grey, 4 Nov. 1846, No. 60, C.O. 54/228.

10. James Stephen, *Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography* (3rd edit. London, 1860), pp. 142, 148. He is here referring to Japanese religion but what he says clearly applies to Hinduism and Buddhism. See also de Silva, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

11. Stephen to Twiss, 9 Dec. 1828, C.O. 323/45, f. 298.

12. Stephen's memo 11 Feb. 1847, C.O. 3/23/63, f. 362.

13. E.g., Stephen's memo. 30 June 1830, C.O. 323/47, f. 198; Empson's report with Stephen's comments thereon, March and April 1841, C.O. 54/191; Stephen's minute, 30 Aug. 1847 on Torrington to Grey, 22 June 1847, No. 34, C.O. 54/236.

possibly understand 'the character and usages' of the people.[14] Repeatedly, he confessed to his superiors his 'ignorance of the Indian character'.[15] That this was sincere cannot be doubted for Stephen eventually came to rely very heavily on local information and tried to limit the role of the British authorities to the examination of and adjudication upon proposals made by the local governments.[16] On one occasion when he had felt compelled to make some disparaging remarks about the general qualifications of Hindu and Buddhist candidates for political office he nonetheless insisted that they be appointed and discounted his own reservations: 'I suppose it to be unsafe to rely, or to act, upon generalities thus vague'.[17]

The actual policy recommendations present an even greater contradiction. In the period up to 1834, before the triumph of coffee cultivation brought a substantial number of European settlers to the island, Stephen's weight was thrown behind the movement to create a more liberal social framework in Ceylon. He supported the attempts to curb the absolute powers of the governor by instituting an official executive council which the governor must consult and a legislative council, containing a number of indigenous members, with which alone legislation could be passed.[18] He also tried to create an independent judiciary in which equal and easy access to the law and equality before the law, irrespective of race or class, were essential elements. He also attempted to dissociate the state and civil authority from its connections with the caste system, compulsory services and the religious observances which the government did not in conscience share. 'The obligations of caste being purely of a religious nature', he wrote in 1828, 'they ought not to be enforced by human laws, unless the legislator sincerely adopts the religious opinions of the people at large on the subject'.[19] Since the British government was obliged by treaty to defend Buddhism in Kandy this attempt to sever the connection with the state has been considerably criticised.[20] Yet Stephen was remarkably consistent on the subject. Throughout his period in office he opposed government attempts to favour any religious community, including the Church of England.

14. Stephen's memo. 20 Jan. 1842 on Campbell to Stanley, 22 Nov. 1841, No. 3, C.O. 54/191.

15. E.g., Stephen to Hay, 16 June 1832, C.O. 54/120, f. 205.

16. Stephen's memo. 28 Aug. 1825, C.O. 54/90, Stephen.

17. Stephen's minute, 5 Feb. 1845 on Campbell to Stanley, 20 Nov. 1844, No. 192, C.O. 54/213. This is, of course, exactly in line with his celebrated statement of 1830: 'Had I the understanding of Jeremy Bentham himself I should distrust my own judgment as to what is really practicable in such remote and anomalous societies'. Stephen to Twiss, 25 Aug. 1830, C.O. 111/98 quoted in V. Harlow and F. Madden, *British Colonial Developments*, 1774-1834 (Oxford, 1953), p. 105.

18. Stephen's minute, 27 June 1837 on Horton to Glenelg, 23 Jan. 1837, Separate, C.O. 54/153.

19. Stephen to Twiss, 9 Dec. 1828, C.O. 323/45, f. 298.

20. De Silva, *op. cit.*, pp. 64-102.

To demonstrate the fact that the British government was composed of Christians who sincerely disapproved of certain Buddhist ceremonies was not the same, he thought, as to use state power and finances to aid Christian proselytization.[21]

Stephen may be made to appear equally unsympathetic to Ceylonese aspirations in his refusal to support the commissioners or 1829-32 (Messrs. Colebrooke and Cameron) in their desire to replace British officials in the civil service by Ceylonese. Again the question is complex. Stephen seems to have felt that British rule was too imperfectly consolidated in the island to risk such a major change. He also judged that, in a colony where public opinion was not well organised, British civil servants would be more impartial in judging local social questions, more familiar with constitutional government and, therefore, much better at suggesting proposals for reform.[22] Whatever these examples may suggest, there can be no doubt that there was not only a consistent element of racial egalitarianism in Stephen's recommendations for Ceylon both before and after 1834 but also a genuine concern to prevent local legislation from adversely affecting the interests of the poorer and illiterate members of the community. On many occasions he attempted to challenge the imperial costs (mainly military and scientific) levied on the Ceylonese exchequer and each time he did so avowedly to make funds available for public works of immediate benefit to the people. He was particularly keen to offer a government-sponsored programme of public education: 'To encourage the diffusion of useful knowledge may be admitted to be amongst the highest duties of government'.[23]

After 1834 Ceylonese administrative problems were greatly complicated by the presence of a large European planting and commercial community. There is some evidence that Stephen deplored this development which seemed to him to deny economic initiative to the indigenous Ceylonese.[24] His objections, however, were powerless to prevent the immigration of British settlers and capital and he was forced to re-consider the future of Ceylon in terms of a bi-cultural society. There is no evidence that he had regarded previous divisions within Ceylonese society, between Kandyans and Low-country Sinhalese, for example, or between Tamil and Sinhalese, as of any real impor-

21. E.g., Stephen's memo. 27 June 1839 on Mackenzie to Glenelg, 25 Jan. 1839, No. 23, C.O. 54/169. See also Stephen, *Essays* . . . , p. 559.

22. E.g., Stephen's memo. 14 Sept. 1837 on Horton to Glenelg, 7 April 1837, No. 64, C.O. 54/154; Stephen's memo. 25 Oct. 1842 on Campbell to Stanley, 13 July 1842, No. 108, C.O. 54/197; Stephen's memo. 31 Aug. 1847 on Torrington to Grey, 22 June 1847, No. 34, C.O. 54/236.

23. Stephen's memo. 28 June 1837 on Horton to Glenelg, 23 Jan. 1837, No. 37, C.O. 54/153. See also minute 26 Feb. 1838 on Horton to Glenelg, 4 Oct. 1837, No. 145, C.O. 54/156.

24. See his objections to capitalist economic development in Stephen's memo. 14 Sept. 1837 on Horton to Glenelg, 7 April 1837, No. 63, C.O. 54/154.

tance. In 1841, however, he wrote: 'Many a generation must pass away before the two populations of Ceylon can be blended in one homogenous mass, or can make any material advance towards such a result'. And, he added, 'it is impossible to sacrifice the interest of the present times to such remote and doubtful interests'.[25] The European community posed three particular problems: their wealth was so much greater than that of the rest of society that an almost unbridgeable gap was opened between them;[26] their political experience and sophistication entitled them to enjoy political privileges which could not be safely entrusted to the indigenous population;[27] and, by displaying that 'contempt and aversion with which the European race everywhere regards the black races', they presented a social problem of equal difficulty since the sense of community amongst all members of the society was broken down.[28]

Stephen's settled policy was to insist on the principle of equal treatment for both communities. If a Ceylon-born civil servant was qualified, for example, he should be promoted into the higher civil service; if his promotion entitled him to sit ex-officio on the executive and legislative councils then he should be so allowed to sit.[29] If the appointed Ceylonese members on the legislative council complained of loss of income through time spent at its meetings, then they should be remunerated.[30] If the European-appointed members on the legislative council held views 'which would depress the natives and elevate the British class' then that would be 'a very sufficient reason for not selecting them . . . The choice should, of course, be dictated by no other consideration than that of the public good and in Ceylon the preference of persons holding less liberal views on this question over those whose views are more liberal' would be inconvenient.[31]

---

25. Stephen's minute, 24 Sept. 1850 on Mackenzie to Russell, 14 Mar. 1840, No. 50, C.O. 54/179.

26. Stephen's memo. 16 Oct. 1841 on Campbell to Russell, 9 Aug. 1841, No. 53, C.O. 54/189; Stephen's minute, 1 May 1839 on Mackenzie to Glenelg, 10 Feb. 1839, No. 38, C.O. 54/169.

27. Stephen's minute, 3 Dec. 1846 on Campbell to Grey, 10 Oct. 1846, No. 36, C. O. 54/226.

28. Stephen's memo. after Fitzroy to Stanley, 16 Aug. 1845, C.O. 209/35 quoted in J. M. Ward, *Empire in the Antipodes* (London, 1966), p. 60. This applied quite as fully to the West Indian colonies under the 'old representative system'. He says, for example, of Jamaica in 1841: '. . . there survive indelible natural distinctions and recollections which divide Society into Castes, and which must make the legislation of the European more or less unjust and oppressive towards the African race'. Stephen's minute, 15 Sept. 1841, C.O. 137/256, quoted in K.N. Bell and W. P. Morrell, *Select Documents on British Colonial Policy*, 1830-1860 (Oxford, 1928), p. 420.

29. Stephen's minute, 4 Nov. 1837 on Hortón to Glenelg, 1 June 1837, No. 81, C.O. 54/154; Stephen's draft, 4 Nov. 1837 on Horton to Glenelg, 16 June 1837, Separate, C.O. 54/154.

30. Stephen's minutes, 16 Oct. and 20 Oct. 1838 on Mackenzie to Glenelg, 12 June 1838, No. 88, C.O. 54/163.

31. Stephen's minute, 1 May 1838 on Horton to Glenelg, 6 Nov. 1837, No. 154, C.O. 54/156.

Here Stephen saw a difficulty. Liberalism was a means to good government but not an end in itself:

> The principle of admitting the natives of Ceylon to an equal participation with the European inhabitants in the honors and emoluments of the public service would be entirely misunderstood and would be urged to consequences altogether indefensible, if it were supposed to require the employment of natives in offices for which they are not qualified by capacity and by previous education.[32]

This was an unfortunate loophole for the governors and their advisers to whom Stephen delegated the task of judging the capacity of indigenous candidates never had the scrupulous impartiality which he expected of them.

The stress on education was also unfortunate for Stephen knew that Europeans alone had access to an English legal education and he himself had opposed a proposal to educate Ceylonese youths in London. The scheme seemed to him to be too expensive and it threatened to expose innocent youths to too many problems of readjustment. But, in any case, Stephen thought a formal training in English law was an irrelevance for anyone wishing to practise law in Ceylon. The complexity and artificiality of the Ceylonese legal system demanded someone of European background to administer it.[33] Once the laws had been anglicised and related to Ceylonese requirements these doubts might disappear. But this could not happen overnight. In 1839 he argued with the Burgher lawyers for the retention of the Roman-Dutch laws on property cases though the European planters were strongly opposed to them: 'The best philosophy as I take it', Stephen wrote, 'is to consult the habits and to respect the prejudices of those for whom laws are to be made . . . habits and prejudice will always be too strong for legislative control'.[34] His solution was to allow each community to operate its own legal system and to gradually assimilate them, a policy not unlike (at least in theory) that of *apartheid*. By these various means, a careful selection of candidates by merit, or an educational qualification, or by proposals for separate judicial systems, he in effect limited the contribution of Ceylonese officials on utilitarian grounds to the lower ranks of the judiciary and civil service. It was Stephen, significantly, who was the moving spirit behind the reform of the civil service in

---

32. Stephen's draft, 19 Feb. 1840 on Mackenzie to Normanby, 5 June 1839, Separate, C.O. 54/171.

33. Stephen's minute, 25 Feb. 1840 on Mackenzie to Russell, 17 Dec. 1839, No. 13, C.O. 54/173.

34. Stephen's memo. 24 Sept. 1840 on Mackenzie to Russell, 14 Mar. 1840, No. 50, C.O. 54/179. See also Stephen's memo. 20 Jan. 1842 on Campbell to Stanley, 22 Nov. 1841, No. 3, C.O. 54/191.

the mid-1840s which sought to improve the calibre of a repidly degenerating public service *and* to restore the exclusive nature of the top positions by re-instituting direct appointments from Britain.[35]

On the other hand there is ample evidence that he wanted to lessen the great disparity in wealth between Europeans and Ceylonese where the government had the power to do so. He continually protested about 'the very great distinction which at present prevails between the remuneration assigned to the European and to the native servants of the crown'.[36] He wrote in 1839: 'the highest salary every given to a black man in Ceylon is such a pittance that no unimaginable thrift could raise from it a maintenance for his declining years'.[37] It was, he said, a matter of principle to respect 'the claims of the natives to have their interests carefully weighed and impartially protected'.[38] Here was where he felt the Colonial Office's power of review could be most useful:

> In Ceylon . . . I have long since observed that, from what I suppose is an inevitable bias, the complaints of the native population and those of the Europeans receive a very different degree and kind of attention and that on more than one occasion this sort of distinction has been overcome by the head of this office showing that he was not unobservant of it.[39]

This may seem a small contribution to racial equality but there was another aspect of even greater importance. With experience Stephen learned that benevolent paternalism was no substitute for personal involvement in the constitutional process. In 1842 he recommended that provisional legislative measures for Ceylon should be publicised and criticisms welcomed so as to ensure that laws were 'properly winnowed by public debate'. Even an important measure such as the amendment of the charter of justice should be handled in this way:

> There are no doubt great objections to local legislation in such a case as this. Prejudices, and selfish interests and feelings of caste and the rivalry of different classes of Europeans, are all fertile sources of error. But the most certain and abundant of all such sources, that is ignorance of the place and the people, is stopped up.[40]

---

35. E.g., Stephen's memo. 16 Oct. 1841 on Campbell to Russell, 9 Aug. 1841, No. 53, C.O. 54/189.
36. Stephen's minute, 19 July 1838 on Mackenzie to Glenelg, 7 Mar. 1838, No. 48, C.O. 54/161.
37. Stephen's minute, 4 Sept. 1839 on Mackenzie to Glenelg, 9 April 1839, No. 47, C.O. 54/170.
38. Stephen's minute, 3 Mar. 1840 on Mackenzie to Russell, 14 Dec. 1839, No. 5, C.O. 54/173.
39. Stephen's minute, 13 Nov. 1841 on Campbell to Russell, 31 Aug. 1841, No. 61, C.O. 54/189.
40. Stephen's memo. 20 Jan. 1842 on Campbell to Stanley, 22 Nov. 1841, No. 3, C.O. 54/191.

The desire to utilise local expertise was not accompanied by any decline in the vigilance with which racial discrimination was attacked in the Colonial Office. 'Ceylon', Stephen wrote in 1844, 'is degenerating into a colony [sic], the scene of newspaper and other agitators, cultivated for the benefit of absentees, with a money-making European aristocracy to keep down the local government with the one hand and the natives with the other. It ought to be an Asiatic province, under the government of a power absolute if not despotic, and ruled for the good of the feeble many rather for that of the strong and wealthy few'.[41]

To defend the 'feeble many' Stephen was quite prepared to defy the 'wealthy few'. On a European petition in 1847 for an elective legislature he minuted:

> To myself it seems that Englishmen who resort to the number of a few hundred to a great Asiatic state having at present more than a million and a half inhabitants must while residing there be content to forego the franchises of their native land. Such a legislature as is here proposed would in fact be an absolute oligarchy, responsible to no-one for their actions but armed with a power crushing and intolerable to the great mass of the people among whom they live.[42]

Nor is this the only instance of his concern. In 1841 he rebuked a governor for having given priority treatment to the needs of the planters over those of the peasantry and, characteristically, he took this opportunity to enunciate his own views on the economic welfare of society:

> A comparatively poor society where manual labour is dear is usually more happy, more virtuous and more powerful than a comparatively wealthy society where such labour is cheap, for in that case the wealth is concentrated and not diffused and so are the enjoyments which wealth procures and so is the conservative spirit and the contentment which thrive only with the prosperous.[43]

Stephen's attitude to such an important and difficult question as that of race clearly cannot be settled by reference to only one colony. But the example of Ceylon is not only important as a contribution to the overall picture but it also has its own intrinsic interest. There can be no doubt that Stephen saw the British role in Ceylon as essentially different from her role in, for

41. Stephen's memo. 21 Aug. 1844 on Campbell to Stanley, 4 June 1844, Private, C.O. 54/211.

42. Stephen's memo. 14 Jan. 1846 on Campbell to Grey, 4 Nov. 1846, No. 60, C.O. 54/228.

43. Stephen's memo. 16 Oct. 1841 on Campbell to Russell, 9 Aug. 1841, No. 53, C.O. 54/189.

example, Australia and New Zealand where a European population enjoying British institutions was happily set on a road leading, sooner or later, to independence. Ceylon, on the contrary, had no such clear future. The most that could be foreseen was a long and exhausting period of trusteeship, of placating contending interests, of vigilantly guarding against the perversion of laws and institutions by the dominant minority. But it is surely significant that Stephen regarded this future as a matter of regret. In almost every case where he sounds most racialist in his pronouncements (including the examples cited by Manning Clark) it is because he wishes to warn against the consequences of creating mixed societies in which a future national homogeneity (his invariable word in this context) is prejudiced. And this surely explains what he meant in his most famous comment on the Empire at mid-century. The British colonial system in the white settlement colonies had become to cheerfully relax the bonds of authority: 'the rest are unfit for it—detached islands with heterogeneous [sic] populations, wretched burdens which in an evil hour we assumed, but which we have no right to lay down again'.[44] Wakefield might have been surprised to learn that Stephen considered trusteeship a poor alternative to independence: he would have been even more surprised had he been able to read another of Stephen's comments on the administration of Ceylon:

> The conquest of Kandy was, I fear, an unprincipled aggression on an independent people. It was one step in the process which has created our Eastern Empire of which, I believe, the best that could be said is that we have made some atonement by the right use of our power for the inequity of the means by which we obtained it.[45]

44. C. E. Stephen, *The First Sir James Stephen* (Gloucester, 1906), pp. 143-144.

45. Stephen's memo. 4 July 1845 on Campbell to Stanley, 8 May 1845, No. 96, C.O. 54/217.

THE KALIṄGA DYNASTY OF CEYLON AND THE THEORY OF ITS SOUTH-EAST ASIAN ORIGIN

W. M. SIRISENA

The Pali chronicle *Cūlavaṃsa* and the inscriptions of the Kaliṅga rulers of Ceylon describe the immediate successors of Parākramabāhu I as belonging to the Kaliṅga dynasty. They ruled from Polonnaruva for about fifty years between A.D. 1184-1235 and this has been called the period of the Kaliṅga kings.[1] The Kaliṅga mentioned in these literary and epigraphical sources was until recently believed to be the well-known Kaliṅga region in Eastern India, which had had close contacts with the Island from the beginning of her history. But recently S. Paranavitana, who had earlier himself shared the traditional view,[2] departed from it and identified this Kaliṅga, when mentioned in Ceylonese sources from the tenth century onwards, as a kingdom of that name in South-east Asia.[3] In this connection he says:

> The country named Kaliṅga in this context means, not Kaliṅga on the Indian Continent, but the Śrīvijaya empire of Malaysia, a vast Buddhist realm extending over the Malay Peninsula and the islands of the East Indies . . .[4]

If this theory is accepted, we will have to concede that Ceylon had close political relations with South-east Asia during the mediaeval period, even closer than with the Indian sub-continent, and that South-east Asian Kingdoms played a vital role in its history. This paper seeks to examine Paranavitana's theory in detail and see whether the Kaliṅga mentioned in the Ceylonese sources can be taken as a kingdom in South-east Asia.[5]

Kaliṅga is mentioned in Ceylonese sources from very early times. According to the tradition preserved in the *Mahāvaṃsa*, Vijaya, the first king of

1. Paranavitana, 'The Kāliṅga Dynasty of Ceylon', *JGIS*, Vol. III (1936), pp. 5764, Sirima Wickremasinghe, 'The Kāliṅga Period of Ceylon History', M. A. Thesis (University of Ceylon, 1956, unpublished); *UHC*, Vol. I, pt. 2, pp. 507-28; Nicholas and Paranavitana, *A Concise History of Ceylon* (Colombo, 1961), pp. 237-46.
2. Paranavitana, 'The Kāliṅga Dynasty of Ceylon', loc. cit.
3. Paranavitana, 'Ceylon and Malaysia in Mediaeval Times', *JCBRAS*, NS, Vol. VII pt. 1 (1960), pp. 1-42; Nicholas and Paranavitana, op.cit. pp. 237-46; Paranavitana' *Ceylon and Malaysia* (Colombo, 1966).
4. Nicholas and Paranavitana, op.cit. p. 237.
5. *Mv*, VI, 1.

Ceylon, is said to have had connections with Kaliṅga.[6] Historians believe that a recollection of the Aryan colonization of Ceylon is preserved in the Vijaya traditions.[7] If this is so, the mention of Kaliṅga may be taken to record an early wave of immigrants from that part of India to Ceylon. Again during the reign of King Sirimeghavaṇṇa (A.D. 352-79) we hear once more about Kaliṅga from the *Cūlavaṃsa*.[8] The king of Kaliṅga, owing to the unsettled political conditions in his own kingdom, sent his daughter Hemamālā with the Tooth Relic of the Buddha to the ruler of Ceylon for its protection.[9] In the 7th century Ceylon came into political contact with Kaliṅga for the first time when a king of the latter was defeated by enemies and took refuge in Ceylon.[10] This friendship seems to have been further strengthened in later years by matrimonial alliances.[11] Mahinda IV (A.D. 956-972) was the first Sinhalese king to contract such an alliance with Kaliṅga,[12] and he was followed by a number of Sinhalese rulers. After the expulsion of the Coḷas from Ceylon, Vijayabāhu I had a consort named Tilokasundarī brought over from the Kaliṅga kingdom.[13] Madhukaṇṇava, Bhīmarāja and Balakkāra, all kinsmen of Tilokasundarī, are said to have settled in Ceylon.[14]

These matrimonial alliances eventually led to the establishment of a Kaliṅga dynasty in Ceylon. Parākramabāhu I, who had no son to succeed him, invited a Kaliṅga prince to take over the throne on his death.[15] This Vijayabāhu II (A.D. 1186-1187), was the first ruler of Ceylon to come directly from Kaliṅga. The Kaliṅga dynasty starts with his reign and ends with that of Māgha, who invaded the island in A.D. 1215. Niśśaṁkamalla, Vikramabāhu II Coḍagaṅga, Sāhasamalla and Māgha belong to this line.[16] In their inscriptions some of them referred to themselves as belonging to the Kaliṅgavaṃsa.[17]

---

6. For other refutation of Paranavitana's theory see K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, 'Ceylon and Sri Vijaya', *JCBRAS*, NS, Vol. VIII, pt. 1, (1962), pp. 125-40; Sirima Kiribamune', 'Some reflections on Professor Paranavitana's Contribution to History', *The Ceylon Journal of the Humanities*, Vol. I, No. 1, (1970), pp. 76-92; R. A. L. H. Gunawardana, 'Ceylon and Malaysia: A Study of Professor S. Paranavitana's Research on the Relations Between the Two Regions', *UCR*, Vol XXV (1967), pp. 1-64. Paranavitana has claimed to have discovered some interlinear inscriptions the contents of which confirm his theories. So far no epigraphist other than Paranavitana has been able even to see any such interlinear writing. Therefore, until other epigraphists accept Paranavitana's reading we have excluded the material drawn by him from these interlinear inscriptions, from discussion in this paper.
7. Basham, 'Prince Vijaya and the Aryanization of Ceylon', *CHJ*, Vol. I (1951), pp. 163-71; *UHC*, Vol. I, pt. 1, pp. 82-97.
8. *Cv*, XXXVII, 92.
9. Ibid.; *Daḷadā-sirita*, ed. Sorata, pp. 28-34; *Pjv*, ed. Suraweera, p. 97.
10. *Cv*, XLII, 44.
11. Sirima Wickremasinghe, 'The Kāliṅga Period of Ceylon History', p. 7.
12. *Cv*, LIV, 9.
13. Ibid, LIX, 29-30.
14. *Cv*, LIX, 46-47.
15. *EZ*, Vol. II, No. 30, pp. 179-84; V, No. 17, pp. 196-208; *UHC*, Vol. I, pt. 2, p. 507.
16. *Cv*, LXXX; *UHC*, Vol. I, pt. 2, pp. 507ff.
17. *EZ*, Vol. II, No. 36, pp. 219-29.

According to Paranavitana's theory Ceylonese chronicles and literary works refer to Kaliṅga from very early times until Māgha's invasion, and even after that, without any distinction between Kaliṅga in India and the Kaliṅga that was in South-east Asia. The chroniclers knew the history of the Island better than any of their contemporaries, and if there had been any difference between the Kaliṅga of the early history and that of the mediaeval period, they would have indicated this in their chronicles. But their work gives no clue of such a distinction, and therefore it is necessary to examine Paranavitana's interpretation very closely.

Ceylon for the first time was invaded by a South-east Asian ruler, named Chandrabhānu, in the reign of Parākramabāhu II (A.D. 1236-70). In the Ceylonese chronicles and other literary sources this invasion is mentioned as that of a Jāvaka ruler.[18] Paranavitana, discussing this invasion of the Jāvaka ruler Candrabhānu says:

> According to Ceylon history as at present accepted, the invasions of the Island by Candrabhānu of Tāmbraliṅga were not related to any event which took place before or after them, and it was only in this period that the Malay people influenced the course of the political history of Ceylon. But, if a certain detail with regard to Candrabhānu's attack on Ceylon, given in the *Rājāvalī*, is properly understood . . . , it would appear that Candrabhānu's attempt to secure the sovereignty of Ceylon for himself was the result of a long historical process, and that the people from Malaysia had played a very important part in the history of this Island.[19]

Paranavitana then analyses the data of the chronicles and other literary sources about Candrabhānu and Kaliṅga Māgha to see any links between this Jāvaka invasion and the Kaliṅga dynasty of Ceylon. His conclusion is that both Candrabhānu and the Kaliṅga rulers hailed from the same place, that is from Malaysia.

The *Cūlavaṃsa*, Ceylon's main chronicle for the period, says that the bulk of the soldiers who invaded Ceylon under Candrabhānu were Jāvakas,[20] while the army with which Māgha came to the Island consisted of Keralas.[21] The *Rājāvaliya*, an eighteenth century work, recording the invasion says that Candrabhānu came with an army of Malalas. In the same chronicle, Māgha's soldiers too are referred to as Malalas.[22] On the basis of this, Parana-

18. *Cv*, LXXXIII, 36-51; LXXXVIII, 62ff; *Pjv*, ed. Suraweera, pp. 117-18; *Hvv*, (P.T.S.), p. 32; Rjv, ed. Pemananda, p. 71; *UHC*, Vol. I, pt. 2, pp. 622ff; A. Liyanagamage, *The Decline of Polonnaruwa and the Rise of Dambadeniya*, (Colombo, 1968), pp. 133 ff.
19. Paranavitana. *Ceylon and Malaysia*, p. 81.
20. *Cv*, LXXXIII, 36-39.
21. Ibid., LXXX, 58ff.
22. *Rjv*, ed. Gunasekera, pp. 44-45.

vitana says that Māgha and Candrabhānu both invaded Ceylon with armies made up of the same type of people.[23]

The author of the *Pūjāvaliya*, who was contemporary with the incidents referred to says that Māgha invaded with 24,000 Malalas.[24] But when he records the invasion of Candrabhānu, it is said that Candrabhānu came commanding an army of Jāvakas.[25] The author knew well that they were different people, for he says that Parākramabāhu II had to fight a *Malala yuddha* (battle), a *Draviḍa yuddha* and a *Jāvaka yuddha*.[26]

Paranavitana, using the *Pūjāvaliya* account of Māgha's invasion and the *Rājāvaliya* account of both invasions, came to the conclusion that Māgha and Candrabhānu both invaded the Island with an army of Malalas.[27] However, he did not take into consideration the statement in the *Pūjāvaliya* that Candrabhānu came with an army of Jāvakas or the *Cūlavaṃsa* account of Māgha and Candrabhānu.

It is clear that, except for the *Rājāvaliya*, all the chronicles and literary works agree that the Jāvakas and Malalas were two different peoples. The *Pūjāvaliya* places the Jāvakas and the Malalas among the enemies with whom Parākramabāhu II fought, and it is quite clear that they were not the same people, otherwise it would mention only the Jāvakas and Draviḍas or the Malalas and Draviḍas, but not all three—Malalas, Draviḍas and Jāvakas—in a context which indicates that they were three different peoples. Thus, whoever the Malalas may have been, they were definitely not Jāvakas. Thus on this basis it is not possible to say that both Māgha and Candrabhānu hailed from the same place.

Paranavitana next seeks evidence from the Ceylonese sources to identify the Malala with the people of the Malay Peninsula. Though he equates *Malala* with *Jāvaka*, he does not find any evidence either from the *Pūjāvaliya* or the *Rājāvaliya* which identifies the Malalas with the Malays. Therefore, he turns to the *Kāvyaśekharaya*,[28] a fifteenth-century literary work, the *magnum opus* of Śrī Rāhula, in which the Malala king was listed among the rulers of different countries who came bearing the characteristic products of their lands to see the Bodhisattva, who was then incarnated as a wise Brahmin, born in Banaras. According to this description, the Malala king brought with him cardamoms, betel-leaves of Malaya, pepper, nutmeg, cubebs and precious stones.[29] On the strength of the word *Mala-bulat* (betel-leaves of Malaya)

23. Paranavitana, *JCBRAS*, NS, Vol. VII, pt. 1, pp. 6ff; Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, pp. 82ff.
24. *Pjv*, ed. Suraweera, p. 108.
25. Ibid., p. 117.
26. Ibid.
27. Paranavitana, *JCBRAS*, NS, Vol. VII, pp. 6ff; Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, pp. 82ff.
28. *Kāvyaśekharaya*, ed. Dharmārāma (Vidyalankara University Press, 1966).
29. Ibid., canto, X, v. 119.

Paranavitana identifies Malala with Malaya, and even explains the phonetic changes from Malaya to Malala, giving examples. Then he says that Malaya can be taken as Malabar as well as the Malay Peninsula. In order to suit his thesis, Paranavitana prefers to take Malala here as the Malay Peninsula on the basis of its products,[30] although he admits that, except for cubebs, all the products mentioned were grown in both places. For his main argument Paranavitana refers to references taken by Nilakanta Sastri from the early Tamil text *Silappadikāram* and its commentaries, to the effect that cubebs (*takkola*) were among the commodities imported to South India from the Malay Peninsula.[31] He says:

> It is, therefore justifiable to take the Malala as people of the Malay Peninsula, even though there is evidence in the historical writings of Ceylon, which, on its face value, seems to support their identification with the inhabitants of Malabar.[32]

Thus on the basis of a single word mentioned in the *Kāvyaśekharaya*, Paranavitana is content to identify the Malalas as the Malay people.

Cubebs were a well-known product of the Malay Peninsula and the islands adjoining it during this period, as they still are in modern times. But evidence is not wanting that cubebs were grown in Malabar during the period when the *Kāvyaśekharaya* was written (A.D. 1449).[32] Valentyn (A.D. 1675) mentions cubebs as a product of Malabar.[33] Garcia (A.D. 1566) does likewise.[34] In A.D. 1504, only 55 years after the *Kāvyaśekharaya* was written, we have details of three cargoes from Malabar that arrived in Lisbon; these included 10,000 *cantars* of pepper, 500 *cantars* of cinnamon, 450 *cantars* of cloves, 130 *cantars* of ginger, and 191 *cantars* of cubebs.[35] Certain manuscripts of the *Travels of Marco Polo* state that in Malabar there is a vast abundance of pepper, ginger, cinnamon, cubebs and Indian nuts.[36] Thus this account shows that as early as the thirteenth century cubebs were growing in Malabar. On the other hand, the fact that *takkola* was imported to the Tamil country from the Malay Peninsula does not necessarily mean that it was foreign to India, for

30. Paranavitana, *JCBRAS*, NS, Vol. VII, pt. 1, p. 7; Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, p. 83.
31. Nilakanta Sastri, 'The Tamil Land and the Eastern Colonies', *JGIS*, Vol. XI (1944) pp. 26-28. R. A. L. H. Gunawardena has pointed out the unreliability of the evidence on which the argument that *takkola* was imported to South India from Malaysia is based. *UCR*, XXV, 16-17.
32. Paranavitana, *JCBRAS*, NS, Vol. VII, pt. 1, pp. 7-8; Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, p. 83.
32. K. Indrapala, 'Review of *Ceylon and Malaysia* by S. Paranavitana', *JCBRAS*, NS, Vol. XI (1967), p. 105.
33. Valentyn, *Ceylon*, p. 243, cited by H. Yule, *The Book of Ser Marco Polo* (London, 1903), Vol. II, p. 390, note 4.
34. Yule, loc.cit.
35. Buchanan, Mysore, II, p. 31, III, p. 193 cited by Yule, loc.cit.
36. Yule, loc.cit.

the sandalwood and aloewood mentioned in the same Tamil commentary as imported from the Malay Peninsula are well-known products of India.

K. W. Goonewardene, supporting Paranavitana's identification, says that not only cubebs but nutmeg also was to be found in Malaysia, according to sixteenth and seventeenth-century Portuguese and Dutch writings.[37] But there is evidence for nutmeg being grown in India in early times. *The History of the Sung Dynasty* mentions nutmeg, cloves, camphor and sandalwood among the products of the Coḷa country.[38]

Another point to be noted in connection with cubebs, is the mention of them in certain versions of the *Kāvyaśekharaya* among the gifts brought by the Madra king.[39] If this is accepted, it would show that the author of the *Kāvyaśekharaya* had no clear idea of what was produced where, as cubebs are certainly not gown in the Madra country, which is in north-west Panjab. Then, although the author of the *Kāvyaśekharaya* does not follow territorial order strictly, the mention of the Malala immediately after the Pāṇḍya king also favours the identification of Malala with the Malabar region.[40] Thus in this respect Paranavitana is not successful in providing adequate evidence for identifying Malala with the Malay Peninsula.

For his identification of Malala, Paranavitana gives some references from the *Kokila-sandēsaya* and its old paraphrase (*Sanne*). The author of this fifteenth-century *Sandēsaya*, describing the city of Yāpāpaṭuna (Jaffna) during its occupation by the forces of King Parākramabāhu VI in the middle of the fifteenth century, says that soldiers of Tamil, Malala, Doluvara and Sinhalese nationality were to be seen in its streets.[41] The Malala in the *Sandēsaya* is glossed as Malayura in the old *Sanne* of the poem, written in A.D. 1773.[42] Paranavitana says:

> . . . if at that date the author of the *Sanne* furnished this information about the Malalas from his own awareness of who they were, and whence they came, it would indicate that the Malala people had dealings with Ceylon even so late as that. But it is more likely that, as is the usual practice of annotators, the author of the *Sanne* had copied this gloss from an earlier writer dating back to a period during which there was intercourse between Ceylon and the land of the Malalas.[43]

37. K. W. Goonewardene, 'Comments on "Ceylon and Malaysia in Mediaeval Times" ', *JCBRAS*, NS, Vol. VII, pt. 2 (1961), p. 256.
38. *History of the Sung Dynasty*, chuan, 489, ed. To To and his colleagues in the Yuan dynasty, quoted by Lo Hsiang-lin, in 'On the Voyage of Soli Samudra, Chola's Envoy to China in A.D. 1015'. *Proceedings of the First International Conferences Seminar of Tamil Studies*, Vol. I, p. 511.
39. *Kāvyaśekharaya* ed. Ratmalane Dharmakiriti Sri Dharmarama, canto, X, 114.
40. Ibid., 118.
41. *Kokila-sandēsaya*, ed. Alawisi Sabihela, v. 254.
42. *Kokila-sandēsaya*, ed. with the *Sanne*, P. S. Perera (Colombo, 1906), p. 95.
43. Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, pp. 83-84.

Thus, according to Paranavitana, the Malaya and the Malayura mentioned in these works can be identified with the Malay Peninsula.

The term Malayura is derived from Malai-ūr, which means a hill town. In Malayalam it means a town, village or locality situated in the hills.[44] According to Joseph Minattur, Malayūr is almost identical in meaning with Malabar.[45] Lassen explains that the *bar* of Malarbar is derived from *vāra*, neaning region. Thus Malayavāra means a region of Malaya.[46] Therefore there is also the possibility that Malayura is derived from Malayavāra. Thus Malayura is virtually identical in meaning with Malabar and hence the author of the *Sanne* glosses Malala with Malayura to denote Malabar.

On the other hand, since the *Sanne* was composed at the end of the eighteenth century, even if its author meant Malayura as the Malay Peninsula, it is not legitimate to use this more recent evidence to identify the Malala mentioned in thirteenth and fifteenth century literary works. For by the eighteenth century there definitely were Malays in Ceylon, according to Portuguese and Dutch accounts.[47] They would have been known among the Ceylonese as Malalas.

Thus when the *Sanne* of the *Kokila-sandēsaya* was composed there were already a number of Javanese and Malays in the Island. 'Malala' may by then have been regularly used by the Sinhalese as a name for the Malays, though we do not find any definite evidence of this in contemporary literature. Therefore, it is possible that the author of the *Sanne* gave Malayura as a synonym of Malala in the *Kokila-sandēsaya* from his knowledge of the contemporary language. This may also have been the reason for the author of the *Rājāvaliya* using Malala for Javanese, to denote the soldiers brought by Candrabhānu, where the word 'Jāvaka' is used in other chronicles and literary works. Thus even if the *Sanne* did use the term 'Malala' in the sense of 'Malay' there is no justification for using this reference to identify the term 'Malala' in the earlier chronicles and other literary works.

Paranavitana has drawn attention to some toponyms around Hambantota in order to justify his thesis that the Malalas with whom Māgha invaded Ceylon were Malays. He gives such names as Malala-lēvāya, Malala-oya, Uḍa-Malala, Palle-Malala and Hambantota and thinks that these place names originated in the thirteenth century as a result of Māgha's activities.[48]

---

44. Joseph Minattur, 'Malaya: What's in the Name', *JSS*, Vol. LIV, pt. 1, p. 19.

45. Ibid., 28.

46. Cited by Caldwell, *A Comparative Grammer of the Dravidian or South Indian Family of Languages*, pp. 23-4.

47. John Crawfurd, *History of the Indian Archipeloga* (Edinburgh, 1920), Vol. II, pp. 493-94, 546, 554 Captain H. M. Said, 'Ceylon Malays', *JMBRAS*, Vol. IV (1926), pt. 1, p. 267-68.

48. Paranavitana, *JCBRAS*, NS, Vol. VII, pt. 1, p. 9.

Hambantota is the principal Malay settlement in Ceylon even at the present day. We have already seen the association of Malays with southern Ceylon dating from the time of the Portuguese, and also the possibility of using 'Malala' to denote Malays. Hence it is quite possible that these Malala toponyms originated from this later association of Malays and Javanese with this part of the Island. Not one of them is mentioned in any of the old literary or epigraphical sources, suggesting that they do not have a history going back to the thirteenth century.

The name Hambantota could have originated as a result of this port being used by Candrabhānu's ships, who landed in the south of Ceylon, where Hambantota is situated.[49] The first element in this name Hambantota is equivalent to *sampan*, a Malay word meaning a ship, given a Sinhalese character by the typical substitution of *h* for *s*. As there is evidence to show that Indonesian ships visited Indian and Ceylonese ports and even reached as far as Madagascar,[50] the name Hambantota may merely have come into being because it was a regular port of call for Malay and Indonesian vessels. In reconstructing obscure aspects of history the evidence of toponyms is sometimes very useful, but it is rarely conclusive without other evidence. We cannot deduce from these toponyms alone that Māgha's soldiers were of Malayan origin.

The use of the word Malala for Malabar as late as the eighteenth century is indirectly attested by the *Malala-kathāva* which is written in mixed Sinhalese prose and verse.[51] It tells us that during King Bhuvanaikabāhu's reign seven Malalas of the Mallava country, due to a hostile king who did not allow them to practise the art of war in their country, decided to come to the Siṃhala island. On their way these Malalas are said to have landed at Bodhimaṇḍalaya, Madurāpura, Mailapura and Ayiyottipaṭṭalama[52] before they reached Ceylon. At Ayiyottipaṭṭalama they met some Tamil *cheṭṭis*. The account of these princes given in the *Malala-kathāva* only indicates that the writers had no clear idea of the home of the Malalas. In this text, the Malala princes speak of the matrimonial links they had with the Pāṇḍya country, and this would strengthen the possibility that they were South Indians. The authors wrote their account of the journey of the Malalas according to their own faulty knowledge of geography. They knew of the Mallas in the Himalaya foothills from the Buddhist scriptures, and of Malabar because its inhabitants had had close relations with the Island, and both these names resemble Malala. The Ayiyottipaṭṭa-

49. Liyanagamage, *The Decline of Polonnaruva and the Rise of Daṁbadeṇiya*, p. 139.

50. Wolters, *Early Indonesian Commerce*, p. 154.

51. 'Malala Kathāva: The Story of the Seven Malabar Princes'. Translated into English by Raghavan from a manuscript in the Colombo National Museum Library, Raghavan, *India in Ceylonese History, Society and Culture* (London, 1964), Appendix II, pp. 175-81.

52. Ibid.

lama and Bodhimaṇḍalaya crept into the *Malala-kathāva* thanks to the authors' knowledge of the Malalas mentioned in the Buddhist scriptures. The other places mentioned in the text were in South India and the mention of them, as well as of Tamils, Pāṇḍyas and Cheṭṭiars, shows that the main theme has connections with the South Indian region of Malabar and that therefore the Malala mentioned here meant Malabar.

From the context of the accounts of Māgha's invasion given in the *Rājāvaliya* and *Pūjāvaliya*, it is clear that the authors used Malala to denote Malabars or Keraḷas. The *Rājāvaliya* says that Māgha put the country into confusion with the aid of the Tamils (Demaḷas). At the same time he made the villges of the Sinhalese into dwellings for the Tamils (*gamak pāsā Demaḷun iňduvā*).[53] The *Pūjāvaliya*, which refers to the soldiers who followed Māgha as Malalas, in its account of the damage caused by Māgha and his troops always uses the word Demaḷa (Tamils) for the latter.[54] Thus both these sources show that the term 'Malala' used in connection with Māgha meant South Indian troops. In all the sources Māgha is referred to as an invader from Kaliṅga.[55] The sources meant here the well-known Kaliṅga, the present Orissa in India.

However, Paranavitana's new theory identifies this Kaliṅga as a place in South-east Asia, sometimes in the Malay Peninsula and sometimes in Java and in Sumatra. Together with some other writers he believes that the Kaliṅga region in India played a vital role in the colonization of South-east Asia, where consequently there were kingdoms of that name. This aspect of his theory also needs examination.

The Chinese sources refer to a kingdom known as Ho-ling in South-east Asia between the seventh and ninth century A.D.[56] According to Paranavitana this was the kingdom referred to in the Ceylonese sources as Kaliṅga, and it was in the Malay Peninsula.[57] Most of the early writers on Ho-ling agreed that this name was the Chinese transcription of Kaliṅga, though they had diverse opinions about its location. It was W. F. Mayers who first drew attention to the possibility of Ho-ling being a Chinese transcription of Kaliṅga.[58] Since then, until recently, almost all the scholars who wrote on the subject contented themselves with investigating the causes which led the Kaliṅgas to take a leading part in Hindu colonization without questioning whether

53. *Rjv*, ed. Pemananda, p. 69.

54. *Pjv*, ed. Suraweera, p. 108.

55. *Cv*, LXXX, 58-9; *Pjv*, ed. Suraweera, p. 109; *Rjv*, ed. Pemananda, p. 69.

56. *Old History of the T'ang Dynasty*, book. 197, quoted by W. P. Groeneveldt, *Historical Notes on Indonesia and Malaya compiled from Chinese Sources*, pp. 13-4; *New History of the T'ang Dynasty*, book, 222, pt. 2 quoted by Groeneveldt, op.cit., p. 13.

57. Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, p. 102.

58. W. F. Mayers, 'Chinese Explorations of the Indian Ocean during the fifteenth century', *China Review*, Vol. IV (1875-6), p. 184.

Ho-ling was indeed Kaliṅga.[59] Some scholars thought that Harṣavardhana's campaigns in eastern India and the invasions of Pulakeśin II led to a mass migration of Kaliṅgas to Java and that they brought the name of their motherland to the new colony.[60] Some others felt that the Sañjaya family of Java came from southern Kaliṅga, and were of the opinion that it was they who gave the name Kaliṅga to the new kingdom.[61]

Thus, almost all the writers who wrote on Ho-ling, having accepted it as the Chinese transcription of Kaliṅga, were tempted to see extensive Kaliṅgan activities in South-east Asia during the early centuries A.D., and were of the opinion that the South-east Asian kingdom was named so mainly because of the influx of Kaliṅgas. While it is possible that the Kaliṅgas, like other Indians, ventured into these South-east Asian countries and, realising the opportunities offered by these distant lands, settled down on these islands, the name Ho-ling, as we shall presently see, cannot be taken as evidence for the presence of Kaliṅgas in that part of the world.

Recently some scholars have realised how uncritically Ho-ling has been assumed to be a Chinese transcription of Kaliṅga. Gerini, though he did not stress the point, disagreed 'that the term *Ho-ling* stands, as most sinologists have suggested, for a word *Kling*, or *Kalinga* introduced by immigrants or colonists from the east coast of India'.[62] Another sinologist, L. C. Damais, has explained the difficulties one has to face when transcribing Ho-ling as Kaliṅga. As an example, he has given some references to the Kaliṅga in India from Chinese literature, and shown the different way in which it has been transcribed in Chinese. With the aid of references in the Javanese inscriptions, he has presented strong reasons for identifying Ho-ling with an old Javanese toponym Walaing.[63] Wolters describes Damais's important identification follows:

> Ho-ling has been placed on the Malay Peninsula, in Borneo, in Sumatra, and in Java. The usual and acceptable choice has been Java, and for many years the word has been uncritically derived from *Kaliṅga*, a kingdom

59. I-Tsing, *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practised in India and the Malay Archipelago*, tr. J. Takakusu (London, 1896) Reprinted (Delhi, 1966), pp. xlvii-xlix, J. L. Moens, 'Srivijaya Yāva en Kaṭāha', *TBG*, Vol. LXXVII, No. 3 (1937), Abridged Eng. tr. by R. J. de Touche, *JMBRAS*, Vol. XVII, No. 2 (1939), p. 73; N. J. Krom, Hindoe-Javaansche geschiedenis, 2nd ed. (The Hague, 1931). The first few chapters translated into English by H. B. Sarkar, *JGIS*, Vol. XVI, pp. 49-50; R. A. Kern, 'Ho-ling', *Orientalia Neerlandica* (1948), pp. 402-11; Majumdar, *Suvarṇadvīpa* (Dacca, 1937), pt. 1, p. 112.

60. Krom, *JGIS*, Vol. XVI, pp. 49-50.

61. Majumdar, *Suvarṇadvīpa*, pt. 1, p. 112; Moens, op. cit., p. 73.

62. G. F. Gerini, *Researches on Ptolemy's Geography of Eastern Asia*, p. 509.

63. Louis Charles Damais, 'Études Sino-Indonésiennes, III. La transcription Chinoise *Ho-ling* comme désignation de Java', *BEFEO*, Vol. LII (1964). pp. 93-14.

in eastern India from which fabulous migrants were believed to have come to Java in early times, but the weaknesses of this identification have recently been exposed.[64]

Another scholar, Iwamoto, says that the view that 'there was in Java a Kaliṅga kingdom dominated by immigrants of Kaliṅga from the seventh to nineth century was only a mirage or a castle built in the air.'[65] Thus, with these new discoveries Kaliṅga will disappear from the legends of South-east Asia,[66] which are based solely on the Ho-ling-Kaliṅga identification, which becomes completely baseless if the new interpretation of Ho-ling is accepted.

In order to identify the Kaliṅga mentioned in Ceylonese sources with the Śrīvijaya empire, Paranavitana cites Majumdar's interpretation of the origin of the Śailendra dynasty of Śrīvijaya.[67] According to Majumdar the Śailendra dynasty came to South-east Asia from the Kaliṅga region in India.[68] He says that it was the Śailendras who adopted the name Kaliṅga for Malaysia because of their connection with the region of that name in India.[69] However, present evidence does not support the Kaliṅgan origin of the Śailendras, about which there are various other theories.[70] Whatever the origin of this dynasty, neither epigraphy nor literary sources support the theory that the Śrīvijaya kingdom was known as Kaliṅga during any period of her history. The misinterpretation of the name Ho-ling mentioned in the Chinese sources, which was taken to be Kaliṅga, has already been pointed out.

Apart from references already mentioned, Paranavitana tries to find further toponyms in the Malay Peninsula which are similar in sound to Kaliṅga in order to prove that there was a kingdom of that name in that region. In the state of Selangor in Malaysia there is a place known as Klang or Kelang. The date of the origin of this name is not known. But in Paranavitana's view it was derived from Kaliṅga due to its association with that region.[71] Several other scholars have interpreted this name differently. Linehan suggests that Kelang comes from the Khmer *klong* which means 'storehouse', 'market' or 'public place'; or from *galong* or *glong* which means 'royal storehouse'.[72]

64. Wolters, *Early Indonesian Commerce*, p. 213.
65. Yutaka Iwamoto, 'On the Ho-ling Kingdom', *Proceedings of the First International Conference Seminar of Tamil Studies*, Vol. I (Kuala Lumpur, 1966), pp. 58-9.
66. Wolters, op.cit. p. 337, note, 110.
67. Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, p. 85.
68. Majumdar, *Suvarṇadvīpa*, pt. 1, pp. 225-7.
69. Ibid., pp. 153 and 225.
70. Coedès. 'On the Origin of the Sailendras', *JGIS*, Vol. I (1934), pp. 61-70; Nilakanta Sastri, 'Origin of the Sailendras', *TBG*, Vol. LXXV (1935), pp. 605-11; J. Przyluski, 'The Sailendravaṃsa', *JGIS*, Vol II (1935), pp. 28-35.
71. Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, p. 108.
72. W. Linehan, 'Historical notes mainly about Klang', *JMBRAS*, Vol. XXIV, pt. 3 (1951), p. 85.

Some say that *Kelang* also means 'tin' in Malay and this may be the true origin of the name. Moreover, according to them the state of Selangor between Malacca and Perak was formerly known as Nageri Kalang, the 'tin country'.[73] The Malay Peninsula is rich in tin and therefore it is quite likely that Klang received its name because of tin. Apart from the similarity of the sound there is nothing to show that Klang got its name from Kaliṅga.

Jampudīpa is mentioned in the *Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa* as the place from which Māgha and his followers hailed.[74] Although Jambudīpa is well known to any Ceylonese as India, to suit his new interpretation of the material, Paranavitana tries to identify it as Jambi in Sumatra in the following manner:

> If 'Jambudīpa' denotes here, as it normally does, the Indian sub-continent, the statement is vague. If, as we have inferred above, the soldiers of Māgha were people from the Jambi area in Sumatra, they might have been described as having come from Jambidīpa. If this text originally had the reading *Jambidīpa*, copyists of a later generation, to whom a place name 'Jambi' was not known, but were familiar with 'Jambudīpa', might very well have considered it to be a mistake, and altered it to what is now found in the manuscripts and printed editions of the *Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa*.[75]

This suggestion cannot be accepted for more than one reason. It is significant that the term Jambidīpa does not occur in any of the manuscripts consulted by the editor of the *Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa*.[76] These all unanimously agree with the present reading 'Jambudīpa'. Hence an emendation to suit Paranavitana's thesis seems rash and unwarranted.

Moreover the place-name Jambi does not occur in any of the Sinhalese or Pāli writings of the period or even of later times. Thus, it is not even certain that the Ceylonese knew this name at all. Furthermore, the whole island of Sumatra was not known by the name Jambidīpa (Jambi-dīpa), though the capital of Śrīvijaya was known as Jambi. The earliest reference to Jambi is found in Chinese sources, in the form Chan-pei. The *Pei-hu-lu*, which was written in about A.D. 875, mentions Chan-pei.[77] The *Ling-piao-lu-i* written during the period between A.D. 889 and 904, has a reference to Pi-chan, reversing the characters.[78] By Jambi is meant here the region on the south-eastern coast of Sumatra, and missions came to China from Jambi in A.D. 853 and

73. Yule and Burnell, *Hobson-Jobson*, p. 145.
74. *Hvv* (P.T.S.), p. 30.
75. Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, pp. 85-6.
76. *Hvv*. (P.T.S.).
77. Pelliot, *BEFEO*, Vol. IX (1909), p. 223; *Pei-hu-lu*, 3, 40, cited by Wolters, *Early Indonesian Commerce*, p. 144, note 35.
78. *Ling-piao-lu-i*, cited by Wolters, op.cit., p. 144, note 36.

871.[79] In the *History of the Sung Dynasty* (A.D. 960-1279) a king is mentioned called Chan-pi. Groeneveldt thinks that this reference is to the king of Jambi[80]. In the *History of the Ming Dynasty* (A.D. 1364-1643) Chan-pi is again mentioned.[81] Wang Ta-yuang in A.D. 1350 describes both Jambi and Palembang as prosperous trading centres.[82] Thus from all these Chinese sources it appears that a particular area of the south-eastern coast of Sumatra was known as Jambi and the term was not used for the whole island. None of the Indian sources or Arab writers mention Jambi as denoting the island of Sumatra. Jambi was known as Malaiyur among the Indians. Rājendra Coḷa mentions it as one of the places invaded by him.[83] Thus 'Jambi' was not used for the whole island (*dīpa*) of Sumatra and hence it is difficult to believe that when in the *Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa* Jambudīpa was given as the place from which Māgha came to Ceylon the correct reading should have been Jambidīpa. Therefore to emend the Jambudīpa given in that chronicle to Jambidipa without strong reasons and reliable evidence is unwarranted.

The Sinhalese version of the *Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa* has *Jambudvīpa-pradeśayen* in place of the Jambudīpa in the Pali work Paranavitana's interpretation of this term is as follows:

> This expression *Jambudvīpa-pradeśa* is nowhere found in Ceylon literature where the Indian sub-continent is clearly meant. On the other hand, an authoritative Sanskrit work dealing, among other things, with the geography of the world as known to the ancient Indians, uses the expression 'Jambudvīpa-pradeśa' as the designation of a particular region, and that precisely the one from which, as we have concluded, Māgha came to Ceylon.[84]

Taking the Yamadvīpa and Malayadvīpa mentioned in the *Vāyu-purāṇa* as among the *pradeśas* of Jambudvīpa Paranavitana locates them in South-east Asia and maintains that this *Jambudvīpa-pradeśa* is almost equivalent to the English usage of 'Further India'.[85] In the light of this interpretation, Paranavitana thinks that the *Jumbudvīpa-pradeśayen* mentioned in the *Eḷu Attanagaluvaṃsa* could be understood as 'Further India' and that Māgha therefore came from that region.

---

79. Wolters, op.cit., p. 144.
80. W. P. Groeneveldt, *Historical Notes on Indonesia and Malaya Compiled from Chinese Sources*, p. 63, note 5.
81. Ibid., pp. 72-3.
82. Rockhill, *Notes on the Relations and Trade of China, T'oung Pao*, Vol. XVI (1915), pp. 134-9.
83. Nilakanta Sastri, *History of Śrīvijaya*, p. 81; Coedès, *The Indianized States*, p. 142. It is mentioned as Malaiyur.
84. Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, p. 86.
85. *Vāyu-purāṇa*, chap. 48, vv. 13-14, 41; Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, pp. 86-7.

However this interpretation is not necessary for the understanding of that term in the Sinhalese chronicle. It can be taken as referring to Kaliṅga as a region or a *pradeśa* of Jambudvīpa. Evidence can be given from Sinhalese sources to show that the term *pradeśa* was used to denote regions of India. The *Pūjāvaliya*, in its accounts of the foreign conquests of Parākramabāhu I, states that he despatched a very large army to Daṁbadiva, and that this army fought with the Coḷas and Pāṇḍyas as far as Aramaṇa and extended his power to Daṁbadiva.[86] Then the *Pūjāvaliya* says that the people who lived in the *pradeśas* were so frightened of Parākramabāhu that they dared not cross over to Ceylon. Thus the term *pradeśavāsin* surely denotes here the people of the *pradeśas* of Jambudvīpa.

Moreover, in both Sinhalese and Pali works, Jambudīpa is used solely to denote the Indian sub-continent from the earliest times even up to the present day. Therefore it is not necessary to make imaginary alterations and interpretations to understand the term. In the chronicles and other literary sources, when kings such as Moggallāna, Dāṭopatissa and Mānavamma crossed over to South India to raise mercenary troops, we are simply told that they went to Jambudīpa.[87] Thus the foregoing discussion shows that by Jambudīpa and *Jambudvīpa-pradeśayen* both the author of the *Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa* and its Sinhalese translator meant the well-known India. Hence we must accept that Māgha and his soldiers invaded Ceylon from India and not from Malaysia as Paranavitana has suggested.

To support his new thesis, Paranavitana interprets in a new way the identity of the Keraḷas, who were mentioned in the *Cūlavaṃsa* as being in Māgha's army. He says:

> If, on the face value of the term "Kerala" applied to them in the *Cūlavaṁsa*, we take that the army of Māgha was composed of Malayālis, it may be questioned why they, after having captured power in this Island, were content to be subservient to one who was not of them, for whether we take Kaliṅga to have been in India or in Malaysia, Māgha was not of Malabar origin.[88]

Paranavitana prefers to take these Keraḷas as Malaysians who came to Ceylon with the Kaliṅga rulers of that region.

Again his argument does not appear to be sound. From Indian history as well as from the history of Ceylon[89] we have enough evidence to prove that troops from Keraḷa often served as mercenaries under rulers who were not of

86. *Pjv.* ed. Suraweera, p. 106.
87. *Cv*, XXXIX, 20-22; XLVII, 40-42.
88. Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, p. 87.
89. *Cv*, LV, 5 and 12; LXIX, 18; LXX, 230; LXXIV, 44.

Malabar origin. There were recruits from Keraḷa in the Coḷa army.[90] Paranavitana's argument applies equally well to the Coḷa rulers who also had Keraḷa mercenaries. It is very clear that the Keraḷas were ready to serve anywhere for pay. Therefore we have to accept that, like other rulers, Māgha employed Keraḷa mercenaries who were readily available. From the way he treated them after conquering Ceylon, giving them land and other facilities, we gather that his army was mercenary in nature.

To suit his theory Paranavitana poses the possibility that these Keraḷas may have been Malayalis who migrated to South-east Asia.[91] In search of evidence for this argument, he turns to Kern[92] who has stated that Malayalis were to be found among the tribes of Karo-Bataks in Sumatra. This evidence hardly proves that those tribes were so numerous as to provide Māgha with a large army. To strengthen his case he draws attention to a single strophe in the *Vāyu-purāṇa* where there is a reference to a people called the Kirātas living to the east of Bharatavarṣa. Then he applies some philological rules to show how the word Kirāta might become Keraḷa through the intermediate stages of 'Keraṭa' and 'Keraḍa'. Explaining how this word came into use among the Sinhalese he says:

> The mariners from Bharukaccha to ports in Further India called at havens in Ceylon; from them the Sinhalese people would have frequently heard the name which would thus have been in common enough use for it to have undergone normal phonetical development, even if the Sinhalese themselves did not visit these lands, and come in contact with the people called the Kirātas.[93]

This explanation is highly imaginative. It is impossible to prove that the Keraḷa mentioned in these Ceylonese sources is derived from Kirāta, a name which became known through mariners from Bharukaccha. First of all the numerous references to the Kirātas do not suggest the meaning which Paranavitana has given to the word, denoting the people of Malaysia and Further India. The Kirātas are mentioned in the *Mahābhārata*, along with the Yavanas, Kāmbojas, Gandhāras and Barbaras who dwelt in the Uttarāpatha.[94] The reference to them in the *Śrīmadbhāgavata* in company with the Hūnas, Āndhras, Puḷindas, Pulkasas, Ābhīras, Yavanas and other non-Āryan tribes supports

90. Nilakanta Sastri, *The Cōḷas*, 2nd ed. (1955), p. 134. Majumdar ed. *The Struggle for Empire*, p. 251.

91. Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, p. 88.

92. H. Kern, 'Dravidische Volksnamen op Sumatra', *Verspreide Geschriften*, III, pp. 67-72.

93. Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, pp. 88-9.

94. *Mahābhārata*, XII, 207, v. 43.

the *Mahābhārata*.[95] Kirātas are mentioned in the *Viṣṇu-purāṇa* as people dwelling in India.[96] The location of Kirātas in the Uttarāpatha is attested to by Ptolemy, who includes them among the Sogdiana tribes.[97]

Among these numerous references to the Kirātas in Indian literature as well as in the foreign accounts, there is none which mentions them as people from Sumatra or the Malay Peninsula. Sylvain Lévi has pointed out that Nepalese usage still gives the name Kirāta to a certain people of Nepal, and that there is evidence to show that the Kirātas once occupied a much more extensive area in Nepal.[98] Geiger takes the word to be the Sanskrit term for 'hill people of dwarfish structure' when explaining the Kirāta mentioned in the Ceylonese chronicles.[99] According to the *Cūlavaṃsa* there were some Kirātas in the army of Parākramabāhu I. They were skilled at wandering by night in the wilderness of the forests and mountains, and slew many people by night and day.[100] In Champa, too, these barbarous mountain tribes were called Kirātas.[101] Majumdar takes the Kirātas to be hill tribes.[102] Malalasekara's opinion is that Kirāta is a name given to a tribe of jungle men and their language is classed as that of *Milakkhas* (Skt. Mlecchas)[103] or barbarians. Some of the hill tribes of South-east Asia would have been known by the name Kirāta, as we have noticed in Champa, but there is no evidence whatsoever to take Kirātas as generally referring to the people of Malaysia and Sumatra, as Paranavitana has suggested. Moreover, the intermediate forms through which Kirāta might have changed to Keraḷa are quite hypothetical, as neither of the terms 'Kerāṭa' or 'Keraḍa' occurs in any literary or epigraphical source. The foregoing discussion shows how weak Paranavitana's interpretation is.

Paranavitana takes Chau Ju-kua's statement[104] (A.D. 1225) that Ceylon was a tributary of San-fo-ch'i i.e. Śrīvijaya at its face value, and says that Māgha invaded Ceylon with the approval of Śrīvijaya, and that after he gained power over the Island he maintained relations with his homeland.[105] To accept this interpretation we have to believe first that Māgha came from Malaysia. But the evidence for this is not sound, as we have seen. Chau Ju-kua who was the Inspector of Foreign Trade[106] at Ch'uan-chou, a port of Southern China. includes Ceylon among the fifteen dependencies of Śrīvijaya when he gives

95. *Srīmad Bhāgavata*, II, 4, 18, cited by B.C. Law, *Tribes in Ancient India*, p. 282.
96. *Viṣṇu-purāṇa*, tr. Wilson, 142, 150, 156, 158, 162, etc.
97. McCrindle, *Ancient India*, p. 277.
98. Sylvain Lévi, *Le Nepal*, II, pp. 72-8.
99. Geiger, *Culture of Ceylon in Mediaeval Times*, p. 18.
100. *Cv*, LXXII, 208.
101. Majumdar ed., *The Struggle for Empire*, p. 746.
102. Majumdar ed., *The Classical Age*, p. 313.
103. Malalasekera, *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*, p. 607.
104. *Chau Ju-kua*, tr. Hirth and Rockhill, p. 62.
105. Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, p. 89.
106. *Chau Ju-kua*, Introduction, pp. 35-6.

his account of that kingdom.[107] On the other hand when he writes on Ceylon itself, he says that it was under the ruler of Nan-p'i, i.e. Malabar.[108] Thus there is an inconsistency on this matter in the book of Chau Ju-kua itself which shows what little knowledge he had.

Chau Ju-kua was more interested in trade than in the political situation of the foreign countries he mentioned. He got most of his information from traders who visited the Chinese ports, though he has also used some of the early Chinese sources.[109] The traders of Śrīvijaya, to get priority attention for their commodities and for the sake of fame too, may well have exaggerated the power of their kingdom, for in fact Śrīvijaya was declining when Chau Ju-kua wrote his account.[110] He would have incorporated such information without checking it, if he had no way of doing so. Therefore it is not proper to take the statements of Chau Ju-kua about Ceylon at their face value without further evidence to support them.

To show Māgha's connection with Śrīvijaya, Paranavitana gives some evidence from the *Pūjāvaliya*. This Sinhalese work refers to Māgha as *Māgharāja nam Kaliṅgu raja*, which means 'the Kalinga king named Māgharāja'.[111] Commenting on this, Paranavitana says that Māgharāja 'seems to be a Pāli rendering of a dialectical form of "Mahārāja", the title by which Malayan potentates were referred to by Arab writers'.[112] But this argument of Paranavitana, like his interpretation of Jambudvīpa, is devised to suit his own purposes. If the writer of the *Pūjāvaliya* wanted to write Mahārāja he would have done so, as that title was not an unfamiliar one. With this type of argument anything can be proved without regard to sources.

Thus, though Paranavitana has tried to prove that Māgha with his Malala soldiers came from Malaysia, we believe that his arguments are not convincing, and we maintain the traditional view, that Māgha invaded from the Kaliṅga region in India. Paranavitana in the same manner tries to prove that, like Māgha, all the other Kaliṅga kings who ruled the Island after Parākramabāhu I until Māgha's invasion, hailed not from the Kaliṅga region in India, but from a Kaliṅga in Malaysia.

The Tooth Relic was brought to the Island from Dantapura in Kaliṅga in India during the reign of Sirimeghavaṇṇa (A.D. 301-28).[113] From then until modern times this relic has been highly venerated in Ceylon. In fact during the

107. Ibid., p. 62.
108. Ibid.. p.72. Nan-p'i is the Malabar coast. *Chau Ju-kua*, p. 74, note. 3. Since Māgha came to Ceylon with 24,000 Keraḷas Chau Ju-kua would have been informed that Ceylon was under Māgha who had a large army of Keraḷas. Hence he would have thought that Ceylon was under Malabar.
109. *Chau Ju-kua*, pp. 36-7.
110. Nilakanta Sastri, *History, of Śrīvijaya*, pp. 89 ff.
111. *Pjv.*, ed. Suraweera, p. 108.
112. Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, pp. 89-90.
113. *Cv.* XXXVII, 92-8.

mediaeval period, rulers thought that it was necessary to possess the Tooth Relic in order to get the support of the people. It was so popular that not only the Sinhalese *literati* but also the ordinary people knew from where it was brought to the Island, who brought it, why it was brought, and so on. But Paranavitana, analysing the accounts of the Tooth Relic given in the chronicles, says that the scholars who wrote these works had no geographical knowledge of Kaliṅga in India. These scholars, he says, described the path followed by Hemamālā and Dantakumāra, who brought the relic to the Island, from their knowledge of the geography of a Kaliṅga in Malaysia.[114]

There are three main chronicles written in Sinhalese and Pāli on this relic, apart from the mention of it in other chronicles and literary works such as the *Cūlavaṃsa* and the *Pūjāvaliya*. The Pāli *Dāṭhāvaṃsa* was written in A.D. 1210 by a *thera* named Dhammakitti, who based his work on a Sinhalese chronicle on the relic which was written during the reign of Sirimeghavaṇṇa.[115] The Sinhalese text which he used is no longer extant, therefore it is not possible to determine how far Dhammakitti followed this work.[116] In any case it may be expected to have contained a very trustworthy account, as it was written during Sirimeghavaṇṇa's reign, most probably from first-hand information provided by Dantakumāra himself, who brought the Tooth Relic to the Island. The *Daḷadā-sirita*,[117] written in the fourteenth century, and the *Daḷadā-pūjāvaliya*,[118] written at the end of the fourteenth or the beginning of the fifteenth century A.D., are two Sinhalese works on the subject.

Dhammakitti describes the defeat of King Guhasīva of Dantapura by an enemy who wished to have the Tooth Relic for himself, and then gives an account of how it was brought to Ceylon by Dantakumāra, the son-in-law of King Guhasīva. Just before the enemy entered Dantapura, Dantakumāra, acting according to the instructions given by his father-in-law, took the Tooth Relic, and fled to a spot south of the city, where he crossed a river on the bank of which he deposited the relic. Then he returned to Dantapura, collected his wife Hemamālā, who was disguised as a Brahman woman, came to the bank of the river, recovered the relic and travelled southwards until they reached Tāmalitti from whence they embarked for Ceylon.[119] In the Sinhalese *Sanne*, which is said to have been written by Dhammakitti himself, the Tāmalitti given in the Pāli *Dāṭhāvaṃsa* has been glossed as Tamaliṅgama.[120] Basing his arguments on the route followed by Dantakumāra and his wife, Paranavitana says that the

114. Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, pp. 96-97.
115. *Dāṭhāvaṃsa* with Sinhalese paraphrase, ed. Asaba Tissa (Kelaniya, 1883).
116. Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, p. 96.
117. *Daḷadā-sirita*, ed. Sorata, (Colombo, 1961).
118. *Daḷadā-pūjāvaliya*, ed. Ratanaramsi (Colombo, 1954).
119. *Dāṭhāvaṃsa*, chap. IV, 21-41.
120. *Dāṭhāvaṃsa* and the old Sinhalese *Sanne*, ed. Sīlālamkara-sami (Alutgama, 1941), p. 81.

Tāmalitti mentioned in the *Dāṭhāvaṃsa* cannot be the same as the Indian Tāmralipti. He says:

> This Tāmalitti cannot be the same as Tāmralipti in Bengal, for it is inconceivable how a person travelling southwards from Dantapura, the modern Palura six miles to the north-east of Ganjam, could arrive at the mouth of the Ganges.[121]

The *Daḷadā-sirita* has given the name of the river which was crossed by Dantakumāra, and where he deposited the relic. Paranavitana uses the earlier edition of the work by Rajasekera,[122] which gives it as *Gaṅgam gaṅga heba*, and therefore states that it is the Ganjam river which is mentioned here.[123] But the critical edition of the *Daḷadā-sirita* by Sorata gives the correct name of the river as *Gaṅgā nam gaṅga heba*, which means the bank of the river Ganges. A comparison of the two phrases clearly indicates that in the earlier edition the letter *na* between the letters *ga* and *ma* was accidently omitted either by the editor or by the scribes. In the *Daḷadā-sirita*, the port from which Dantakumāra embarked for Ceylon is given as Tāmalitti.[124] Therefore since there is no port called Tāmalitti at the mouth of the Ganjam, the correct name of the river mentioned here could only be taken as the Ganges, where there was a port called Tāmalitti. There is no doubt about the name of the river in the *Daḷadā-pūjāvaliya*[125] where the phrase *Gaṅgā nam gaṅgin etarava* occurs, which means 'after crossing the river Ganges', and this agrees with the name given in the Sorata edition of *Daḷadā-sirita*. Thus as the *Daḷadā-sirita* and the *Daḷadā-pūjāvaliya* both mention the Ganges, one can safely take this as the name of the river crossed by Dantakumāra.

The Tāmalitti mentioned in the account cannot be anything other than the well-known Tāmralipti near the mouth of the river Ganges. Paranavitana, referring to a Kaliṅga in Malaysia says that the Tāmalitti here mentioned does not mean the Tāmralipti in Bengal and he prefers to take this Tāmalitti to be the Tāmbraliṅga from which Candrabhānu invaded Ceylon. One of the two main reasons for him to identify this Tāmalitti as Tāmbraliṅga, is the mention of Tamaliṅgama in its *Sanne* instead of the Tāmalitti in the *Dāṭhāvaṃsa*. The other is the use of the name Tamaliṅgomu in the *Daḷadā-pūjāvaliya* as the name of the port from where Dantakumāra and Hemamālā embarked. Paranavitana argues that no sea-port with a name like Tamaliṅgama is known to have existed on the east coast of India south of the river Ganjam.[126] But we have

121. Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, 97.
122. *Daḷadā-sirita*, ed. Rajasekera, p. 36.
123. Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, p. 97.
124. *Daḷadā-sirita*, ed. Sorata, p. 31.
125. *Daḷadā-pūjāvaliya*, ed. *Ratanaraṃsi*, p. 51.
126. To identify Tāmalitti as Tāmbralinga, Paranavitaṅa finds a Dantapura somewhere around Ligor. He says that in a Portuguese map of A.D. 1595 there is a place named Tandafori just south of Mergui and he prefers to take this to be Dantapura. *Ceylon and Malaysia*, p. 98.

already seen that the river mentioned here is not Ganjam but Ganges. On the other hand Tamaliṅgamu in the *Daḷadā-pūjāvaliya* creates no problem as here the Ganges is clearly mentioned in the phrase *Gaṅgā nam gaṅgin etarava*. If the author of the *Daladā-pūjāvaḷiya* meant the Tāmbraliṅga in the Malay Peninsula, it is strange that a person crossing the Ganges in India should arrive at Tāmbraliṅga in the Malay Peninsula in order to embark for Ceylon. In this connection Paranavitana says:

> If the Kaliṅga in India is well known to him and his readers, he [the author of the *Daḷadā-pūjāvaliya*] would not have brought Tamaliṅgamu into the narrative, for in that case he would have been condemned by critics for allowing the blemish of *deśa-virodha* in his poem.[127]

Here it is important to note that the Tāmralipti of India was also known as Tamaliṅgamu among the Sinhalese *literati* of the mediaeval period. The *Saddharmālaṅkāraya* relates a story about sixty Sinhalese Buddhist monks who reached the roadstead of Tamaliṅgamuva on their way to the City of Pālalup (Pāṭaliputra).[128] It is clear that they could not go to Pālalup, which was in Magadha in India, by way of Tāmbraliṅga in the Malay Peninsula, and therefore by Tamaliṅgamuva undoubtedly the writer meant Tāmralipti in India. According to the *Saddharmaratnākaraya*, the ship bearing the sapling of the Bodhi-tree touched at Tamaliṅgamutoṭa on its way from Buddha Gayā to Ceylon.[129] In this context too, Tamaliṅgamutoṭa, could be Tāmralipti, and it is quite certain that ships used to sail down the lower Ganges at that time. Thus it appears that Tamaliṅgamu was in usage for Tāmralipti and hence there is no reason to condemn Dhammakitti for allowing the blemish of *deśa-virodha*, in using Tamaliṅgamuva for Tāmralipti, as this alternative form would have been well-known to his readers also.

On the other hand the Buddhist monks had close contacts with eastern India during the mediaeval period and there is no reason to think that they had no knowledge of Kaliṅga and Tāmralipti. Sinhalese monks were familiar figures among the pilgrims who visited the shrines in eastern India.[130] In the tenth century a Sinhalese monk named Śrījana was the composer of a panegyrical inscription about a Rāṣṭrakūṭa prince.[131] A 'Ceylon Assembly' in Mahābodhi is mentioned in an inscription dated in the fifty-first year of the Era of Lakṣmaṇasena (A.D. 1157) of Bengal.[132] Taking all this evidence into consideration, R. A. L. H. Gunawardana says:

127. Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, p. 98.
128. *Saddharmālaṅkāraya*, ed. Saddhatissa, p. 391.
129. *Saddharmaratnākaraya*, ed. Gnanavimala, p. 361.
130. R. A. L. H. Gunawardana, 'Buddhist Nikāyas in Mediaeval Ceylon' *CJHSS*, Vol. IX, no. 1 (1966), p. 65.
131. Rajendralala Mitra, *Buddhagayā, Hermitage of the Śākyamuṇi* (Calcutta, 1878), pp. 194-7.
132. A. Cunningham, *Mahābodhi or the Great Buddhist Temple under the Bodhi Tree at Buddha-Gayā* (London, 1892, Reprint Varanasi, n.d.), pp. 78-9.

> It is evident from the foregoing evidence and particularly from the twelfth century inscription cited above that, apart from the occasional pilgrims who came to worship at the shrines of eastern India, there was a community of Sinhalese monks who were permanent residents at the monastery of Buddha Gayā. It is unlikely that they were confined to Buddha Gayā. Most probably, some of them would have been attracted to the centres of Buddhist learning which flourished at short distances from this shrine.[133]

Thus Buddhist monks had close relations with eastern India and therefore it can hardly be said that they had no knowledge of Kaliṅga, Tāmralipti or the Ganges.

One serious objection raised by Paranavitana to identifying this Tāmalitti with the Tāmralipti in India is that Dantakumāra, after having left Dantapura, fled to the south of that city. Therefore, he argues, how could a person travelling southwards from Dantapura arrive at the mouth of the Ganges. But it is not proper to expect an accurate present-day knowledge of the geography of Kaliṅga from the Buddhist monks who wrote these accounts and the strange itinerary may be merely a matter of faulty geographical knowledge. On the other hand it is not easy to find a direct route from Dantapura in Kaliṅga to the Ganges through difficult countryside. It may well be that Dantakumāra went in a southern direction for some distance until he reached the normal route to northern India via south Bihar. Here he would have crossed the river and proceeded down-stream to reach Tāmralipti. Thus from this reference alone we can hardly say that the writers of the account had no knowledge of Indian Kaliṅga. By the mention of Tāmralipti, the Ganges and Dantapura one can hardly doubt that Dhammakitti as well as the authors of the *Daḷadā-sirita* and the *Daḷadā-pūjāvaliya* knew that they were writing about Kaliṅga in India and that they gave their accounts accordingly.

In order to locate Kaliṅga in the Malay Peninsula, Paranavitana draws attention to the accounts of Couto and Queyroz. Diego de Couto states that the father of Vijaya, the first king of Ceylon, was a ruler of Ajota and further says that this was the same as Tenasserim.[134] Paranavitana, taking this Ajota to be another name for Kaliṅga, says that Couto would have got his information from a Sinhalese prince. Further commenting on Couto, Paranavitana says:

> Couto has been chided by his translator for blundering as he had reported facts which do not agree with the knowledge possessed by modern Orientalists on historical geography; on the other hand, what has been stated already about this matter and what will follow would show that he deserves a word of praise for having reported faithfully what he learnt from his informants.[135]

133. Gunawardana, *CJHSS*, Vol. IX, pp. 65-6.
134. *JCBRAS*, Vol. XX, no. 60, pp. 62 ff. and 101.
135. Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, p. 101.

Couto was a Portuguese soldier, and he would have had very little knowledge about the ancient history of Ceylon. Furthermore we are not sure whether he had enough knowledge of Sinhalese to understand his informants correctly in matters concerned with early history. Apart from that, being a soldier, he would not have come into contact with literary men or other people who had a knowledge of history. His manner of reporting ancient history may be seen from his account of the origin of the name Ceylon. According to him Ceylon got its name from the Chinese who once ruled the Island.[136] Thus as his knowledge of the ancient history of Ceylon was meagre he invented fanciful stories. With regard to the Ajota mentioned by Couto, it may be pointed out that this could be the Ayodhya in India. Ayodhya in India was not well known in those days and the Portuguese in particular would not have been familiar with this name. But there was another Ayodhya which from the fourteenth century had been the capital of one of the kingdoms in Thailand and this was well known to them because of their contact with the Malay Peninsula. One of Couto's informants, most probably a Sinhalese soldier who had little knowledge of the ancient history of the Island, would have told him that Ayodhya was the home of Vijaya, the first ruler of Ceylon. Since Couto had no knowledge of Ayodhya in India, he would have linked this with the Ayodhya which was somewhat closer to Tenasserim. Queyroz, another Portuguese writer, says that Vijaya came from the kingdom of Telingo or Calingo in the neighbourhood of Tenasserim.[137] According to Father Perera, who translated the account of Queyroz, one of Queyroz's sources was Couto's account.[138] Hence Queyroz repeated Couto's mistake by saying that Vijaya came from the neighbourhood of Tenasserim. It is not safe to depend on these isolated references from the accounts of late Portuguese writers who had very little knowledge of the ancient history of Ceylon and to build up theories without further evidence and firmer foundations. Neither can these accounts be taken as representing the knowledge about the first ruler of the Island prevailing among educated Sinhalese during the sixteenth century. The contemporary literature, the work of the Sinhalese themselves, has to be taken into consideration. These literary works do not mention any tradition that Vijaya came from Kaliṅga in the Malay Peninsula.

The *Cūlavaṃsa* says that the three kinsmen who came with Tilokasundarī, the Kaliṅga queen of Vijayabāhu I, came from Siṁhapura.[139] The Polonnaruva slab inscription of King Niśśaṁkamalla states that Parākramabāhu I, towards the close of his reign, sent emissaries to Siṁhapura in Kaliṅga who brought back his son-in-law to succeed him.[140] Niśśaṁkamalla and Sāhasamalla say that

136. *JCBRAS*, Vol. XX, no. 60, p. 31; Yule and Burnell, *Hobson-Jobson*, p. 838.

137. *The Temporal and Spiritual Conquest of Ceylon* by Father Ferno de Queyroz, tr. S. G. Perera, p. 5.

138. Ibid., Introduction, pp. 10-11.

139. *Cv*, LIX, 46-7.

140. *EZ*, Vol. V, no. 17, pp. 196-208.

they came from Siṁhapura in the Kaliṅga region.[141] The Siṁhapura mentioned in all these sources was in Kaliṅga. Geiger writes that the Siṁhapura from which Tilokasundarī and her kinsmen came was the same Siṁhapura mentioned in the Vijaya tradition, which is said to have been founded by Vijaya's father in Lāḍhadeśa. Then Geiger proceeds to identify this with the present Simhabhum in the south-eastern district of Chutia Nagpur in the west of Bengal.[142] D. C. Sircar comments on Geiger's identification as follows:

> .....It has, however, to be noticed that in the age of Vijayabāhu I (really from about the end of the sixth at least to the end of the twelfth century A.D.), the name Kaliṅga was exclusively applied to the kingdom of the Gaṅgas of Kaliṅganagara (modern Mukhalingam near Srikakulam) who styled themselves as *Kaliṅga-ādhipati*. Siṁhapura (mod. Singupuram in the same neighbourhood) was, however, the capital of the Kaliṅga-ādhipatis in the fourth and fifth centuries. It was no longer the capital of Kaliṅga, but may have been the residence of some scions of the Gaṅga family. Rāḍha and Kaliṅga do not appear to have had continuous boundaries in any known period of Indian history.....The representation of Siṁhapura as the capital of Kaliṅga in the Mahāvaṁsa tradition seems to be due to the fact that the chronicle was composed about the fifth century, while the *Chūlavaṁsa* appears merely to have continued the same tradition, although the later capital of the country was at Kaliṅganagara.[143]

Paranavitana takes the Siṁhapura mentioned in the chronicles as well as in the inscriptions to be a city in the Malay Peninsula, in keeping with his new theory. Tracing the evidence for a Siṁhapura in the Malay Peninsula, Paranavitana says that there was more than one Siṁhapura there. He prefers to identify Singora as the Siṁhapura mentioned in Ceylonese sources because this suits his identification of Kaliṅga in the light of Hsü Yun-ts'iao's location of the kingdom of Ch'ih-t'u mentioned in Chinese histories.[144]

Hsü studied the references to Ch'ih-t'u or the Red Land, given in the *History of the Ming Dynasty*, the *History of Sui Dynasty*, and the *History of the T'ang Dynasty*. In the account of Ch'ih-t'u given in the *History of the Sui Dynasty*, it was mentioned that the king dwelt in the city of Seng-chih. In the *T'uan-tien* it was mentioned as Shih-tze-cheng which literally means 'Lion Seat' or 'Lion City'.[145] Hsü identifies this Seng-chih or Shih-tze-cheng with Singora, which also means 'Lion City' or 'Lion Seat'. He then concludes that the Chinese

141. Ibid., II, no. 17, pp. 109; no. 37, p. 227.

142. Geiger, *Cv*, tr. LIX, p. 213, note 1.

143. D. C. Sircar, *The Struggle for Empire*, ed. Majumdar, pp. 267-8; D. C. Sircar, *Studies in Ancient Geography of India*, p. 137.

144. Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, p. 94; Hsü Yun-ts'iao, 'A Study of Ch'ih-t'u or the Red Land, *Journal of Southseas Society*, Vol. IV, pp. 11-13.

145. Hsü, op. cit., p. 11.

gave this name, which is somewhat similar to the name by which they identified Ceylon,[146] to Singora on account of the resemblance of its landscape to that of Ceylon.[147] Hsü has nothing to say about Kaliṅga contact with, or influence in, the region which could have resulted in the naming of Singora after Siṁhapura in Kaliṅga.

On the other hand there is another possible source of the name Singora. The *Chih-tu-lun* says 'Buddha is the lion in human species, and so wherever the Buddha sits, be it bed or floor, the Lion Seat is'.[148] In giving an account of the state of Töng-liu-meï, Chau Ju-kua says that 'there is a mountain called Wu-nung (where) Shï-kia (i.e., Sakya-muni Buddha) (after his) *nié-pan* (i.e. nirvāṇa) manifested himself.....the event being commemorated by a bronze elephant (at this place)'.[149] This shows that a tradition prevailed that in the region of Ligor the Buddha manifested himself after attaining *Nirvāṇa*. As it is stated in the Chinese sources that whatever the Buddha sits on, be it bed or floor, becomes a 'Lion Seat' there is a possibility that this tradition may account for the origin of the name Singora. Chinese who heard of this tradition would have called this region Shi-tze-cheng (Lion Seat).

Whatever may be the origin of the name Singora, there is another serious objection against identifying this as Siṁhapura mentioned in the Ceylonese sources; this is that while the latter was in Kaliṅga, there is no evidence for a Kaliṅga kingdom in the region of Ligor during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

The Siṁhapura mentioned in the *Mahāvaṃsa* in connection with the Vijaya legend, and the Siṁhapura mentioned in the *Cūlavaṃsa* as the city from which Kaliṅga rulers hailed would appear to be two different places, the former in Lāḍha and the latter in Kaliṅga. Therefore why did Niśśaṁkamalla emphasise the connection of his dynasty with that of Vijaya,[150] the first ruler of Ceylon? The reasons are quite obvious. The Kaliṅga dynasty was an alien one in Ceylon and, judging from the struggle they had with princes who did not belong to their dynasty,[151] and from the wording of Niśśaṁkamalla's inscriptions,[152] it appears that the people of Ceylon were not satisfied with their rule. Therefore in order to get the support of the Sinhalese people, Niśśaṁkamalla stated in his inscriptions that his dynasty had connections with the family of the first king of the Island, and tried to prove that the Kaliṅga rulers had legitimate rights by descent. The ordinary people knew that Vijaya

146. A name used by the Chinese for Ceylón is Shi-tze-kuo (the Lion State).
147. Hsü, op. cit., p. 12.
148. Ibid., p. 11.
149. *Chau Ju-kua*, p. 57.
150. *EZ*, Vol. I, no. 9, pp. 121-35; Vol. II, no. 17, pp. 98-123; no. 42, pp. 283 ff.
151. *UHC*, Vol. I, pt. 2, pp. 507-21.
152. Ibid., pp. 509-10.

came from Siṁhapura in India but they were ignorant of the geography of the mainland, and at least some of them would have believed that both the Kaliṅga rulers and Vijaya came from the same Siṁhapura.

In India there was more than one Siṁhapura. We have already noticed references to two of them in the *Mahāvaṃsa* and the *Cūlavaṃsa*. Hsüan-Tsang says that the western border of a kingdom of Siṁhapura was on the river Indus, and the city itself was situated about 700 li to the south-east of Taxila.[153] A Siṁhapura in western India is also mentioned in the *Cetiya Jātaka*.[154] The Siṁhapura from which the Kaliṅga rulers came was in Kaliṅga, but in none of the sources where it is mentioned in this connection is it described as the capital of Kaliṅga. During the period of Gaṅga rule Kaliṅganagara was the capital, as is attested by the fact that most of the Gaṅga rulers issued their inscriptions from this place.[155] According to his inscriptions, Niśśaṁkamalla's father was Jayagopa. Jayagopa is not mentioned in any of the inscriptions issued by the Eastern Gaṅga rulers from Kaliṅganagara. Therefore it appears that Jayagopa, though he was known as Mahārāja, was not a recognised ruler in Kaliṅga and had no direct connection with the main line of the Gaṅga rulers. That may be the reason why princes such as Niśśaṁkamalla and Sāhasamalla sought their fortune in a distant island like Ceylon. Sircar rightly points out that Siṁhapura may have been the residence of some scion of the Gaṅga family.[156] The rulers of Ceylon may have been the descendants of a branch of the Gaṅga family of Kaliṅga who were ruling from Siṁhapura. As there is no mention in Ceylonese sources of Siṁhapura being the capital of Kaliṅga, there is no serious objection to identifying this Siṁhapura in Kaliṅga in India as the home of the Kaliṅga rulers. Thus the Siṁhapura mentioned in Ceylonese sources was not Singora, as Paranavitana suggests, because there is no Kaliṅga kingdom in its vicinity. On the other hand, though Niśśaṁkamalla links his family with that of Vijaya for his own purposes, this does not constitute a serious objection to identifying the Siṁhapura he mentions with the Siṁhapura in Kaliṅga in India.

In support of his theory of the Malayan origin of the Kaliṅga rulers, Paranavitana interprets in a new way some of the terms in their inscriptions. Singora was the capital of Ch'ih-t'u, a name which means 'Red Land'. It is thought that this name is due to the colour of the soil of that region.[157] Paranavitana suggests that it should be taken as a Chinese transcription of Setu, and then tells how the name *Setu*, which means 'causeway or bridge', was applied to the narrow neck of the Malay Peninsula which was the overland trade route con-

153. Beal, *Buddhist Records of the Western World*, Vol. I, pp. 143–6.
154. *Jātaka* (P.T.S., 1963) ed. Fausboll, Vol. III, p. 460.
155. H. C. Ray, *The Dynastic History of Northern India*, Vol. I, p. 448. Niśśaṁkamalla himself refers to an embassy he sent to Kaliṅganagara. Allai plates, Ceylon Daily News, 20-9-68, p. 12 (P. E. E. Fernando, 'A Royal Charter on Copper plate').
156. D. C. Sircar, *The Struggle for Empire*, ed. Majumdar, p. 268.
157. Hsü, op. cit., p. 13.

necting the Bay of Bengal with the Gulf of Siam. But before accepting Paranavitana's theory it is necessary to see whether this region was indeed known as Setu.

In Chinese writings Topo-teng has been mentioned as the name of the state which bordered Ho-ling on the west. By amending this location to the north-west and situating Ho-ling in the Malay Peninsula, Moens says that Topo-teng was on the east side of the narrow neck of the peninsula. Then he equates the name Topo-teng with a conjectural old Malay word *duwawwatan* meaning 'two bridge land' and explains that this region acquired such a name because of the land route from coast to coast which traversed it.[158] Here again, to accept Moens' identification and the location of Topo-teng in the narrow neck region, we have to accept his location of Ho-ling in the Malay Peninsula. Though there were diverse opinions regarding the location of the kingdom of Ho-ling in the light of Chinese evidence it has now been more or less conclusively proved that this name had no relation whatsoever to the name Kaliṅga and that it was a kingdom of Java.[159]

Two T'ang histories point out that Topo-teng was situated to the west of Ho-ling.[160] Since Ho-ling has been located in Java, Topo-teng has to be looked for either in Java or Sumatra. Wolters says about Topo-teng:

> The exact locations of the Javanese kingdoms have not been supplied nor has attention been given to minor toponyms such as Mo-ho-hsin or To-p'o-têng. Nor, with the exception of Vijayapura, has the real name of any of these kingdoms been suggested. Their exact location and their names will become apparent only when new inscriptions are found.[161]

Damais remarks that Topo-teng may be a Sumatran toponym.[162] Thus Moens' hypothesis of the equation of Duwawwatan with Topo-teng no longer has any foundation.

Paranavitana supports Moens' theory by adducing evidence from a Sinhalese inscription and from the Nālandā copper plate inscription of Devapāladeva.[163] The inscription of Sundara-mahādevī in the Māravīdiya cave at Diṁbulāgala contains the phrase *devoṭuna māṅde upan*.[164] Bell read this as describing Vikumbā *niriṁdu* in the inscriptions and interpreted it as meaning that

158. Moens, *JMBRAS*, Vol. XVII, no. 2, pp. 22-23.
159. For various theories about the location of the kingdom of Ho-ling see Gerini, *Researches on Ptolemy*, pp. 472 ff; Braddell, *JMBRAS*, Vol. XXIV, pt. 1, pp. 3 ff; Coedès, *The Indianized States*, pp. 79-80; Damais, *BEFEO*, Vol. LII, pt. 1, pp. 93-141; Wolters, *Early Indonesian Commerce*, pp. 214-18.
160. Cited by Wolters, *Early Indonesian Commerce*, p. 215.
161. Ibid, p. 220.
162. Damais, "Review of *Riwajat Indonesia*" by Poerbatjaraka, 1951, *BEFEO*, Vol. XLVIII (1957), p. 612.
163. *EI*, Vol. XVII, pp. 310-27.
164. *EZ*, Vol. II, no. 34, pp. 194-202.

both the parents of Vikramabāhu were crowned and therefore he was called *Devoṭunu mäṅda upan* which means 'born between two crowns'.[165] Wickramasinghe, who edited the inscription for the second time, accepted Bell's interpretation.[166] But Paranavitana takes this as an adjectival phrase equalifying Sundara-mahādevī, saying that this phrase signifies her birth-place. According to him, as she was not a native princess but was born in Kaliṅga, Devoṭunu was the name of that region in the Malay Peninsula where the Kaliṅga kingdom was. Then Paranavitana uses Moens' identification to equate Devoṭunu with Duwawwatan. He then tries to see a similarity not only in sound but also in meaning between the Malay name and the Sinhalese phrase. In the phrase *Devoṭunu mäṅda, de* means 'two' and *mäṅda* could be translated as 'in between', but what Paranavitana finds most significant is *voṭunu*. Generally this Sinhalese word *voṭunu* means 'crown'. But Paranavitana interprets it as the Sinhalese form of the Sanskrit word *vartma* (Pāli and Prakrit *vaṭuma*) which means 'way or route'. Then he translates the above phrase as 'the land between the two routes'.[167]

Thus Paranavitana equates the Sinhalese phrase with the Malay name in sound as well as in meaning by implying that the Sinhalese knew that the narrow neck region was called Duwawwatan and found a Sinhalese expression to suit it. But we canot assume that they came to know this name as we are not sure whether the region was in fact then known as Duwawwatan. It mainly depends upon Moens' hypothesis, but his identification of Topo-teng has already been questioned by some historians, in the light of the new interpretation and identification of the kingdom of Ho-ling.[168]

To support his theory as well as Moens' identification, Paranavitana also draws attention to the Nālandā copper plate[169] of Devapāladeva.[170] This records the grant made by the Pāla king Devapāladeva of Bengal, of a gift of a village to the temple founded at Nālandā by King Bālaputradeva of Śrīvijaya. In this record Bālaputradeva's maternal grandfather is mentioned as Dharmasetu. Hirananda Sastri, who edited the inscription, read this name as Dharmasetu and gave Varmasetu as a possible alternative reading.[171] N. G. Majumdar's opinion is that Varmasetu is the only justifiable reading.[172] Paranavitana accepts Majumdar's reading and emends it further by saying that if it is taken as Var-

165. *CALR*, Vol. III, p. 7, note 12.
166. *EZ*, Vol. II, no. 34, pp. 194-202. In his first edition of the inscription Wickramasinghe read it as *la da-voṭunu mä*.....
Ibid., no. 31, pp. 184-89. Later he accepted Bell's reading.
Ibid., no. 34.
167. Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, p. 106.
168. *BEFEO*, Vol. LII, pp. 93-141.
169. de Casparis dates this inscriptions between A.D. 860 and 870, *Prasasti Indonesia* Vol. II, p. 297.
170. Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, p. 106; *EI*, XVIII, pt. 2, pp. 22-3.
171. *EI*, Vol. XVII, p. 326, note 5.
172. *MASI*, no. 66 (1942), p. 99, note 3.

masetu, 'armour causeway', it has no meaning. Therefore, according to Paranavitana, to make a meaningful proper name, *Varma* has to be changed to *Vartma* by adding a *t*. He then gives a number of reasons for the disappearance of the *t* from this name. According to him this letter could have been omitted by the engraver, or worn out. Further, he says that 'it is also possible that a difficult sound as that of the nexus *rtma* was actually pronounced as *rma*, and the name was used in the document as it was pronounced'.[173] But the idea that there may once have been a *t* in the middle of the name had never even occurred to the two Indian writers, as there was no gap between the two *akṣaras*.

The meaning of *Vartma* suggested by Paranavitana, is 'the causeway' (on the trade routes). Then he says that this would have been the name of both the kingdom and its king and thus the Vartmasetu mentioned in the above inscription could be the ruler of the Malay Peninsula from where the Kaliṅga princess Sundara-mahādevī hailed.[174] In fact *setu* may mean 'causeway', but the meaning of *vartma* is simply 'road, path or track'.

Scholars have different opinions with regard to the identification of the King Dharmasetu. Stutterheim identifies Dharmasetu with the father of Devapāladeva of Bengal and says that the name Dharmasetu could be regarded as a poetic synonym for Dharmapāla. He thinks that Mahāyāna Buddhism was introduced into the kingdom of Śrīvijaya as a result of a matrimonial alliance.[175] But Bosch rightly argues that if the king of Bengal was meant here, his son would have recorded it unmistakably on the Nālandā plate. His opinion is that Tārā, the daughter of Dharmasetu, was a Javanese princess who married into the Śailendra dynasty in Sumatra.[176] Most scholars, including Coedès, agree with Krom's identification of Dharmasetu.[177] According to Krom, Dharmasetu was the king of Śrīvijaya and his daughter was married to Samarāgravīra, the Śailendra king of Java.[178] If we accept this, it would appear that Dharmasetu was a ruler of Sumatra. In any case present evidence does not suggest that he was ruler of the 'two-bridged land', and, even if he had supremacy over that region, as it was not his main centre, he would not have been named after such a remote area in his kingdom.

From the foregoing discussion it is clear that Topo-teng was not in the narrow region of the Malay Peninsula. Thus the suggestion that Duwawwatan was the name of that region, from which the Chinese are said to have got the name Topo-teng is a hypothesis without evidence. Therefore Paranavitana's

173. Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, p. 107.
174. Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, p. 106.
175. Stutterheim, *A Javanese Period in Sumatran History*, pp. 9-12.
176. F. D. K. Bosch, *TBG*, Vol. LXVIII (1929), pp. 141-42.
177. Nilakanta Sastri, *History of Śrīvijaya*, pp. 57-8; Coedès, *The Indianized States*, pp. 92, 108-9, de Casparis, *Prasasti Indonesia*, II, p. 258, note 71.
178. N. J. Krom, 'Het Hindoe Tijdperk', *Geschiedenis van Nederlandsch Indië*, I, ed. F. W. Stapel (Amsterdam, 1918) p. 162.

equation of Duwawwatan with Devoṭunu has no foundation either, being mainly based on Moens' identification, which has no proof. The name Ch'ih-t'u need have nothing to do with *setu*, as Paranavitana has proposed, but may be accepted as meaning 'Red Land'. In the light of all the data available, the Siṁhapura mentioned in the Ceylonese sources could not be anything other than the well known Siṁhapura in the Kaliṅga region of India. Therefore the Kaliṅga rulers could only have come from that region.

From an inscription of Niśśaṁkamalla from Polonnaruva it appears that one of the gates of Polonnaruva was named Kāmbōjavāsala[179] (Cambodian Gate). His slab inscription at Ruvanvälisäya in Anurādhapura has recorded that Niśśaṁkamalla 'bestowing on Cambodians gold and cloth and whatever other kind of wealth they wished....commanded them not to catch birds'.[180] Paranavitana, in the light of these references, says that Niśśaṁkamalla had Cambodian bodyguards in his service:

> If Niśśaṁkamalla came from Singora, in the Malay Peninsula, he must have brought with him some troops from that region who could be relied upon to guard his person, which he would certainly have not entrusted to Sinhalese troops. And not very far from Singora, in the Malay Peninsula, there was a region of which the people were Khmer-speaking, as is proved by the inscription on the pedestal of a Buddha image found at Grahi. A prince from Kaliṅga in India would hardly have had Khmer people in his service.[181]

Here Paranavitana does not explain why Niśśaṁkamalla, being a Malay prince, brought Khmer-speaking people as his bodyguards. He could have brought his own men rather than Khmers, who also were not of his own race and therefore would be no more trustworthy than the Sinhalese. Moreover, on account of the expansion of the Khmer empire of Cambodia in the direction of Thailand and the Malay Peninsula, he would not have been likely to trust Khmers. Like Paranavitana's Keraḷa argument, this present argument that 'a prince from Kāliṅga in India would hardly have had Khmer people in his service' is not very convincing.

First of all it has to be proved that the Cambodians were in his service as bodyguards. Though there is indeed evidence of their presence in Polonnaruva, there is no definite proof of their being bodyguards. On the other hand there is no lack of evidence of friendly relations between Ceylon and Cambodia, at least from the reign of Parākramabāhu I onwards. One of the main causes for the hostility between Ceylon and Burma was these friendly relations. Moreover, before Parākramabāhu sent missions to Cambodia with a Sinha-

179. *ASCAR* (1911-12), p. 100.
180. *EZ*, Vol. II, no. 13, pp. 70-83.
181. Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, p. 110.

lese princess there may have been a Cambodian mission to Ceylon. Niśśaṁkamalla, too, in his inscriptions, says that he had friendly relations with Aramaṇa, and Kāmboja.[182] Such a friendship may well have resulted in the coming of the Cambodians to Ceylon. Some of them would have come for trade purposes, and catching rare kinds of birds may have had something to do with this. It is not impossible that Niśśaṁkamalla, though an Indian prince, should have had Khmer-speaking people in his service, if in fact they ever did serve as bodyguards. Though it is uncertain how a gate of Polonnaruva was named Kāmbōjavāsala, this too could have been one of the results of the longlasting friendship between the two countries. The gate would have been given its name during the reign of Parākramabāhu I when there was close friendship with Cambodia. Envoys from Cambodia may have been given this part of the city, which would then have come to be known as the Kāmbōjavāsala, and this would have still been the case under Niśśaṁkamalla, as he too had friendly relations with Cambodia. Be that as it may, the evidence is too meagre to enable a definite conclusion to be arrived at.

In Niśśaṁkamalla's rock inscription at Polonnaruva, Vijayapura in Kaliṅga is mentioned among other places in Ceylon and abroad as a spot where he established alms-houses.[183] Paranavitana prefers to identify this Vijayapura with the capital of the Śrīvijaya kingdom in Palembang, in the light of the evidence in a Nepalese manuscript of the tenth or the eleventh century, where Śrīvijayapura in Suvarṇapura is mentioned.[184] To accept Paranavitana's suggestion we have also to accept his theory that Śrīvijaya was known as Kaliṅga during this period. But it has already been shown that Śrīvijaya was not known by this name in any period of her history. Except for the similarity of the names there is no other evidence to equate the Vijayapura mentioned in Niśśaṁkamalla's inscription with the Vijayapura referred to in the Nepalese manuscript. If Niśśaṁkamalla meant Śrīvijayapura, the capital of the kingdom of Śrīvijaya, it is not clear why the prefix *Śrī* which was so common in Ceylon, was omitted. On the other hand, evidence is not lacking for a Vijayapura on the mainland in the vicinity of the Kaliṅga region. The Nāgārjunakoṇḍa inscription of the fourteenth year of the reign of King Vīrapurisadata, records the building by a lay member, Bodhi Śrī, of a *chaitya gṛha* for the *therīs* of Tambapaṇṇi in the Cūladhammagirivihāra on the Śriparvata to the east of Vijayapūrī.[185] It has been suggested that this Vijayapūrī was near Nāgārjunakoṇḍa.[186] Though the Kaliṅga rulers had no direct supremacy over the Āndhra territory, this whole region was known as Trikāliṅga. Therefore it could be said that Vijayapūrī was in the Kaliṅga

182. *EZ*. Vol. II, no. 26, pp. 148-52; no. 27, pp. 153-56.

183. Ibid., no. 29, p. 178.

184. Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, p. 110.

185. D. C. Sircar, *The Successors of the Sātavāhanas in the Lower Deccan*, p. 32.

186. An Amarāvatī inscription mentions a Vijayapura, Luders, no. 1285, cited by Sircar, op.cit., p. 32, note 1.

country. Though our reference to this city belongs to the early centuries of the Christian Era, the name of the place could well have continued into later times even though we have no reference to it. From the presence of *therīs* from Tambapaṇṇi it appears that this Vijayapūrī had contacts with Ceylon. Because it was a Buddhist centre, Niśśaṁkamalla would have selected it to build an alms-house for the Buddhist monks. Therefore Vijayapura in India suits the inscription better than does Śrīvijaya in Sumatra.

Paranavitana has stated that some of the names and titles in some of the inscriptions of the Kaliṅga rulers are non-Sinhalese and he tries to identify these as Malayan names and titles. Thus he relates the name Tāvuru, mentioned in Niśśaṁkamalla's inscriptions[187] as belonging to one of Niśśaṁkamalla's generals, to *Tuvavūravān*, a part of the name of one of the Śailendra king's officers who built the Buddhist shrine at Nāgapaṭṭana during Rājendra Coḷa's reign.[188] He thinks that this name was Telugu in origin. If this is so, since the Telugu region certainly had relations with the Indian Kaliṅga, is it not possible to trace such names direct from Indian names, rather than indirectly from Telugu names used in Malaya? If this General Tāvuru was not a Sinhalese, he might have come to Ceylon from Indian Kaliṅga with Niśśaṁkamalla. Another such name is the *sam* in *Vijaya sam-siṅgu senevi*, a title given to Cūḍāmaṇi who was a high-ranking minister under queen Lilāvatī.[189] According to Paranavitana this *sam* appears to be the same as the Malay *sang* which is prefixed as an honorific to the personal name. He is of the opinion that Ādi, the name of a minister in Kalyāṇavatī's reign, was derived from the Malay 'haji', a royal title. Manakkā and Erapatta are two other such names given by Paranavitana as non-Sinhalese. Paranavitana's methods can best be understood by quoting from Indrapala's review, when he refers to Paranavitana's non-Ceylonese toponyms as follows:

> .....the defects in this method of research are very glaring. We know of only a few place-names of ancient Ceylon from our records. The vast majority of our toponyms are unknown to us. Under these circumstances, can we easily dismiss a place-name occurring in one of our inscriptions as non-Ceylonese on the ground that it is not "known to have existed in Ceylon"?[190]

The same comments could be applied to his non-Sinhalese proper names to demonstrate that this type of argument is not acceptable or substantiated by reliable sources.

---

187. *EZ*, Vol. II, no. 27, p. 156; no. 29, p. 176.
188. *EI*, Vol. XXII, p. 258.
189. *EZ*, Vol. IV, p. 81.
190. K. Indrapala, 'Review of *Ceylon and Malaysia* by S. Paranavitana', *JCBRAS*, NS, Vol. XI (1967), p. 103.

The statement in Niśśaṁkamalla's inscription that the Kaliṅga kings were descended from Vijaya has been interpreted as a reflection of similar legends which were current in the Malay Peninsula.[191] Niśśaṁkamalla in his inscriptions stated that his family was descended from Vijaya, the first king of Ceylon, and came from the same Siṁhapura as Vijaya did.[192] Paranavitana, commenting on this, says that the Siṁhapura in the Vijaya legend was in Lāḍha and not in Kaliṅga. Therefore this claim of Niśśaṁkamalla and of his kinsmen is not in accordance with Sinhalese tradition if they came from Kaliṅga in India. On the other hand he says, 'if they came from the region of Singora, ...they could with apparent truth claim to be descended from Vijaya who made Laṇkā a habitation of men'.[193] According to him, Laṅkāsuka, which was near the Patani district on the coast of the peninsula, was believed to be the abode of beings corresponding to the Yakṣas of Ceylon legends. Furthermore, he says that the name Laṅkā was probably given to Ceylon as well as to this region in the Malay Peninsula by the people who came from Kaliṅga in India. But to come to such a conclusion it is necessary to have at least some mythical stories from this region connecting Kaliṅga and the Malay Peninsula. The name was probably given by Indians to both places, but whether they were Kaliṅgas or Indians from another part of India cannot be determined.

Vijaya was the first king of Ceylon according to tradition. Paranavitana now tries to find another Vijaya who was the first king of Laṅkāsuka to show a similarity between the history of the two countries. He draws attention to the names of two rulers named Vijayavarma (Pisapatma A.D. 433) and Śri-pi-jia-a (Śrīvijaya A.D. 452) who ruled in Ho-lo-tan and sent envoys to the Chinese court.[194] According to Moens, Ho-lo-tan adopted the name of Śrīvijaya shortly after A.D. 666.[195] Using this as evidence, Paranavitana says that the kingdom was given that name after its king, Vijaya. Thus, according to him, if Niśśaṁkamalla's family was the same as that of this Śrī Vijaya, then he had the right to say he belonged to the family of the Vijaya who made Laṅkā an abode of men.

Paranavitana's suggestion is that Niśśaṁkamalla and other Kaliṅga rulers came from the region of Singora in the Malay Peninsula.[196] Though Moens argues that the first capital of Śrīvijaya was in the Malay Peninsula, the data now available show its headquarters to have been in Palembang.[197] We have no evidence to show that the two rulers Śrīvijaya and Vijayavarma were the first rulers of the Śīvijaya kingdom, because the Ho-lo-tan where they reigned was located in Java.[198] Hence there is no evidence of a King Vijaya who

191. Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, p. 112.
192. *EZ*, Vol. II, p. 112 and 164.
193. Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, p. 112.
194. *JMBRAS*, Vol. XXIX, pp. 166 ff.
195. Ibid.
196. Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, pp. 103 ff.
197. Wolters, *Early Indonesian Commerce*, pp. 207 ff.
198. Ibid., p. 151.

founded a dynasty in Laṅkāsuka, the region proposed by Paranavitana as that from which Niśśaṁkamalla hailed, for the latter to claim descent from. Nor is it possible to link Niśśaṁkamalla and the rulers of Śrīvijaya. Thus the King Vijaya mentioned in the inscriptions of Niśśaṁkamalla could be no other than the famous first king of Ceylon. On the other hand if Niśśaṁkamalla was a Malay prince and claimed descent from an Indian prince the Ceylonese, who were familiar with the Vijaya tradition, would have rejected his claim as a *deśa-virodha* (contradicting geography) statement.

Gerini has recorded a legend prevalent in Ligor that the city was founded by Dantakumāra, who arrived in Ligor after having been shipwrecked. There is another legend that Dharmāśoka, driven by pestilence from his homeland of Magadha, set sail with the remnants of his people in a golden junk and was wrecked on the sand of Ligor. It appears that some Ligor families claimed descent from those who came with Aśoka.[199] According to Paranavitana these legends are similar to those found in Ceylon. Therefore he says:

> The statement of Niśśaṁkamalla that he was a descendant of Vijaya who made Laṅkā an abode of men, could have therefore been due to a tradition that the originator of his family in the Malay Peninsula was a scion of the Vijaya dynasty of Ceylon.[200]

Thus Paranavitana, who earlier subscribed to the idea that Niśśaṁkamalla's claim to connections with Vijaya was due to the fact that the originator of the Śrīvijaya kingdom was known as Vijaya and that he had connections with that dynasty, now gives a different argument. However, there is no evidence to support even this theory, and such legends as are common to both Ligor and Ceylon no doubt originated from the Indian and Buddhist influence which was common to both regions.

Paranavitana draws attention to a passage in the *Rājāvaliya* which reads *daḷadā gena Kaliṅgayen ā Kīrti Niśśaṁkamalla* i.e. Kirti Niśśaṁkamalla who came from Kaliṅga with the Tooth Relic.[201] From the history of the Tooth Relic it is certain that Niśśaṁkamalla did not bring this relic at all. Here it is probable that a scribe who copied the manuscript made a mistake by omitting 'ā' after the word 'gena'. In the original it may have been *daḷadā gena ā Kaliṅgayen ā Kirti Niśśaṁkamalla raja* or *daḷadā genā Kaliṅgayen ā Kirti Niśśaṁkamalla raja*, i.e. 'Kirti Niśśaṁkamalla who came from the Kaliṅga whence the Tooth Relic was brought'. Paranavitana takes this passage in the *Rājāvaliya* as it stands, and says that this was probably due to a tradition that his family were descended from Dantakumāra who brought the Tooth Relic to Ceylon. He connects this evidence with the legend that the city of Ligor was founded

199. Gerini, op. cit., pp. 107-8.
200. Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, p. 113.
201. *Rjv*, ed. Pemananda, p. 68.

by Dantakumāra. If such a legend had been prevalent, Niśśaṁkamalla, who boasted so much in his inscriptions about his connections with Vijaya and his belonging to the Buddhist Faith, would have undoubtedly used it to get the support of the Buddhists. Though he records the building of a Tooth Relic temple, there is not even the slightest hint of his connection with Dantakumāra, nor do any other literary sources contemporary or of later date mention any such tradition.

Thus we believe that the arguments so far put forward by Paranavitana fail to prove his thesis of the Malayan origin of the Kaliṅga rulers of Ceylon. The traditional view is further reinforced by the evidence from epigraphical records and chronicles about these rulers. The names used by some of the Kaliṅga rulers are quite similar to those of the Eastern Gaṅga rulers whose kingdom was in the Kaliṅga in India. One of the kinsmen who came with Tilokasundarī to Ceylon was called Madhukaṇṇava.[202] This name strongly resembles the names Madhu-kāmārṇava and Kāmārṇava borne by princes of the Indian Gaṅga dynasty.[203] Anikāṅga and Coḍagaṅga were two names used by the Kaliṅga rulers of Ceylon. These were also quite common names among the Gaṅga rulers of India.[204] Thus there are more grounds for linking the Kaliṅga rulers of Ceylon with the Eastern Gaṅgas than with Malayan rulers.

One of Niśśaṁkamalla's queens was Kalyāṇavatī, who, according to the Galpota inscription of Polonnaruva, came from Kaliṅga and was a Gaṅga princess.[205] Paranavitana, commenting on this, says that the Kalinga rulers of Ceylon, who came from the Malay Peninsula, would have had matrimonial alliances with the Kaliṅga kingdom in India and that Kalyāṇavatī might have been one of the princesses brought from there.[206] If we accept that they had matrimonial alliances with the Indian Kaliṅga, this would show that Ceylon had close relations with that region and this contradicts the earlier statement of Paranavitana that during this period Ceylon had no knowledge of Kaliṅga in India.[207] On the other hand, if Niśśaṁkamalla came from a Kalinga kingdom in Malaysia and if the Kaliṅga rulers had matrimonial alliances with Kaliṅga in India, it is not clear why they did not distinguish the Indian Kaliṅga from their original home in the Malay Peninsula. If they came from the Malay Peninsula they would have known very well that there were two Kaliṅga kingdoms. To avoid confusion, they would undoubtedly have made the difference clear in their inscriptions. But they used Kaliṅga without any definition. This would mean that they were writing about one Kaliṅga kingdom only, which was both

202. *Cv*, LIX, 46.
203. H. C. Ray, *The Dynastic History of Northern India*, Vol. I, pp. 500-1.
204. Ibid.
205. *EZ*, Vol. II, no. 17, p. 118.
206. Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, p. 115.
207. Ibid., p. 98.

their original home and the country with which they had matrimonial alliances, that is Kaliṅga in India.

Niśśaṁkamalla's Galpota inscription clearly mentions that he came from Daṁbadiva where Buddhas, Bodhisattvas and universal Monarchs were born.[208] Thus here Daṁbadiva meant India. However, Paranavitana thinks that this is not conclusive enough evidence to identify him as Indian because Greater India too was included in the term Jambudīpa. He gives some evidence from I-Tsing's account and from the *Jinakālamālī* to support his argument.[209] But Niśśaṁkamalla was addressing the people of Ceylon and therefore would have presented his account of himself in accordance with their own beliefs. In none of the Sinhalese sources is there any reference to Buddhas being born outside the Indian sub-continent. On the other hand the Sinhalese writers used Jambudīpa and Daṁbadiva to denote the Indian sub-continent alone. Therefore according to the beliefs prevalent among the people of Ceylon as known to us, Buddhas were born in India and not in the Malay Peninsula, Java, Sumatra or any other South-east Asian land. Thus, if Niśśaṁkamalla had been a prince from the Malay Peninsula, the people would not have believed that he was born where Buddhas were born, because as far as we know the Malay Peninsula was not included in their conception of Jambudīpa. Thus there is little doubt that the Jambudīpa mentioned in the inscription could have been no other than the Indian sub-continent.

The data found in Niśśaṁkamalla's inscriptions concerning his foreign relations suggest links with India rather than with the Malay Peninsula. In his inscriptions he says that, being desirous of war, he crossed over to Jambudīpa with his four-fold army and fought various battles,[210] and that apart from the hostile attitude he adopted towards the Coḷas and Pāṇḍyas, he entered into friendly relations with countries like Karnāṭa (Mysore), Nelluru (Nellur), Gauḍa (Bengal), Kaliṅga, Teliṅga (Telingana), Gurjara (Gujarat), Aramaṇa (Burma) and Kamboja (Cambodia).[211] There is not much doubt that here the Kaliṅga mentioned between Gauḍa and Teliṅga denotes the Kaliṅga region in India. Then Niśśaṁkamalla says that he had matrimonial alliances with countries like Kaliṅga, Veṅgi, Karnāṭa, Nellūr and Gujarat.[212] Here too, the Kaliṅga mentioned among all the other kingdoms in India has to be taken as the Kaliṅga in India. Thus it is clear that, except for Aramaṇa and Kāmboja, all the countries mentioned were regions in India. As Burma and Cambodia had close relations with Ceylon during the Polonnaruva period, Niśśaṁkamalla would no doubt have continued the long-standing friendship with those two countries.

208. *EZ*, Vol. II, no. 17, p. 115.
209. Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, p. 116.
210. *EZ*, Vol. II, no. 14, pp. 84-90; no. 17, pp. 98-123; no. 20, pp. 128-30; no. 21, pp. 130-34; no. 27, p. 156.
211. Ibid., I, no. 9, p. 134; II, no. 17, pp. 98-123; no. 26, pp. 148-52; no. 27, pp. 153-6.
212. Ibid., II, no. 17, p. 95; no. 42, p. 289.

Though Paranavitana says that the Kaliṅga rulers were supported by the rulers of the Śrīvijaya empire, it is odd that there was not a single word about these Śrīvijaya rulers in their inscriptions.

The evidence about the origin of the Jaffna kingdom also supports the Indian origin of the Kaliṅga rulers of Ceylon. The Tamil Chronicles *Yaḷpāṇa-vaipava-mālai*, the *Takṣiṇa-kailāca-purāṇam*, the *Vaiyāpāṭal* and the *Kailāca-mālai*, have preserved legends about its origin. From these legends historians have come to the conclusion that the founder of the Jaffna kingdom was Kaliṅga Māgha.[213] Indrapala, who consulted all the sources on the subject, believes that it was most probably founded in the thirteenth century A.D. by Māgha and his followers.[214] The Vijaya-kūḷaṅkai mentioned in the legends about the kingdom of Jaffna has been identified as Māgha.[215]

From both archaeological and literary sources, it appears that the founders of Jaffna had close relations with the Kaliṅga region in India. The coins issued by the early Jaffna rulers have certain similarities to those of the Eastern Gaṅga rulers of Kaliṅga in India. Some gold coins found at Ganjam, which belonged to the Eastern Gaṅga rulers, have a recumbent bull facing to the left with the rising sun or *liṅga* in different positions in relation to the bull.[216] The recumbent bull with the rising crescent was represented in the coins of the Jaffna rulers,[217] and also on their banners.[218] The Eastern Gaṅga rulers had for their crest a couchant bull facing to the left.[219] From these similarities it appears that the Jaffna rulers borrowed their crest from the Gaṅga rulers.

The Jaffna rulers claimed that they belonged to the *Gaṅga-vaṃsa*.[220] As it has been concluded that Māgha was the founder of the Jaffna kingdom, the *Gaṅga-vaṃsa* here referred to has to be taken as the Eastern Gaṅga dynasty of Kaliṅga in India. Though Paranavitana argues that the 'Kankai' mentioned in the legends as the *vaṃsa* of the Jaffna rulers, has to be taken as 'Gaṅgā', not as 'Gaṅga', Indrapala has given enough evidence to show that 'Kankai' can be taken as 'Gaṅga' as well as 'Gaṅgā'.[221] Therefore, as we have evidence to show connections with the Gaṅga dynasty of Kaliṅga in India, this too can

213. C. Rasanayagam, *Ancient Jaffna*, pp. 328 ff. Paranavitana, 'The Arya Kingdom in North Ceylon', *JCBRAS*, NS, Vol. VII, pp. 174-224; H. W. Codrington. *The Coins and Currency*, p. 74; Indrapala, 'Dravidian Settlements in Ceylon and the beginning of the kingdom of Jaffna, Ph.D. Thesis (University of London, 1965, unpublished), pp. 460-73; Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, pp. 122-26.
214. Indrapala, Ph.D. Thesis, p. 469.
215. Ibid., pp. 460 ff.
216. Hultzsch, 'Miscellaneous South Indian Coins', *IA*, Vol. XXV, p. 322.
217. Rasanayagam, op. cit., pp. 300-1; plates between the pages 300 and 301.
218. Ibid., p. 302.
219. *EI*. Vol. IV, p. 243.
220. Rasanayagam, op. cit. p. 304, note 1.
221. Paranavitana, *JCBRAS*, NS, Vol. VIII, pt. 2, p. 370; Indrapala, Ph.D. Thesis, pp. 467-68.

be taken as a reference to that dynasty. Rasanayagam has drawn attention to the similarity of the legends in the inscriptions about the origin of the Eastern Gaṅgas to the legends in the chronicles about the origin of the rulers of the kingdom of Jaffna.[222]

According to the Tamil chronicles, the capital of the early kings of the kingdom of Jaffna was Ciṅkainakar or Siṅkainakar (Siṁhanagara). This capital seems to have been named after the Kaliṅga city of Siṁhapura.[223] We have seen already that Niśśaṁkamalla and other Kaliṅga rulers came from Siṁhapura in Kaliṅga. It is likely that Māgha, who founded the Jaffna kingdom, named the capital of his new kingdom after his original home.[224]

Thus the data available about the beginnings of the Jaffna kingdom show that its foundation was due to the retreat of Māgha and his followers to the northern part of Ceylon. As we have evidence to show that the founders of the Northern Kingdom had connections with the Eastern Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga in India, this too can be given to support the identification of the Kaliṅga region, from which these rulers of Ceylon hailed, with the Kaliṅga in India.

All the evidence cited above goes to prove that the Kaliṅga rulers, who reigned in Ceylon from the death of Parākramabāhu I to the reign of Parākramabāhu II, were Indian princes who originally came from the Kaliṅga region in India and we, therefore, do not believe that they were Malay princes as Paranavitana has suggested.

222. Rasanayagam, op. cit., p. 304.
223. Indrapala, Ph.D. Thesis, p. 468.
224. Ibid.

Abbreviations in Footnotes

ASCAR	—	*Archaeological Survey of Ceylon, Annual Report.*
BEFEO	—	*Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient.*
CALR	—	*Ceylon Antiquary and Literary Register*
CHJ	—	*Ceylon Historical Journal*
CJHSS	—	*The Ceylon Journal of Historical and Social Studies*
CJSG	—	*Ceylon Journal of Science Section G—Archaeology, Ethnology etc.*
Cv	—	*Cūlavaṃsa*
EI	—	*Epigraphia Indica*
EZ	—	*Epigraphia Zeylanica*
Hvv	—	*Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa*
IA	—	*Indian Antiquary*
JCBRAS	—	*Journal of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*
JGIS	—	*Journal of the Greater India Society*
JMBRAS	—	*Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*
MASI	—	*Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India*
Mv	—	*Mahāvaṃsa*
Pjv	—	*Pujāvaliya*
Rjv	—	*Rājāvaliya*
TBG	—	*Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal—, Land—, en volkenkunde witgegeven door het Bataviaasch Genoolschap van kunsten en wetenschappen*
UCR	—	*University of Ceylon Review*
UHC	—	*University History of Ceylon*

THE THEORY OF THE KING'S OWNERSHIP OF LAND IN ANCIENT CEYLON: AN ESSAY IN HISTORICAL REVISION*

W. I. SIRIWEERA

One of the crucial themes in historical writings on land tenure in South Asia in ancient times pertains to the king's precise position in the complex of tenurial relationships then in existence. While some scholars seek to prove the theory that all land belonged to the king,[1] others maintain that individuals or groups of individuals held proprietary rights over certain categories or land.[2] The present paper seeks to analyse these problems in relation to ancient Ceylon (up to c. 1500 A.D.), primarily with the aid of epigraphic evidence.

This subject is beset with difficulties owing to the ever present danger of reading into the past, ideas of ownership and proprietary rights current in modern times. Besides, there are the problems stemming from the lack of a well-defined terminology in the land grants. Some of the phrases occurring in these grants are open to more than one interpretation, and one needs to be cautious in the use of the inscriptional evidence, for any misreading or wrong interpretation of a term is likely to yield a distorted picture.

Terms such as 'ownership' and 'proprietorship' have not been defined with any real precision by any of the writers on ancient land tenure problems of Ceylon. Thus, H. W. Codrington, who pioneered this subject in his *Ancient*

*This essay was read before the Ceylon Studies Seminar, University of Ceylon, Peradeniya on 17 November 1970.

1. H. W. Codrington, *Ancient Land Tenure and Revenue in Ceylon*, Colombo, 1938, pp. 5-6; Julius De Lanerolle "An Examination of Mr. Codrington's work on Ancient Land Tenure and Revenue in Ceylon", *JRASCB*, XXXIV, 1938, pp. 203-205; J. N. Samaddar, *Lectures on the Economic Condition of Ancient India*, Calcutta, 1922, p. 55 ff; V. A. Smith, *Early History of India* (fourth edition), 1957, p. 137 ff; F. W. Thomas, *Cambridge History of India*, 1962, p. 428.

2. J. B. Phear, *The Aryan Village in India and Ceylon*, London, 1880, pp. 197 ff; B. H. Baden Powell, *The Indian Village Coumunity*, Behaviour Science Reprints, New Haven, 1957, p. 1 ff; 202 ff; 398 ff; K. P. Jayaswal, *Hindu Polity*, Pt. II, Calcutta, 1924, pp. 174-183; A. Appadurai, *Economic Conditions in Southern India*, I, Madras, 1936, pp. 98-178; Premnath Banerjea, *Public Administration in Ancient India*, London 1916, p. 179 ff; Lallanji Gopal, "Ownership of Agricultural Land in Ancient India", *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, IV, 1961, pp. 240-63; H. S. Maine, *Village Communities of the East and West*, London, 1907, p. 76 ff; 103 ff; 160 ff; 226 ff.

Land Tenure and Revenue in Ceylon states that "In the following pages it will be understood that the words 'ownership', 'proprietor' and the like are used with no legal significance. Whether the European conception of ownership prevailed in ancient India and Ceylon is doubtful".[3] L. S. Perera in his paper "Proprietary and Tenurial Rights in Ancient Ceylon", uses terms such as 'owner', 'ownership' and 'inalienable ownership'[4] but no definition of these terms is provided in this paper. The same may be said of several others who have written on this theme.[5]

The concept of 'ownership of land' as it exists in modern Ceylon, is derived basically from Roman Dutch Law. The provisions regarding landed property or 'ownership of land' embodied in the Roman Dutch law, however, have been modified from time to time by legal enactments. These changes and modifications could very often be of fundamental importance. At the same time this would render the indiscriminate use of comparatively modern legal concepts in relation to ancient conditions an extremely hazardous venture in historical analysis and interpretation.

The definition of the concept of 'ownership' of land in the context of ancient Ceylon presents great difficulties. The gradations between ownership and tenancy were so subtle that it is sometimes difficult to know exactly where to draw the line between the two. What is attempted in this essay is an examination of the nature of proprietary rights over land on the assumption that the term 'ownership' to mean the right to alienate land,[6] by means of sale or gift or other means such as mortgage. Admittedly this criterion is not entirely satisfactory as there may have been limitations on the alienation of land. In the first place, the practice of alienation of land by monasteries to others does not appear to have been very common in Ceylon. Secondly, as Codrington has shown, alienation of land by an individual of a particular village, to a stranger from outside the village created resentments among the inhabitants of the village in which the land was sought to be alienated.[7] The evidence of an inscription from Kaludiyapokuna datable to the reign of either Sena III (938-46) or Sena IV (954-56) seems to suggest that employees of the Dakinigiri monas-

3. H. W. Codrington, *op. cit.* p. 6.

4. L. S. Perera, "Proprietary and Tenurial Rights in Ancient Ceylon", *Ceylon Journal of Historical and Social Studies*, Vol. 2, 1959, pp. 1-32.

5. M. B. Ariyapala, *Society in Mediaeval Ceylon*, Colombo 1956, p. 140; Wilhelm Geiger, *Culture of Ceylon in Mediaeval Times*, ed. by Heinz Bechert, Wiesbaden, 1960, p. 50; T. B. H. Abeyasinghe, *Portuguese Rule in Ceylon*, Colombo 1966, p. 101.

6. An inscription from Gaḍalādeniya which could be datable to 1344 A.D., refers to a donation of a 'plot of land' to the Gaḍalādeniya temple by an officer of the king. This plot of land was held on service tenure by him (*tamaṇa divelaṭa siṭi* (*E.Z.*, IV, no. 12). Land held under service tenure by officials were to be held only for the period of service. Therefore, in this grant, really land was not alienated to the temple but only the income from land. However, it seems that this type of grant to religious institutions was very rare during the period under review.

7. H. W. Codrington, *op. cit.* p. 28.

tery from a certain village belonging to that monastery were forbidden even to cultivate land in other villages.[8] It may also be assumed that family tradition and rights were a check on the alienation of proprietary rights as the strength of this link in the agricultural society of Ceylon was not inconsiderable. In this connection *Kauṭilya* may be cited regarding the Indian practices in land alienation. According to *Kauṭilya* immovable property could be sold but in such sales preference should be given to kinsmen and neighbours.[9]

L. S. Perera, while suggesting the emergence before the end of the eighth century of the right of private individuals to own property[10] goes on to discuss the monarch's precise status in the tenurial system. He states that:

> "The documents themselves on which our conclusions have to be based are ambiguous in as much as there were law-givers who intentionally propounded this theory. The fact is that there is evidence both for private and communal ownership of land as well as for a wide extension of the power of the king in respect of property in proportion to the increase of his authority and also in respect of the land over which he had proprietary rights. It is the growth of this latter development that we must trace, and which will provide the clue to this theory that the king owned all the land".[11]

> "This leads us therefore to the other implication that the king could in various ways acquire ownership rights similar to those exercised by long standing cultivators. In the codes of *Manu* this is not quite so apparent, but in the *Arthasāstra* it was taken for granted and was a matter of policy. In the verse from the *Mahāvaṃsa* about the fate of ownerless land the king is called *puthuvisāmi* (Skt. *pṛthvi-svāmi*), 'the owner of the earth'. This may be a literary pun used by the author on the word *assāmiko*. In the inscriptions of the ninth and tenth centuries the king was often called *vat himiyan vahansē* (Skt. *vastu-svāmin*) or 'owner of land', thus emphasising his ownership of property. It is possible, therefore, that the king gradually extended his rights over land along with the growth of his influence and power. But acquisition of these rights must have been gradual".[12]

However, a careful analysis of the evidence on which his conclusions are based leads us to doubt about many of them. There are several reasons why we cannot entirely accept the view that the phrase *vat himiyan vahansē* referred to above supports the theory that the king gradually extended his rights over land, or that he was the sole owner of land. In the first place, the Sanskrit term

8. *E.Z.* III, No. 27.
9. *Arthasāstra*, Bk. III, Ch. 9.
10. L. S. Perera, *op. cit.* pp. 3-4.
11. *ibid.*, p. 4.
12. L. S. Perera, *op. cit.* p. 4.

vastu from which the word *vat* is derived could mean not only land but also any form of wealth. In fact, L. S. Perera himself states in a footnote that "in the present record, however, it refers to the king apparently as *vastu-svāmi*, 'the owner of property', and we know it is so used in the *Nikāya Sangrahaya* and in the *Kurunāgala Vistaraya*; e.g. Vijayabāhu vathimi, vathimi Bhuvanekabāhu and vastu himi kumārāya".[13] Secondly it may be pointed out that the Sanskrit term *Vāstu* (not *vastu*) means land, fields, gardens, houses, sites, tanks etc. and if we assume that the term *vat himi* is similar to Sanskrit *Vāstu svāmi*, meaning owner of land, it does not imply that the king gradually extended his rights over land or that he was the 'sole owner of land'. Thirdly, it is doubtful whether the eulogistic terms used before the name of a king really tell us anything of real value about the tenurial problems of Ceylon. It could well be that the term *vathimiyan vahansē* was a literary pun similar to the term *puthuvisāmi*.

Other writers have claimed without much hesitation that the king was the sole owner of land. Thus Codrington, writing in 1938 argued that "The king was *bhūpati* or *bhūpāla*, 'lord of the earth'..... The king, though having the supreme disposal of land, was bound by the law....."[14] Unfortunately, he has not given us the source of these particular terms. M. B. Ariyapala states—that: "....the king was the sole owner of land, which was given out to people by his grace either for a payment or in return for some kind of service".[15] He too provides very scant supporting evidence to buttress his adherence to this theory. More recently, T. B. H. Abeyasinghe, who apparently has based his statements on the writers quoted above has casually stated—once again without providing any substantial evidence in support of his views that: "The central fact was that the king was the *bhūpati*, the lord of the land. He had absolute control over the manner of its disposal".[16]

It would appear that some of these scholars have based their concept of the king's sole ownership of land largely on terms such as *bhūpati*, *bhūpāla* and *vathimi*. It may thus be useful to examine the contexts in which these terms are found in the literature and inscriptions of Ceylon. The terms *bhūpati*, *bhūmipāla*, *bhūmipa*, *bhūmissara*, *mahīpāla*, *mahīpati* and *paṭhavipathi*, all of which may be rendered literally as 'ruler of the earth' or 'lord of the earth' are found in the *Mahāvaṃsa*.[17] The *Saddharmaratnāvaliya* written in the thirteenth century refers to the king as *pṛthuvīsvara*,[18] which may be rendered literally as 'lord of the earth'. The Kahambiliyāwa slab inscription of Vikra-

13. *ibid.*, p. 33, footnote 19.
14. H. W. Codrington, *op. cit.* pp. 5-6.
15. M. B. Ariyapala, *op. cit.* p. 140.
16. T. B. H. Abeyasinghe, *op. cit.* p. 101.
17. *Mv*, XV, 26, 31, 37; XXI, 7; XXXIII, 23; XXXIV, 7, 51, 82; XXV, 47; 126.
18. *Saddharmaratnāvaliya*, ed. D. B. Jayatilaka, 1930, p. 755.

mabāhu I (1111-32) refers to the king as *bhūpati*.[19] The terms *bhūpālendrān* and *bhūpah* are found respectively in the Polonnaruva Galpota slab inscription of Nissamkamalla and the Prīti-Dānaka Maṇḍapa rock inscription of the same king (1187-96)[20]. It should be noted here that in all these instances the terms *bhupati, bhūpāla, pṛthuvisvara, mahīpati* etc. are used as conventional epithets to denote the king. More to the point, in the context of actual land grants none of these terms are found thus raising the crucial question whether these rhetorical usages could really support the theory that the king was the sole owner of land in his kingdom.

Again, the phrase *lakdivu poloyana parapuren himi* is used in medieval inscriptions in referring to kings.[21] Paranavitana renders it into English as "who is by right of descent, the lord of the young damsel that is the earth of the island of Lankā".[22] Godakumbure similarly translates the phrase as "by right of descent husband of the damsel (namely), the soil of the island of Lankā".[23] It should be noted that in some inscriptions the phrases *srī lankāva manusya vāsa kala vijayarāja paramparāyen lankāva himi*,[24] 'lord of Lankā by descent from the royal family of king Vijaya who made a human habitation of this srī Lankā' and *taman yona parapuren lakdiva himi*,[25] 'by right of lineal succession of kings' occur in place of the above phrase. Hence, it would appear that these phrases too do not imply the king's 'ownership' of land or his economic rights to land in his kingdom but indicate only that the legal basis of the authority of the king and his political rights rested on the belief of his regular descent from the line of previous lawful kings. In other words, these stereotyped phrases were used in the context of a king's ascending the throne by right of succession; they have little to do with the king's ownership of land.

In the texts of Indian jurists of ancient times, there are some references to the king as 'lord of the earth'. Most notable of these are the works of *Manu* and *Kātyāyana*. According to *Manu* the king is entitled to a share of treasure troves found beneath the ground and of the produce of mines, because he affords protection and because he is the lord of the earth (*bhūmer adhipatir*).[26] *Kātyāyana* states that the king should receive one sixth of the produce of the fields for he is the lord of the soil.[27] But U. N. Ghoshal has shown that these references do not necessarily support the theory of the king's ownership of

19. *E.Z.* V. No. 39.
20. *E.Z.* II, No. 17; No. 19.
21. *E.Z.* II, No. 16; *E.Z.* III, No. 34; *E.Z.* V, Nos. 1 and 35.
22. *E.Z.* V, p. 188.
23. *E.Z.* V, p. 377.
24. *E.Z.* V, No. 43.
25. *E.Z.* II, No. 17.
26. *Manu*, VIII, 39.
27. *Kātyayāna*, 16-17.

land; indeed Ghoshal suggests that statements in these texts are laid down not as definite heads of law, but as arguments for justifying or explaining the king's right to levy specific taxes on the land.[28]

At the same time classical Indian jurists provide evidence that individuals had proprietary rights over land. *Kauṭilya* states that land could be sold by individuals and he uses the word *svāmyan* or 'ownership' when dealing with disputes about the sale of land.[29] According to *Nārada*, "A house-holder's house and his field are considered as the two fundamentals of his existence. Therefore, let not the king upset either of them; for that is the root of the house holders".[30] *Bṛhaspati* declares that both movable and immovable property to be vendible commodities.[31] There are also rules in the texts of some of the jurists relating to legal problems connected with land such as boundary disputes,[32] inheritance,[33] dispossession of a cultivator's plot by another[34] and using one's field as a pledge.[35]

Thus it seems that there is no uniform theory in Indian texts regarding the king's sole ownership of land. The attempt to base theories on isolated statements in these texts quoted without reference to context, and without regard to other statements which contradict these, is thus basically unsatisfactory. And so far that matter is the attempt to read too much into terms such as *bhūmer adipatir* found in these texts.

An analysis of the inscriptional and literary evidence of Ceylon shows that in certain instances a distinction was made between 'ownership' of land and the right to dues and services. The Perumäiyankulam rock inscription of Vasabha (67-111 A.D.) records that the king granted the revenues derived from a number of irrigation tanks to the *thera* Majibuka.[36] Buddhadāsa (337-65) arranged for physicians in the king's service to receive the produce of ten villages each as living.[37] Aggabōdhi III (628-39) is said to have granted the royal share in the revenues of the village Kehella to the *Sangha*.[38] A pillar inscription from Mihintale datable to the reign of Sēna II (853-87), states that certain dues in respect of plots of land which were previously derived by the royal family were donated to the Sāgiri monastery.[39] In the Kantalāi inscription of Nissan-

28. U. N. Ghoshal, *Agrarian System in Ancient India*, Calcutta, 1930, pp. 89-99.
29. *Arthasāstra*, Bk. III, chs. 9-18.
30. *Nārada*, XI, 42.
31. *Bṛhaspati*, XVIII, 2.
32. *Manu*, VIII, 245-266; *Nārada*, XI, 1-4; *Vishnu*, V, 172; *Kautilya*, Bk. III, ch. 9.
33. *Nārada*, VIII, 1-2; *Gautama* XXVIII, 1.
34. *Manu*, VIII, 264.
35. *Manu* VIII, 143; *Nārada* I, 125; *Gautama*, XII, 32.
36. *E.Z.* I, no. 6.
37. *Mv.* XXXVII, 146-147.
38. *Cv.* XLIV, 120.
39. *E.Z.* V, No. 29.

kamalla (1187-96) reference is made to *gamvarak ādivū aya,*[40] 'a *gamvara*[41] and other revenue'. An inscription of Sāhasamalla (1200-1202)[42] records a grant of *gamvara hā parivāra hā siyalu sampattiya,* 'gamvara, retinue and other forms of wealth'. Codrington has shown the term *vara* in the inscriptions bears the meaning 'due' or 'tax'.[43] It would thus be evident that such grants were limited to the transfer of royal revenue or tax and not the land itself and such royal grants too cannot be taken as evidence in support of the view that the king was the sole owner of land. It is also worth noting here that in certain grants there is some confusion as between taxes due to the king and income drawn on the basis of proprietary rights by the king. Very often no clear distinction is made between income and taxes or proprietor's share and taxes in the use of terminology in these sources.

The statement that a piece of land was granted by the king may convey at least three different meanings. First, it could mean that the land referred to was handed over to the donee with complete proprietary rights. Originally such plots of land would have belonged to the king. It is noteworthy that in certain instances, particularly in the ninth, tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries, immunities from taxes were also granted along with proprietary rights. Secondly, it could mean that what was donated was merely the tax from the land which was due to the king. These plots of land were held by individuals and the original 'owners' or cultivators remained undisturbed by the grant. Thirdly, it could mean that the income of a particular plot of land was commuted to the grantees. When land belonging to the king is granted to individuals on service tenure, such land mostly falls into this category.

Furthermore, the existence of private 'ownership' as defined earlier is implicit in the land grants of ancient Ceylon. In the first place, there is no mention of the king's consent being made a prior condition to alienation of land by individuals in any of these grants. A cave inscription at Gallena *vihāra* in the Kurunegala district datable to the first century A.D. refers to a grant of a cave, half a *karisa* of land and the field named Avulada to the *Sangha* by one *Mataya.*[44] The Timbirivāva inscription of the reign of Gōṭhābhaya (249-62) records the donation of a share of a tank by a private donor that belonged to her family.[45] A rock inscription datable to the seventh century A.D. refers to a grant of land by an individual named Sumanaya to the Dakkhinavihāra.[46]

40. *E.Z.* II, No. 42.
41. Paranavitana has pointed out that in certain instances the term *gama* has been used to denote a single field or estate instead of a village. (*E.Z.* III, pp. 274-76). Codrington and Julius de Lanerolle too support this meaning of the word *gama.*Codrington, *op. cit.* p. 1; Lanerolle, *op. cit.* pp. 211-12).
42. *E.Z.* II, No. 36.
43. Codrington, *op. cit.* p. 23.
44. *E.Z.* V, No. 20.
45. *E.Z.* IV, No. 28.
46. *E.Z.* V, No. 5.

All these instances are to be found in grants made to the Buddhist monks by individuals but more specific references to justify our argument are found after the ninth century A.D. An inscription from Eppāvala which could be dated to the tenth century provides the information that one *paya*[47] of paddy land was sold (*vikinā*) for eight *kalandas*[48] of gold by a certain Velātme Mihindu to a person named Ukunuhasa Kōttā.[49] The Galapātavihāra rock inscription datable to the reign of Parākramabāhu II (1236-70), which records a grant made by Demela Adhikāri Mahinda and his family, is even more specific: it states that the donors bought (*ran dīlā gat*) some plots of land from ordinary individuals before gifting them to the *vihāra*.[50] This suggests that the donors bought the 'ownership' of the plots of land concerned, and that the vendors had the complete right to alienate land. The donors of the grant, too, acquired the same right by purchasing it. A rock inscription from Gaḍalādeniya datable to 1344 A.D. states that a plot of land granted to the monastery there by a certain dignitary was purchased by him (*panam.....k dī gat*) from another individual before donation.[51] Neither in these instances, nor in any other instance of individual transactions, is any reference made to obtaining prior permission from the king.

There are, at the same time, a few inscriptions which show that the king bought property for donation. The Vihāregala inscription records that Subha (60-67 A.D.) dedicated a reservoir to the *sangha* after having bought it for five hundred pieces of money.[52] The *Mahāvaṃsa* records that Gajabāhu I (114-36 A.D.) bought the plots of land which he donated to the *sangha* at Issarasamana and Mariccavaṭi monasteries.[53] According to the *Cūlavaṃsa* Kassapa I (473-91) bought lands and dedicated them to the Issarasamanārama.[54] The Nāgirikanda inscription records that King Kumāradāsa (508-16) bought certain plots of land for the purpose of donating them to the *sangha*.[55] An inscription of Nissankamalla (1187-96) records a grant of a paddy field called Yaktuḍukumbura and the text makes it clear that the land was first purchased by the king before it was donated.[56]

It may be of interest to note here that the *Tacēvalamai* which records the customary law of the Tamils, too indicates that the belief that the king was the

47. A measure of land. A *paya* is one fourth of a *kiri* (Pāli: *karisa*) the standard land measurement of ancient Ceylon. *Paya* is equivalent to an *amuna* (sowing extent) according to the present usage. See *E.Z.* III, pp. 189-90.
48. A measure of weight equal to 1/6 oz. of troy. *E.Z.* III, p. 336.
49. *E.Z.* III, No. 18.
50. *E.Z.* IV, No. 25.
51. *E.Z.* IV, No. 12.
52. *E.Z.* III, No. 15.
53. *Mv.* XXXV, 118-21.
54. *Cv.* XXXIX, 10-12.
55. *E.Z.* IV, No. 14.
56. *E.Z.* V, No. 17.

owner of all land is devoid of any valid foundation. According to this text most of the arable land was freehold and possession of land could be acquired by five ways namely: royal grant (*utāram*), hereditary right (*Paravani āṭci*), usufructory mortgage (*orri*), donation (*nankoṭai*) and purchase.[57]

If the criterion of ownership was the right of alienating the land, rather than of alienating the revenue or tax, then the evidence of inscriptions would seem to provide proof that there was private ownership of land in ancient Ceylon. The king as the head of the political organization as well as the protector of his subjects, would have had to respect the rights of individuals.

However, in practice too, the king had certain claims over most of the land. He could claim a portion of the produce as tax in return for the services he rendered to the people in maintaining order in the kingdom. *Gautama* justifies the king's levy of taxes on the ground that he is charged with the duty of protecting the subjects.[58] According to *Vishnu*, a *kshatriya* should protect the world and receive his due reward in the form of taxes.[59] This direct relation between taxation and protection emphasised by Indian lawgivers would not have been unknown in Ceylon from ancient times for the institution of kingship in the island was influenced to a considerable extent by the ideas of the Buddhist canon and the Indian literature. As U. N. Ghoshal has shown, in the versions of the origin of kingship occurring in the Buddhist canon, in the *Arthasāstra* and the *Mahābhārata*, the payment of certain specific taxes by the people and the protection afforded by the king are practically conceived as the two sides of the original contract between the ruler and the subjects.[60]

In addition to the right to claim a share of the produce from all occupied and cultivated land, unoccupied waste, both fallow and cultivable, were under the king's possession.[61] The *Arthasāstra* lays down elaborate rules for the settlement of new, or old but since deserted tracts by the king.[62] The kings of Ceylon whenever opportunities arose had jungle and waste lands cleared and cultivated. The king could grant complete proprietary rights of such property to any individual or institution as he desired. Thus, Aggabōdhi I (571-604) granted a coconut garden which he had planted, to the Kurunda monastery.[63] Mānavamma (884-718) is mentioned as having founded two villages (*katvā gāmadvayam*) and made donations of these to the monasteries.[64] It is said that

57. *Tēcavalamai*, Pt. I, 3-4, 5.
58. *Gautama*, X. 24-28.
59. *Vishnu Smṛti*, III, 12.
60. U. N. Ghoshal, *Contributions to the History of the Hindu Revenue System*, Calcutta, 1929, p. 18.
61. In Armour's *Grammer of the Kandyan Law* this principle is recognised. It states that "forests and wilderness, unreclaimed and untenanted by men.....belong to the king". (Armour, p. 5).
62. *Arthasāstra*, Bk. II, Ch. 1.
63. *Cv.* XLII, 15.
64. *Cv.* XLVII, 64.

the minister Dēvappatirāja of Parākramabāhu II (1236-70), had the 'whole of the vast forest called Mahalabujagacca, cleared by the roots, a fine village built there and in its neighbourhood a large grove of Jak trees planted.'[65] This village was subsequently granted by the king to Dēvapatirāja as a permanent possession (*pamunu*).[66] Thus, waste land and land newly cultivated by the initiative of the king or his officials became royal property as there was no antecedent right of a private individual. For the king the prerogative of owning waste or jungle land must have served a number of useful functions including the promotion of expansion into new areas or the rehabilitation of older areas which had been deserted or devastated by disasters natural and human.

There is also evidence to show that abandoned and ownerless land belonged to the king. Thus, the *thera* Sanghamitta in persuading Mahāsena (274-301) to seize the land of the Mahāvihāra said: "ownerless land belonged to the king".[67] In commenting on this phrase, L. S. Perera observes:

> "This was apparently the accepted practice because the Mahāvihāra monks combatted the threat, not by calling in question the principle invoked but by trying to prove that the land was never abandoned. They claimed that there were monks hidden within the premises in an underground chamber. This seems to indicate that land in continuous occupation could not be seized by the king, and that the owners in occupation had an inviolable right to the land.[68]

The Gaḍalādeniya inscription (end of the fifteenth century) which records certain proclamations of Sēnāsammata Vikramabāhu implies that the king could dispose of ownerless property as he liked. According to this inscription, in the absence of any lawful claimant, the heriot of those who died in battle or in the elephant hunt should be offered for the restoration of *vihāras*.[69] It is implicit in a passage of the *Saddharmaratnāvaliya*, too, that ownerless property belonged to the king. This passage reads:

> *siṭānam mala niyāva asā kosol rajjuruwō sampat himivanṭa nisi daru malu kenekun näti kalaṭa mē sampat kavurun santaka vēdäi vicārā kosol rajjuruvanṭa vēdäi kī kalhi,*[70]

i.e. 'having heard of the death of the *seṭṭhi* the king of Kōsala inquired as to who would become the owner of the wealth when the deceased left no heir, and learnt that it was the king who came into possession of such wealth'.

---

65. *Cv.* LXXXVI, 49-50.
66. *Cv.* LXXXVI, 53-54.
67. *Mv.* XXXVII, 8.
68. L. S. Perera, *op. cit.* p. 3.
69. *E.Z.* IV, No. 2.
70. *Saddharmaratnāvaliya*, ed. D. B. Jayatilaka, Colombo 1930, p. 867.

It is noteworthy also that in the works of *Kautilya* and *Āpasthamba* the same principle is recognised. *Kautilya* states that a holding for which no claimant is forthcoming shall be taken possession of by the king, and that property for which no claimant is found shall go to the king.[71] According to *Āpasthamba*, in the absence of any relatives the property of a deceased devolved on the ruler.[72]

In the case of land without heirs, the king could probably exercise a residual right of overlordship and cultivate the land. This would have been an integral function of the king's responsibility to assure the well-being and productivity of the land.

The confiscation of land and other property was recognised as one of the royal prerogatives. Whenever the subjects in the kingdom committed heinous crimes, especially treason, the king could confiscate the property of offenders. According to the *Cūlavaṃsa*, Dhātusēna (455-73) after his victory over the Tamil kings deprived of their lands those dignitaries who had supported the Tamils.[73] The regulations promulgated by Kassapa V (914-23) state that the plots of land granted to the monks should not be confiscated even if the members of the order acted against the king.[74] The Panākaḍuva copper plate which has been attributed to Vijayabāhu I[75] (1055-1110) by Paranavitana embodies an order delivered by the king granting certain privileges to one Budalnāvan and his family. This charter states that even if an offence is committed by Budalnāvan and his family, their share of land holdings should not be confiscated (*dōsayak kalada pet pamunu noganna koṭaca*). In the Dādigaṃa slab inscription which records certain amnesties proclaimed by Bhuvanekabāhu VI (1470-78) the king decreed that those who offered their submission to him after the *sinhala sange* (Sinhala rebellion) should not suffer loss of property and loss of life.[76] An inscription from Gaḍalādeniya datable to the reign of Srī Jayavīra Parākramabāhu (1467-69) records a somewhat similar proclamation.[77] Thus, inscriptional evidence provides ample proof that confiscation of land by the king was in vogue.

---

71. *Ārthasāstra*, Bk. III, ch. 5 and ch. 9.
72. *Apasthamba*, II, 6, 14.
73. *Cv.* XXXVIII, 38, 39.
74. *E.Z.* I, No. 4.
75. *E.Z.* V, No. 1. In a review of the *Epigraphia Zeylanica*, Vol. V, part I, which appeared in the *JRASGB*, parts 3 and 4, 1956, pp. 237-240. C. E. Godakumbure stated that the Panākaduwa copper plate was a forgery. Paranavitana's reply to this review appeared in the same journal parts 3 and 4, pp. 213-214. Godakumbure's rejoinder appeared in parts 1 and 2, 1958, pp. 51-52.
76. *E.Z.* III, No. 29.
77. *E.Z.* IV, No. 3.

The king it should appear, also had his own private land. The *Mahāvaṃsa* refers to a plot of land that belonged to the family of (*kulasante*) king Kūṭakannatissa[78] (44-22 B.C.). A pillar inscription from Mihintale which has been dated to the reign of Sēna II (853-87), refers to a donation of certain revenues derived by the royal family to the monastery at Sāgiri, i.e. Mihintale.[79] Parākramabāhu I (1153-86) is said to have laid out a private garden in a region close to his palace.[80]

One other point needs mention: the rights of the king's consorts and of women in general with regard to land. Did these latter have any proprietary rights over land? The chronicles and inscriptions certainly provide evidence to show that consorts of kings granted property to monasteries,[81] but these are of little use in determining the more general question of women's proprietary rights as it is likely that consorts of kings as privileged persons could obtain the right to appropriate revenues from specified plots or blocks of land. However, there are some references in the inscriptions which appear to support the possibility that women actually had proprietary rights over land. In the early inscriptional records women appear fairly often as donors of caves.[82] The mother of Gajabāhu I (114-36) paid a hundred thousand pieces of money and bought a plot of land to construct buildings for a monastery.[83] A rock inscription found at Timbirivāva datable to the reign of Gōṭhābhaya (249-62) refers to a donation of a share of a tank by a lady named Anulabi to the monastery called Gagapavata.[84] Though this grant refers to a share in a tank it is very likely that the same principle may have been applied to the 'ownership' of land as well. The thirteenth century Galapātavihāra rock inscription records a list of lands and serfs dedicated to that *vihāra* by one Mahinda and some of his relatives including his mother.[85] Another Sinhalese inscription of the thirteenth century found on the rock wall of the cave temple at Nākolagane in the Kurunegala district, records the gift of certain plots of land to the Nāgala monastery by Sumēdhādēvi (wife of a royal officer), her two sons and another person.[86]

One last theme needs mention here—what evidence do the inscriptions provide of joint ownership of land? There is no evidence to suggest the prevalence of joint tenure in the Anurādhapura period, but two inscriptions referred to earlier in this essay, both belonging to the thirteenth century, may imply the existence of joint ownership. Those associated in the grant recorded in the

78. *Mv.* XXXIV, 36.
79. *E.Z.* V, No. 29.
80. *Cv.* LXXIII, 95-102.
81. *Mv.* XXXV, 48; *Cv.* XLII, 62; *E.Z.* II, No. 39; *E.Z.* IV, No. 19.
82. *E.Z.* I, No. 2; *E.Z.* V. Nos. 18, 19, 20, 40.
83. *Mv.* XXXV, 117.
84. *E.Z.* IV, No. 28.
85. *E.Z.* IV, No. 25.
86. *CJSG*, I, p. 170.

Galapātavihāra rock inscription were Kahambalkulu Mindalnā, his mother, his nephews called Kadānā and Vijayānā and another relative named Kaṭuvitāna Sātambā.[87] It is noteworthy that in this grant other relatives of the family of Kahambalkulu Mindalnā such as Kaṭuvitāna Sātambā also participated along with the members of the nuclear family. The participants in the grant made to the Nāgala vihāra recorded in the inscription on the rock wall of the cave temple at Nākolagane were Sumēdhādēvi, her two sons named Parākrama Ambara and Mīnd Ambara and another donor called prince Girihaṇḍasāta.[88] In this instance, too, prince Girihaṇḍasāta did not belong to the nuclear family of Sumēdhādēvi and her sons. Very probably he was a more distant relative of the family. Thus, it would seem that in certain cases members outside the nuclear family also had land rights jointly with those of the nuclear family. On the other hand, it is possible that the donors referred to above donated their individual plots of land having inscribed the grant on one inscription, but the balance of probability favours the first supposition. Even if we assume that these inscriptions imply joint ownership, we have little basis to assume that such joint ownership was a regular feature in the land tenure system of ancient Ceylon.

As for inheritance of land, this normally took place within a framework of kinship. Grants of caves to the Bhikkhu community dating from the third century B.C. give full geneological details of the grantors. As noted earlier, the Timbirivāva inscription of Gōṭhābhaya records the donation of a share of a tank by a private donor that belonged to her family (*tumaha kula sataka koṭasa*).[89] The Perimiyankulam inscription refers to another grant of a similar share in a tank which belonged to the donor's father (*tumaha pita sataka koṭasa*).[90] The Rambāva slab inscription datable to the reign of Mahinda IV (956-72) records a land grant made by the king to one Kilingu-rad Pirivat Hāmbuvan. The record states that lands donated should be enjoyed by the donee, his children, grand children and their descendants.[91] An inscription of the twelfth century, which has been assigned to the reign of Nissankamalla by Paranavitana, records a permanent land grant (*pamunu* in the terminology of mediaeval Ceylon) by the king to an officer named Vijayā. In this grant the king lays down the rule that the plots of land granted should not be given to those who are neither Vijayā's descendants nor his relatives.[92] The evidence of a rock

87. *E.Z.* IV, No. 25.
88. *CJSG*, I, p. 170.
89. *E.Z.* IV, No. 28.
90. *E.Z.* I, No. 6.
91. *E.Z.* II, No. 13.
92. *E.Z.* V, No. 17.

inscription from Kōṭṭange datable to the reign of Lōkesvara II (1210-11), may also be profitably utilised here. The inscription records a permanent land grant (*pamunu*) made by the king to one Arakmēnāvan.[93] In this inscription too, it is laid down that the land should be enjoyed by those of the Māpaṇḍi family (*Māpaṇḍi vaṃsaya*). The *Māpaṇḍi vaṃsaya* in this context indicates members of kinsmen of the family of Arakmēnāvan. Some of the plots of land which were donated to the Galapāta monastery in the thirteenth century, by the members of Kahambalkulu Mindalanā's family were the hereditary property of the grantors—*apa sī parapuräva valandā ā.*[94] These provisions for the future of family land holdings suggest that there was faith among the people that the institution of kingship would continue to guarantee law and order and protect private property.

One last word may be said regarding the conclusions offered in this essay. They are necessarily tentative. Future research may help us to understand more clearly whether terms such as "ownership" can really be applied to problems of ancient land tenure. If so, in what sense? If not, what alternative terms should be used and with what definition etc.? On the whole it seems to me that the formulation of these problems is more urgent than their solution.[95]

Abbreviations

CJSG	—	*Ceylon Journal of Science, Section G.*
Cv.	—	*Cūlavaṃsa.*
E.Z.	—	*Epigraphia Zeylanica.*
JRASCB	—	*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Ceylon Branch.*
JRASGB	—	*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Great Britain.*
Mv.	—	*Mahāvaṃsa.*

93. *E.Z.* IV, No. 11.
94. *E.Z.* IV, No. 15.
95. The author wishes to acknowledge his debt to Professor K. M. de Silva for the improvements made in the original draft to this essay and his encouragement; to Dr. S. Pathmanathan for his assistance and to Mr. W. J. F. LaBrooy, Professor N. A. Jayawickrema, Drs. R. A. L. H. Gunawardena and Ananda Kulasooriya for their comments.

TRIUMPH OF COMPETITION IN THE CEYLON CIVIL SERVICE

W. A. Wiswa-Warnapala

Many nationalist movements in the colonies, especially that of India, in their initial stages, arose as campaigns for localisation of the public services. The pioneers of such nationalist movements were generally of the opinion that the 'real power was in the hands of the Civil Service'.[1] Although the leadership of Ceylon's constitutional struggle, which was confined to the English educated middle class of the island, rarely made localisation of the public services a primary platform for agitation, there were occasional references to the issue of Ceylonese participation in the administration.[2] This lack of initiative, especially in the early period of the reform movement, was perhaps due to the ideology of the reform struggle, according to which the aristocratic elements which constituted the reform movement were successful to a great extent in establishing a healthy relationship with the Civil Service bureaucracy.[3] However, a number of Legislative Councillors advanced the view that Ceylonese participation in the administration could be complete only after the introduction of a scheme to admit Ceylonese to the higher services. Meanwhile, a Ceylonese association in 1860 petitioned the Secretary of State for Colonies that the competitive examination should be introduced in Ceylon. This was shortly after the introduction of the competitive examination by Macaulay for entry to Covenanted Services in India. This demand was viewed with apprehension by the authorities. Henry Ward, the Governor, advanced the view that the introduction of the competitive principle in the Ceylonese setting would create a situation where the 'precocious Burgher, Tamil or Low Country Sinhalese would defeat the

1. Symonds, Richard. *The British and their Successors*. London. Faber and Faber, 1966, p. 14.
2. Arunachalam, Ponnambalam. *Our Political Needs*. Ceylon National Association, p. 59.
3. This was a prominent feature among the Civil Servants who were incharge of provincial stations; they found it convenient and advantageous to the stability of the administration to come to terms with the native aristocracy, who for generations dominated and controlled the political and social life of the people. Another significant factor which must be noted is the interest shown by the local European community in the constitutional reforms. Those who formed the leadership of the reform struggle were interested in entering into an active partnership with the bureaucracy. The reform movement which existed before 1915 could therefore be described 'a compromising elite campaign'.

European candidate'.[4] The competitive principle, however, was adopted, and the developments which centred around it forms a significant chapter in the evolution of the Ceylon Civil Service. An attempt has been made here to discuss the adoption of the competitive principle, the nature of the competitive examination, the early beginnings of Ceylonisation, and other developments which resulted from them.

The Report on the Organisation of the Permanent Civil Service, now known to us as the famous Northcote-Trevelyan report, created an epoch in the annals of the British Civil Service. The competitive system, its greatest contribution, appealed to the members of the growing middle classes in England. The middle class Victorians who were rapidly gaining political power were suspicious of aristocratic influence exercised through jobbery, and they admired the open professions to which a person could enter by his own efforts.[5] The effect of the Report was so great that a Committee was appointed, headed by T. B. Macaulay, Trevelyan's brother in law, to work out regulations for the competitive entry into the Indian Civil Service. In 1855, when the agitation for administrative reform in England was at its zenith, a Commission was set up, by Order in Council, to examine the candidates for the Civil Service. The features of the higher Civil Service which are known to us today, particularly the higher standard and the wide range of subjects demanded by the examination, developed in the Indian Civil Service, and its competition resulted in the creation of a 'new profession'. The effect of this change was felt in Ceylon, and in 1856 an important change was effected in the method of recruitment; the Haileybury examination was scrapped and a competitive examination held by the Civil Service Commissioners was established instead. The intended purpose of the examination was to attract University graduates of high quality, and the men who vigorously supported this change in England had been brought up in the tradition of 'strenuous academic competition which had been coming into fashion at Oxford and Cambridge since the beginning of the century'.[6]

In Ceylon, up to 1854, recruitment was on the basis of the Haileybury Entrance Examination which was based on public school standards. The students had gone to Haileybury from schools where they had been treated as boys. They went there just before completing their general education.[7] A candidate was expected to stay two years at the College at Haileybury. But Haileybury did not possess the social and educational advantages of a University, and it also could not provide any instruction in law. Yet, the community of tastes and interests, the common tradition, and the knowledge of the habits

4. Symonds, Richard, op. cit., p. 102.

5. Fabian Group. The Administrator. *The Reform of the Civil Service*. London, 1964, p. 2.

6. Reader, W. J. *Professional Men. The Rise of the Professional Classes in the Nineteenth Century England* (London. 1966, p. 86).

7. Lowell, A. L. *Colonial Civil Service*. (London. 1900, p. 13).

and the character of contemporaries which were the results of common collegiate life at Haileybury were of great importance in shaping the characters of the members of the Civil Service. In fact, the advantage which the Haileybury education offered in contrast to those of an University led Salisbury to remark, in a letter to the Governor-General of India, that 'the eulogies which

> the older civilians bestow upon the Haileybury education depend, no doubt, in some degree upon a feeling which the Universities may not be able to so completely to satisfy. The close friendship formed there, which softened the rivalries of after life, and secured devoted instead perfunctory cooperation in those who were, far apart, working together for the same cause, were an important advantage of that education. The Universities being many, and each containing many colleges, will not necessarily bring the future civilian into the same close daily contact.[8]

The assumption that what was needed in a service which had to deal with backward peoples was not so much brains as personality and character led to the adoption of the Haileybury system of recruitment. Moreover, it was this system of education which allowed the selection of men with both personality and character, who could earn the respect and trust of indigenous peoples.[9] On the other hand, the East India Company's interference in the affairs of the Haileybury system prevented it from maintaining a high standard of instruction, and the college also suffered from the immediate defect of having the Directors of the Company as the governors of an institution which was the gateway to a lucrative career. A change in this system of recruitment was advocated in order to get men of more than average intellectual ability. The direct recruitment of University men for superior positions in the service, though it became a subject for public debate, was adopted because it was realised that superior intellectual attainments of Oxbridge allrounders would produce a class of professional administrators. The direct recruitment of University graduates in preference to just school-leavers was certainly a step in the right direction.

Before the replacement of the Haileybury system by the competitive examination, the local candidates for the Civil Service were not recruited by an examination. In fact, they were not appointed entirely on the basis of the nomination by the Governor.[10] The Governor maintained the right of nomination even after the introduction of competition and in 1863 his nominees were made to sit for a non-competitive examination, the purpose of which was to test their general level of education. All gentlemen who obtained nomination as Writers by the Governor after January, 1863, were required to pass this exami-

8. Civil Service Commission. *Twentieth Report of the Civil Service Commission. London.* HMSO, 1876, pp. vii-viii.

9. Vide Furse, Ralph. (Aucuparius) *Recollections of a Recruiting Officer.* (Oxford, 1962).

10. Collins, Charles. *Public Administration in Ceylon.* (London, 1951, p.)

nation. It included four subjects—1. English Composition, 2. Accounts and Book-keeping, 3. Euclid Book I-IV and Algebra, and 4. Geography. They were also given the option to choose one subject from among a series of subjects; theses sub-branches were (*a*) Languages Greek, Latin, French and German or Sanskrit if they preferred it, (*b*) Modern History—British Colonies and Dependencies including India, (*c*) Elements of Constitutional and International Law, (*d*) Elements of Political Economy, (*e*) Civil Engineering and Surveying.[11] The general standard of proficiency reached at this examination was judged on the basis of fixed marks. Though the examination was limited and non-competitive, the list of subjects did indicate the standard expected. It also indicated the extent to which the recruitment criteria was related to educational attainments.

Though the Governor, Henry Ward (1855-60) viewed the demand for the competitive principle as a threat to the establishment, the climate of opinion changed during the time of Hercules Robinson (1865-72), whose request for an increase in the salaries of the Civil Servants, convinced the Secretary of State that the introduction of a scheme to recruit Ceylonese into the higher services would be economical.[12] This proposal did not receive a warm welcome in the island. Amidst fears and suspicion, expressed both by the Governor and the members of the Executive Council, a scheme was introduced in 1870 to hold examinations simultaneously in Colombo and London. Educated Ceylonese opinion in the country considered this a great triumph; it also represented a landmark in the administrative history of the island. The political effect of the competitive system was tremendous, because the mere opening up of the doors of the Civil Service for the nationals of the country was a great step forward in the direction of political advancement.

Even though identical papers were set for this competitive examination held simultaneously in Colombo and London, the opportunities for Ceylonese to take up the examination were limited. The reason was the absence of opportunities for Ceylonese to obtain an education in a British University. The examination demanded a high educational standard, which could not be obtained with the facilities of education available in the island.[13] The Colombo Academy established by the Government 'after years of inaction and resistance', was the institution which imparted some kind of higher education.[14] This institution, known then as the Queens College, was affiliated to the University of Calcutta, and administered a limited programme of university education by preparing students for London University external degrees. In Ceylon, therefore the

11. Dickman, C. *Ceylon Civil Service Manual*, 1865. (Colombo, 1865) p. 20.
12. Buckingham to Robinson. 17th March, 1868, C[olonial] O[ffice] Despatches Ceylon, Series 55, Vol. 115.
13. Pieris, Ralph. 'Universities, Politics and Public Opinion in Ceylon,' *in Minerva*, (Summer, 1964) p. 436.
14. Ibid., p. 436.

facilities for University education were severely limited. The few University educated young men in the island at this time had graduated from British Universities with scholarships or from Indian Universities. These drawbacks in the sphere of education imposed a severe limitation on the participation of the native candidates in the Civil Service examination. It therefore meant that the mere introduction of the competitive examination failed to bring about a recognisable increase in the number of native aspirants to the Civil Service, and in fact, fewer Ceylonese now entered the service than in the days when they were nominated by the Governor.[15]

A candidate sitting for the examination was required to show a competent knowledge in the following subjects—(*a*) Exercises designed to test handwriting and orthography, (*b*) Arithmetic, including vulgar and decimal fractions, (*c*) Latin—and one of the following languages—Greek, French, Italian and German, (*d*) English Composition including precis writing. The optional subjects, from which two were to be selected by a candidate, included Pure and Mixed Mathematics, Ancient or Modern History and Geography, the Elements of Constitutional and International Law, Political Economy, Geology, Civil Engineering and Surveying.[16] Civil Engineering and Surveying were included in the list of subjects with a view to encouraging men with technical knowledge to enter the ranks of the Civil Service. Since they were optional subjects, very few candidates offered them at the examination.

The age at which a candidate could seek entrance into the service was between 20 and 23; this age qualification also imposed a limitation on the entry of Ceylonese candidates. It was widely accepted that with the limited educational facilities a candidate could not reach the required standard at that age. In the nationalist circles of the island, the imposition of this age limit was viewed as an obstacle deliberately introduced by the authorities to prevent the entry of natives into the service.[17] Recruitment at a younger age was desired as a means of getting young men from England to serve in the tropics where conditions were hard. Many, if not all, of the British Civil Servants served in the island for more than twenty years; for some of them the island became a permanent home. Therefore the argument that tropical conditions demanded recruitment at an early age could not be supported. However, the age requirements imposed too helped to perpetuate the British monopoly of the Civil Service.

When the decision was taken in 1880 to hold the examination in London only, the hopes which the 'simultaneous system' created in the minds of the educated Ceylonese young men, suddenly vanished. With this change, the Governor's power of nomination too disappeared, which could be interpreted as

15. *Fifteenth Report of the Civil Service Commission*, pp. 85-86.
16. Jeffries, Charles. *The Colonial Empire and its Civil Service*. (London, 1938), p. 27.
17. Symonds, Richard. op. cit., p. 103.

another blow to local aspirants. Throughout the previous decade a great preparation had been made by the educational institutions to train the educated young to qualify for the examination. Now the London examination required the candidate to be present in London, creating yet another obstacle to Ceylonese entry into the service. Moreover, the demand was made that Ceylonese should study in an English University to sit for the examination.[18] Only a few persons from the new middle class and the well-to-do families could afford the luxury of going to an English University. This move to hold the examination in London was certainly a discriminatory measure imposed against the Ceylonese candidate, and opinion in Ceylon therefore interpreted the abolition of the 'simultaneous system' as a means to discourage the participation of Ceylonese in the examination. The authorities therefore had to advance reasons to justify this change in the venue of the examination, and Sir James Longden, who was then the Governor, emphatically stated that 'it was impossible for any young man without leaving the island to shake himself so free of local ties and local feelings of caste prejudices and insular narrowness as to acquire any independence of thought.'[19] He further maintained that this was not part of a conscious policy to prevent the admission of Ceylonese into the Civil Service. In his point of view, the public school system in the island, despite its Classics-History-Mathematics oriented curriculum, was not developed enough to train young men for a career in the Civil Service, and moreover, these institutions, according to him, lacked the moral, physical and social training of an English public school or University. 'Even in mere matters of instruction', he wrote, 'he must be at a disadvantage. The high schools and colleges of this island cannot be put on par with high schools in the United Kingdom, and they are hardly equal.'[20] Longden supported the abolition of the Colombo examination on the ground that it might have resulted in the 'admission of gentlemen who may perhaps cram sufficient superficial knowledge to pass successfully an examination'.[21]

The aim of this change therefore had been to attract young men of high ability from England. As far back as 1874, the Vice Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, George Phear, in a letter to the Marquis of Salisbury, the Secretary of State for India, remarked that the 'Service (here the reference is to the ICS) would be greatly benefitted if the successful candidates could enjoy the moral and mental training afforded by University residence'.[22] The general opinion current at this period was that a Civil Service candidate must get himself associated with a British University. When it was decided to hold the examination in London, it was expected that Ceylonese candidates would make an

18. Saparamadu, S. D. ed. Leonard Woolf's *Diaries in Ceylon* 1908-1911. (Colombo, 1962) p. xv.
19. Longden to Kimberly. 15th October, 1880. C.O 54/528.
20. Ibid.
21. Ibid.
22. Vide Correspondence in *15th Report of the Civil Service Commission*, p. 475.

effort to enter a British University. It also would compel them to come to London; mere association with the metropolis, they thought, would give them the necessary moral and intellectual training. A trip to London to take the examination surely gave the Service a prestige and the selected candidate a status back at home. Most candidates, if entrance was sought, would probably go to Oxford and Cambridge. A few would like to go to Kings College or to University College, London. It was also during this period that the Oxbridge combination was trying to organise courses to fit into the demands of the Indian Civil Service Examination.[23] Jowett, supporting University training for Civil Service aspirants, wrote that 'they would be cared for than at present; they would have the pleasure and advantage of mingling with their contemporaries in any rank of life; they would have college recollections and interests, and the opportunity of forming friends and connections'.[24] The headmasters of public schools, while stating that the system then in existence was too favourable to the crammers, supported University training for Civil Service aspirants. The move to hold the examination in London was partly motivated by the desire to maintain a high standard of moral and intellectual quality in the Service.

Before discussing the effect of competition on the native entry into the Service, some information about Ceylonese in the Service may well be added. Though it was thought that the competitive system would open the doors of the service to the natives, their entry depended entirely on their educational attainments. The provision for educational opportunities therefore attracted priority, but the developments in education were too slow to produce results. Consequently, there were few Ceylonese with an adequate knowledge of English and so few who could obtain places in the Civil Service. In 1844 the first two were appointed. Fredrick Livera, who had obtained his education in India, and Casie Chetty.[25]

Of the five Ceylonese who were admitted into the Service in 1845 and 1846, three had served as district judges, one was promoted from the clerical service, and the other entered from the ranks of the Public Works Department. Since the early period of British rule in the island, it had been their avowed policy to encourage natives to specialise in judicial work. Therefore, many Ceylonese who obtained admission into the higher rungs of the public service were liberally allocated to judicial posts, which prevented them from getting any revenue posts. In the period around 1870 all the Ceylonese in the Civil Service were serving as judicial officers, for example, David Ernest de Saram as

23. Jowett's letter to Marquis of Salisbury in the 15th Report, op. cit. pp. 477-478.
24. Ibid., pp. 477-478.
25. Casie Chetty was first appointed a member of the Legislative Council. It was the practice to appoint public servants to fill positions as unofficial members in the Legislative Council. In 1844 the Secretary of State disapproved of the principle of appointing public servants as Councillors, and subsequently Casie Chetty was appointed a member of the Civil Service. He was the author of the first Gazatteer of Ceylon. Vide Toussaint, J. R. *Annals of the Ceylon Civil Service.* (Colombo, 1935).

Acting District Judge at Kurunegala, and Christofel Henricus de Saram as Commissioner of Courts of Requests and Police Magistrate at Galle. The usual practice when a Ceylonese acquired sufficient seniority and showed promise to qualify himself for a higher position of responsibility was to post him to a judicial post where he served till his retirement. Sir Ponnambalam Arunachalam, who entered the service in 1878, and served with efficiency and loyalty to the Colonial Government, was never given a vital post in the administration. Though he was sufficiently senior to be a Government Agent, he was 'instead appointed to the comparatively powerless post of Registrar General'.[26] In this respect, the career of Paul E. Pieris who joined the Civil Service in 1896 represents the best example.

Paul E. Pieris (*September* 1907—£700)

Cadet	1896	Appointed by the Secretary of State.
	1896	Attached to the Puttalam Kachcheri.
	1897	Jaffna Kachcheri.
	1898	Office Assistant to Government Agent, Colombo.
Class V	1899	Acting Assistant Government Agent, Puttalam.
	1899	Police Magistrate, Puttalam.
	1899	Acting District Judge, Ratnapura.
	1901	Office Assistant to Government Agent, Galle.
Class IV	1903	Acting District Judge, Matara.
	1903	Extra Office Assistant to Government Agent, Western Province.
Class III	1904	District Judge, Kegalle.
	1906	District Judge, Kalutara.
	1925	District Judge, Kandy.

This shows that Pieris, until his retirement from the service, was engaged in judicial work.[27] Thus, for a considerable period, the vital posts in the administration were denied to Ceylonese members of the Civil Service. Though Civil Servants were not allowed to enjoy the highest plums of the Civil Service, they were not discouraged in entering the Service.

The movement for Ceylonisation of the Civil Service became increasingly important after the introduction of the competitive system. In 1883, a Committee of the Legislative Council reported that 'if Ceylon is to be administered on a more economical basis, it can only be by the more extended employment of natives'.[28] The official members of the Council viewed the proposal for native entry into the Civil Service with favour purely on the grounds of economy. Before any action was contemplated on this recommendation, a deputation

26. Saparamadu, S. D. ed. op. cit., p. xviii.
27. Vide, *Ceylon Civil List*, 1907.
28. *Reclassification of the Ceylon Civil Service*. Ceylon Sessional Paper xxvii of 1897, p. 13, hereafter S.P. XXVII.

from the Ceylon National Association called on Governor Gordon and asked for greater representation of Ceylonese in the Civil Service. Gordon, who was dissatisfied with the existing form of native entry into the Civil Service was himself interested in Civil Service reform.[29] He was the first, from the official ranks, to express the viewpoint that the examination held in London was the chief obstacle to Ceylonese entry. In 1890, he proposed that in order to facilitate Ceylonese entry into the Civil Service the examination should be held simultaneously in Ceylon and London. Gordon's proposals, though receiving nationalist approval, failed to invite immediate response from the Colonial Office. The policy of the latter was undoubtedly to encourage Ceylonese participation in the administration, but it lacked that enthusiastic approach which should normally accompany a progressive policy of this nature; however, the Secretary of State proposed the appointment of natives as Office Assistants and Magistrates 'at the larger stations where they would receive the guidance of higher European officers'.[30] A subordinate division in the Civil Service, they thought, would satisfy the nationalist aspirations of the Ceylonese. The subordinate division, which was called the 'local division' of the Ceylon Civil Service was therefore created in 1891 to accommodate the Ceylonese. It was created by combining twenty one offices of the Civil Service and forty five offices in the Clerical Service, and contained fifteen posts in all. This division, far from being a solution, created doubts as to its suitability even in official circles, and its inadequacies therefore led Sir Arthur Havelock to remark that 'I have little faith that the scheme will for any length of time continue to fulfill one of its objects, namely, to satisfy the aspirations of the Ceylonese'.[31] It was evident in the subsequent years that mere creation of an inferior division in the service failed to satisfy the legitimate demand of the Ceylonese for greater representation in the Civil Service.

The new appointees were recruited by competition from among the candidates nominated by the Governor. The Civil Service was then classified into four Classes, excluding the subordinate division. There was also a Class of Staff appointments, into which the post of Colonial Secretary belonged.[32] Class 1 of the service, the higher salary point of which was 1,800 rupees, included the Auditor General, Treasurer, seven Government Agents, the Collector of Customs, Post Master General, two District Judges and the Assistant Colonial Secretary; Class II included three Government Agents (of the under-developed provinces, North Central province, Uva and Sabaragamuwa) three Assistant Government Agents, four District Judges, Registrar General, Director of Public Instruction, Inspector General of Police, Inspector General of Prisons, and the

29. Chapman, J. K. *The Career of Arthur Hamilton Gordon*, 1829-1912, (Toronto, 1964), p. 329.
30. Vide, S.P. XXVII.
31. Ibid.
32. Ibid.

Post Master, Colombo—the higher salary of this class was fixed at 10,800 rupees; Class III was composed of 19 Civil Servants, and included 9 Assistant Government Agents, 5 District Judges and two Police Magistrates, and the highest salary was fixed at 7,200 rupees; Class IV comprised 16, which number included 5 Office Assistants, 8 Police Magistrates and two others, and the highest salary was fixed at 4,500 rupees.[33] Practically all the important situations of the administration of the island, on the basis of the classification, were exclusively in the hands of Europeans. The 'subordinate division', which consisted of 4 Office Assistants, 7 Police Magistrates, 2 Landing Surveyors and two others, was open to British subjects born in Ceylon whose families were permanently resident in Ceylon.[34] It was true that this broad definition of British subjects included Ceylonese, but the positions were filled by the members of the local European community and the Burghers. A few from the indigenous communities also found entrance into the division. Even on the basis of the revised classification, this division carried only 15 posts, to which there was an army of aspirants in the subordinate clerical services.[35] The candidates for this division were required to possess a pass at the Cambridge Senior Examination or the London Matriculation. There were very few promotions from this division to another class of the service, and a claim for promotion was possible only on the basis of an evaluation of the candidate's fitness. Members of the division were aware of its inferior status.

> 'The badge of inferiority affixed to the Ceylonese', wrote Governor Ridgeway, 'is far more distasteful than any difference of pay, which can be defended without any imputation of social or official inferiority'.[36]

Since the members of the subordinate division suffered from a feeling of inferior status, their output will have been completely less, because successful performance rested in part on the satisfaction of the members. Ridgeway possessed the administrative vision to observe this feature, which in his point of view, was not in the interest of the performance of the total service. But his efforts to bring about an amalgamation of the two divisions did not reach fruition till 1920. The politically tense period which followed the 1915 riots was partly, if not wholly, responsible for whatever changes that came to be introduced subsequently in the public services of the country.

The Subordinate Service was reviewed in 1920, and it was found that the main difficulties of the existing Civil Service organisation were (1) the system of classification, (2) the poor prospects of promotion, and (3) the failure to

33. *Vide, S.P. XXVII.*
34. Braibanti, Ralph. *Asian Bureaucratic Systems Emergent from the British Imperial Tradition.* (Commonwealth Studies Centre, 1966) p. 464. Duke University, [North Carolina, U.S.A.]
35. *Vide S.P. XXVII.*
36. Ibid., p. 24.

attract natives of the country. It was discovered that the classification was not in the interest of efficient performance by any officer. The pay was attached to the post and not to the officer, and this affected the movability of officers. Accordingly, it was proposed that the pay should be attached to the officer, so that whenever an officer moved, he could carry his pay with him.[37] When a person was allowed to stay in a post for nearly twenty years there was apt to develop apathy and indifference. It was felt that a classification of the service with more opportunities for Ceylonese talent would be economical as well as efficient. The major alteration made in the scheme was the addition of two judicial posts to the First Class, with a view to encouraging the officers holding judicial appointments to remain in the service. It also offered opportunities for Ceylonese Civil Servants who occupied judicial posts to enter Class I of the Service. Frequent transfers from judicial to administrative posts disturbed the concentration of talent in one branch; the move to assign posts in the Class I to judicial officers was to help to preserve the talent in the same branch.

The smallness of the Ceylon Civil Service and the difficulties in holding three different examinations for the prospective Civil Servants of Ceylon, Hongkong, and Malay Straits Settlements, led to the creation of the Eastern Cadetships in 1896.[38] As the vacancies available for the Eastern Cadetships were limited to a number between 2 and 8, the attraction of able candidates too was restricted. The arrangement that limited the attraction of able candidates itself led to the amalgamation of the examinations for the Indian Civil Service, the Home Civil Service and the Eastern Cadetships. The recruitment procedure of the Indian Civil Service, revised in 1882, influenced the new development of the whole structure of the Civil Service in the empire. The syllabi of the respective examinations were standardised. On the basis of this competitive examination, administered by the Civil Service Commission in London, candidates were given the option of choosing one of the services.[39] Though the successful candidates were allowed to indicate their preference, the final allocation was decided by the Secretary of State upon a consideration of all circumstances (including the wishes of the candidates) and the requirements of the public service ranked in importance before any other consideration. The candidates were asked to declare their preference immediately after the announce-

37. Vide Governor's Address to the Legislative Council, October 26, 1896.

38. Civil Service Commission. Open Competition for Civil Service of India, Home Civil Service and Eastern Cadetships. London. HMSO, 1898, p. 12.

39. In 1899 the number of selected candidates at the Eastern Cadetships Examination was 23, out of which three were for the Ceylon Civil Service, two for Hongkong, six to the Straits Settlements, and twelve to the Malay States.

ment of the results of the examination. Most of the candidates, except those who aspired to get into the Home Civil Service, aimed at the Civil Service of India..

> 'I missed India by 25 marks out of 5,000', wrote Sir Henry Monck-Mason Moore, who later became the first Governor-General of Independent Ceylon, 'but obtained an Eastern Cadetship in Ceylon instead. I have never regretted my good fortune in going to Ceylon instead of India in the light of subsequent events'.[40]

Normally the candidates with higher marks in the examination took the Home Civil Service, India was always the second choice, and Eastern Cadetship the third.[41] Candidates with stable private sources of income chose the Home Civil Service, while those without private means went to India. The Eastern Cadetships, which included Ceylon, Hongkong and Malaya were left to those who had no choice, and among them the general order of preference was Ceylon, Hongkong and Malaya. Following the Indian example, the candidates who sought entrance into the service of these three countries were to be given a training in the laws, customs and language of those territories. Initially this was the position, but it was later abolished and Civil Servants were sent out to Ceylon without prior training as to the nature of the work which they were expected to do. The philosophy of in-service training was supreme, both in England and throughout the Colonial Empire. Therefore the Cadets were required to learn all rigours of administration on the job. 'They were shipped to their colonies', writes Stace, 'to begin work immediately after examination. How could these people learn the principles of Government? They would learn them on the job'.[42] Candidates for Ceylon Cadetships, according to the requirements, must be natural-born British subjects of European or Asiatic descent, whereas the candidates for Malay and Hongkong Cadetships were required to be natural-born British subjects of European descent.[43] In respect of the age requirements, there was a difference between the Indian Civil Service and the Eastern Cadetships; the age limit was between 21 and 23 in the case of candidates for the Indian Civil Service, and it was between 21 and 24 in the case of Eastern Cadetships.

The open competitive examination was conducted in 33 subjects, and the candidate could select at his pleasure any of these up to a certain total of marks. The list of subjects included Modern Languages, Mathematics, Natural *Science, History, Philosophy, Politics, Law and Classics. A candidate whose*

40. Kulugalle, H. A. J. *British Governors of Ceylon.* (Colombo, 1963) p. 210.
41. Furse, Ralph. op. cit., p. 207.
42. Stace, W. T. 'British Colonialism', in *Yale Review*, Vol. 43, 1954, p. 375.
43. Civil Service Commission, Concurrent Open Competitive Examination for Civil Service of India, Home Civil Service, and Eastern Cadetships, 1910. London. HMSO, 1910, p. 7.

speciality was in a certain field could offer three or four from the category of subjects. For instance, a candidate could select any number, not exceeding four from the group of Natural Science subjects. The choice of the number of subjects from this heavy list was entirely at the discretion of the candidate, but the marks that could be obtained from the subjects chosen was limited to 6,000. Marks for various subjects were allocated on the basis of certain weightage, for instance Mathematics carried 1,200, Modern Language 600 each, Natural Science 600, Greek History 500, Roman History 500, Philosophy 600, Politics 500, and English History 400. The general classification of subjects was directly related again to Classics, Natural Science, History and Mathematics; the Cambridge and Oxford domination in the service was perhaps due to this, which was inevitable because the competition was designed to draw University graduates. It was said that there was a movement after Macaulay's epoch-making reforms to bring the Oxford and Cambridge men into the service for prestige reasons. It was equally undesirable that the scheme, as it stood, favoured the Oxford course of education rather than that pursued in Cambridge, especially in respect of the number of subjects falling within the candidate's range of study.[44]

The Civil Service Commission adopted the 'weightage scheme', according to which different weightages were given to different subjects. They wanted to give every candidate whose speciality was in a particular discipline an equal chance at the examination, and thereby attract University educated men with higher intellectual attainments.[45] It is that a Classics man always combined his speciality with Logic and Psychology, Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy, and Roman Law. Nearly half the number of candidates offered General and Modern History and Political Science.[46] It is also said that Political Science was offered in order to count towards one's general knowledge.[47] A closer perusal of the Political Science papers of the examination proves the point that they were definitely above the standard of general knowledge. Nearly one-third of the candidates offered Political Economy and Economic History. In the areas of Natural Science and Mathematics, only about five candidates were suc-

44. Civil Service Commission. 48th Report of the Civil Service Commission, 1904. London, HMSO, 1904, p. 39.

45. The Civil Service Commissioners accepted the suggestions of Cambridge with regard to Mathematics and Natural Science, and those of Oxford with regard to Classics, Philosophy, History, and therefore Oxford men were certain to succeed at the competition. The Cambridge graduates found the sure road to success in Mathematical subjects; Mathematics carried 1,800 marks—both Pure and Advanced Maths. Therefore Mathematics men also could succeed at the examination.

46. For the purpose of analysing the intellectual background of the Civil Servants who went to Ceylon after the introduction of Eastern Cadetships, 50 of them were chosen. The years in which they went to Ceylon covered a period of 25 years; the period being 1898-1923. It must be noted that annual intake to the Ceylon Service was 2 or 3. All the 50 recruits successfully offered English Compósition; 29 of them offered English. Less than half of the 50 offered Classics. Marks lists in the Civil Service Commission Reports were perused to obtain the information.

47. Lowell, A. L. op. cit., p. 36.

cessful. A good number of candidates offered English History I, but many of them took up English History II in which the questions were based on constitutional matters.

But it could not be denied that the subjects were sufficient to test the general level of education of a candidate. The criteria with which the intellectual calibre of a person was measured was in terms of his knowledge in the Literary Humanities, Mathematics or Modern History. 'We are of opinion', wrote the Commissioners, ' a candidate ought to be allowed no credit at all for taking up a subject in which he is a more smatterer. Profound and accurate acquaintance with a single language ought to tell more than bad translations and themes in six languages. A single paper which shows that the writer thoroughly understands the principles of the differential calculus ought to tell more than twenty superficial and incorrect answers to questions about Chemistry, Botany, Mineralogy, Metaphysics, Logic and English History'.[48] Thus it was clear that a high standard in the subjects offered was stressed. The results of the examination were more or less on the following pattern. A candidate, irrespective of his specialised field, was able to pass the examination because the balanced weightage of subjects. A candidate who possessed a thorough grounding in Mathematics and Classics was certain of success, while a Classical scholar was certain of success if he was well read in the history or the literature of his own country. A person who had scarcely any knowledge of Mathematics, little Latin and no Greek, was able to pass the examination with Modern Languages and Natural Science. Many, if not all who offered Mathematics and Classics were successful at the examination.

The general concentration of subjects was thus in the areas of Classics, Political Science, Political Economy, Economic History and Philosophy. It could be conveniently argued that a large number of Civil Servants who went to Ceylon obtained their education in Classics and Philosophy, they also possessed a knowledge of Political Science, Economic History and General Modern History. Most of the candidates crammed the subjects which were outside their main subject in order to be successful at the examination, however, so it could not be argued that they had a thorough grounding in them. The subsequent activity in the study of native culture, religion, folk lore, customs and languages could be attributed to their training in literary humanities.[49] The lack of interest in the study of anything, for instance Mineralogy, Soils and etc., related to the development of the country, could be adduced to the paucity of knowledge in

48. *Twentieth Report of the Civil Service Commission.* (London. HMSO), p. 496.
49. Vide Braibanti, Ralph. op. cit. for a list of those Civil Servants who pioneered such studies.

Natural Science and similar subjects. For instance, the study of the ancient irrigation works, and birds in Ceylon came from the members of the professional services.[50]

In most cases, the choice of subjects was unrelated to the tasks which the recruit to the Civil Service was required to perform in the country to which he was allocated. 'It will be observed that none of these subjects,' wrote Lawrence Lowell, 'has any direct bearing upon the work. They are all tests of general education; that is of candidate's knowledge of general subjects.'[51] The examination was certainly stiff, and demanded a high intellectual ability. 'The examination was so stiff,' writes Walter Stace, 'that none below the highest grade of University honours men, or men of equivalent intellectual calibre, could hope to be selected.'[52] Ralph Furse, who for several decades was involved in the recruitment of the Colonial Service, made the comment that 'they wrote beautiful despatches and spoke the same language as the Home Civil Service, with whom I sometimes thought they shared that rather dangerous attribute, a sense of intellectual superiority.'[53] The service was thus composed of men of high intellectual standing. This was certainly an asset. The only disadvantage was the development of a brahaminical attitude towards their colleagues in the professional services in the Colony.[54]

The requirements of the examination also did not demand that a candidate must possess a special knowledge of political theory, of government or of any subject which could have direct relevance to his future career. Though Political Science was included in the list of subjects for the examination, it was not a compulsory subject. A candidate could sit for Political Science if he wanted to. Since the subjects were not equally weighted, both Classics and Mathematics, as said before, counted four times more than political science and economics. It was perhaps due to the established view that a good grounding in literary humanities would produce the 'gentlemen administrator,' and it was this academic background which gave birth to the concept of the 'generalist administrator.' Most of these 'guardians' began their careers as administrators of men without any knowledge of the art or the science of government. Some Civil Servants, who had passed this stiff competition, had occasion to complain that the examination was totally unrelated to the work which they were expected

50. As in Malaya and India, the professional services of Ceylon too contributed largely to the limited development that took place in the island. In India, the Indian Forestry Service alone did a great deal.
51. Lowell, Lawrence, op. cit., p. 36.
52. Stace, Walter, op. cit., p. 372.
53. Furse, Ralph. op. cit. p. 206.
54. Ibid., p. 207.

to do. 'I could find nothing about them,' writes Stace, 'in Shelley or the books on the Absolute. I learned the hard way, picking up tiny crumbs of knowledge here and there. But one did, of course, learn in the end.'[55]

The introduction of the competitive examination marked the beginning of an era in the recruitment to the Civil Service. In the case of Ceylon it immediately brought to an end the Haileybury system of recruitment based on patronage, and thereby raised the academic standard and the general quality of the members of the Service. The 'simultaneous system' introduced in 1870, though it satisfied the wishes of the educated minority, failed to attract many Ceylonese into the Service. Unavailability of educational facilities, the low age requirements which it imposed, and the high standard of the examination were contributory factors. The other obstacle to the entry of Ceylonese into the service came with the abolition of the Ceylon examination in 1880. A few Ceylonese entered the service, but they were all given judicial assignments, and thereby were prevented from playing an active role in the administration. The subordinate division was created to satisfy the growing nationalist sentiments, and it, far from being a means of increasing Ceylonese participation, created a class in the Service with an 'inferior status.' The institution of the Eastern Cadetships with an examination based on University training unrelated to administrative tasks, raised the intellectual quality of the Service, but made it more difficult for Ceylonese to enter the Service.

55. Stace, Walter, op. cit., p. 376.

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE PUBLISHED WRITINGS OF SENERAT PARANAVITANA, 1924-1970

H. A. I. GOONETILEKE

The opportunity afforded by the editors of *The Ceylon Journal of Historical and Social Studies* of including a bibliography of Professor Senerat Paranavitana's published writings in English has been gratefully availed of by the compiler to revise and bring up to date the bibliography which was published in the *Paranavitana Felicitation Volume* in 1965. This contained contributions only up to the end of 1963. This publication by its very nature had only a limited circulation, and the demand for a more accessible bibliography of Professor Paranavitana's works has been increasingly felt. A few items overlooked in that compilation have now been incorporated, and the work of the last seven years added. It comprises books, articles, reviews and edited works, but newspaper articles have been excluded. As is the usual convention in bibliographies of this kind the writings are arranged in chronological order, and alphabetically by title within each year. There is an alphabetical index of titles at the end to facilitate reference.

The resulting bibliography, running to 292 entries, can now fairly claim to be as complete an inventory of the writings, in forty seven prodigious years, of perhaps the most remarkable, industrious and versatile scholar who has graced the world of learning in Ceylon. The compiler hopes that students of Ceylon history, archaeology, epigraphy and the fine arts in particular, and all those interested in the fascinating evolution of culture and society in ancient and mediaeval Ceylon will find this guide useful.

THE BIBLIOGRAPHY

Guide to Abbreviations

A.B.I.A.	—	Annual Bibliography of Indian Archaeology (Leiden).
A.S.C.A.R.	—	Archaeological Survey of Ceylon. Annual Report.
A.A.	—	Artibus Asiae (Ascona, Switzerland).
Buddhist	—	Buddhist. Organ of the Colombo Young Men's Buddhist Association.
C.A.L.R.	—	Ceylon Antiquary and Literary Register (Colombo).

C.H.J. — Ceylon Historical Journal (Colombo).
C.J.H.S.S. — Ceylon Journal of Historical and Social Studies (Peradeniya).
C.J.S.(G.) — Ceylon Journal of Science (Section G.).
C.L.R. — Ceylon Literary Register (3rd series).
C.T. — Ceylon Today.
E.I. — Epigraphia Indica.
E.Z. — Epigraphia Zeylanica (Colombo).
J.G.I.S. — Journal of the Greater India Society (Calcutta).
Mahā Bodhi — Journal of the Mahā Bodhi Society (Calcutta).
J.R.A.S.(C.B.) — Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (Ceylon Branch).
U.C.R. — University of Ceylon Review (Peradeniya).

1924

1. The Cholas and Ceylon. *C.A.L.R.* Vol. 10, Pt. 2, October 1924, pp. 114-121.

1926

2. Polonnaruwa inscription of Vijayabahu I. *E.I.* Vol. 18, Pts. 7 and 8, July–October 1926, pp. 330-338, 1 plate.

1927

3. *Annual Reports on South Indian Epigraphy for the years ending 31 March, 1925 and 31 March, 1926* by G. Venkata Rao [Review]. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)* Vol. 30, No. 80, 1927, pp. 461-463.
4. Gaja Bahu I and Mahallaka Nāga—their relationship. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 30, No. 80, 1927, pp. 452-454.

1928

5. Epigraphical summary. *C.J.S.(G.)*. Vol. 1, Pt. 4, February 1928, pp. 165-173.
6. Epigraphical summary. *C.J.S.(G.)*, Vol. 2, Pt. 1, December 1928, pp. 17-29.
7. Mahayanism in Ceylon. *C.J.S.(G.)*, Vol. 2, Pt. 1, December 1928, pp. 35-71, 5 plates. (For abstract *see* No. 236).

1929

8. Badulla pillar-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Pt. 2, 1929, No. 4, pp. 71-100.
9. Mannar Kacceri pillar-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Pt. 2, 1929, No. 5, pp. 100-113.
10. Pre-Buddhist religious beliefs in Ceylon. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 31, No. 82, 1929, pp. 302-328.
11. Three Chola invasions of Ceylon not recorded in the *Mahāvaṃsa*. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 31, No. 82, 1929, pp. 384-387.

1930

12. The Capital of Ceylon during the ninth and tenth centuries. *C.J.S.(G.)*. Vol. 2, Pt. 2, August 1930, pp. 141-147.
13. Dolmen at Padiyagampola near Rambukkana. *C.J.S.(G.)*. Vol. 2, Pt. 2, August 1930, pp. 96-97, 2 plates.
14. Epigraphical summary. *C.J.S.(G.)*. Vol. 2, Pt. 2, August 1930, pp. 99-128.
15. The Excavations in the Citadel at Anurādhapura. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 31, No. 83, 1930, pp. 471-485.
16. A Fragmentary inscription on a pillar discovered near Jaffna Road, Anurādhapura. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Pt. 3, 1930, No. 8, pp. 126-131.
17. Giritalē pillar-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Pt. 3, 1930, No. 10, pp. 138-148.
18. An Inscription of Niśśaṁka Malla, found near the Vān-Āla, Polonnaruva. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Pt. 3, 1930, No. 11, pp. 149-152.

19. Inscriptions on the stone canoe within the Citadel, Anurādhapura. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Pt. 3, 1930, No. 9, pp. 131-137.
20. Kuccavēli rock-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Pt. 3, 1930, No. 13, pp. 158-161.
21. A Note on the 'Abhayagiri' copper-plate inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Pt. 3, 1930, No. 16, pp. 169-171.
22. Prehistoric site known as Kuraṅgupadai-eduttu-vembu in Batticaloa district. *C.J.S.* (*G.*). Vol. 2, Pt. 2, August 1930, pp. 94-95, 1 plate.
23. Rock-inscription at Pahala Kayināṭṭama. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Pt. 3, 1930, No. 14, p. 162.
24. Ruvanvälisäya pillar-inscription of the reign of Buddhadāsa (388-416 A.D.). *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Pt. 3, 1930, No. 7, pp. 120-126.
25. Thūpārāma slab-inscription of Gajabāhu I. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Pt. 3, 1930, No. 6, pp. 114-119.
26. Two rock-inscriptions at Vihāregala. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Pt. 3, 1930, No. 15, pp. 163-169.
27. Two rock-inscriptions of Bhātika Abhaya and Mahānaga at Mōlāhiṭiyavelēgala. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Pt. 3, 1930, No. 12, pp. 153-157.

1931

28. Buddhist festivals in Ceylon. *Buddhistic Studies*; ed. by B. C. Law. Calcutta, Thacker, Spink, 1931, Ch. 17, pp. 529-546. (For reprint in French translation, *see* No. 169).
29. Gāraṇḍigala rock-inscription of Kassapa III. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Pt. 4, 1931, No. 19, pp. 195-199.
30. Goddess Maṇimekhalā. *C.L.R.* Vol. 1, No. 1, January 1931, pp. 37-38.
31. Iṅdikatusäya copper plaques. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Pt. 4, 1931, No. 20, pp. 199-212.
32. Kataragama inscriptions. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Pt. 4, 1931, No. 21, pp. 212-225.
33. Temple regulations, about A.D. 1300 (Translation and notes). *The Temple of the Tooth in Kandy*; by A. M. Hocart. (Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of Ceylon—Vol. IV) London, 1931, pp. 34-37.
34. Tōnigala rock-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Pt. 4, 1931, No. 17, pp. 172-188.
35. Two inscriptions from Eppāvala. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Pt. 4, 1931, No. 18, pp. 188-194.
36. Village communities of Ceylon. *C.L.R.* Vol. 1, No. 2, February 1931, pp. 49-53.

1932

37. Archaeological summary, 1932. *J.R.A.S.*(*C.B.*). Vol. 32, No. 85, 1932, pp. 141-144.
38. Colombo Museum pillar-inscription of Kassapa IV. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Pt. 5, 1932, No. 28, pp. 270-277.
39. Dādigama slab-inscription of Bhuvaneka Bahu VI. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Pt. 5, 1932, No. 29, pp. 278-286.
40. A Fragmentary slab-inscription found at the 'Buddhist railing', Anuradhapura. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Pt. 5, 1932, No. 22, pp. 226-229.
41. Kaḷudiyapokuṇa inscriptions. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Pt. 5, 1932, No. 27, pp. 253-269.
42. Pillar-inscription of Bhuvanaikabāhu Mahapā from Anurādhapura. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Pt. 5, 1932, No. 30, pp. 286-288.
43. Rādaraksa or Rāmaraksa? *C.L.R.* Vol. 2, No. 1, Jan. 1932, p. 46.
44. Religious intercourse between Ceylon and Siam in the 13th-15th centuries. *J.R.A.S.* (*C.B.*). Vol. 32, No. 85, 1932, pp. 190-212.
45. Two rock-inscriptions from Labuāṭabāṅdigala. *E.Z.* Vol.3, Pt. 5, 1932, No. 26, pp. 247-253.

1933

46. Antiquarian remains in Ceylon. *The Surveyor* (*Ceylon*). Vol. 2, No. 2, November 1933, pp. 20-21.
47. Archaeological summary *C.J.S.*(*G.*). Vol. 2, Pt. 3, October 1933, pp. 149-173, 16 plates.
48. Archaeological summary, 1933. *J.R.A.S.*(*C.B.*). Vol. 32, No. 86, 1933, pp. 251-254.
49. *A.S.C.A.R.* 1931-32. 11 p., 8 plates.
50. Devanagala rock-inscription of Parākramabāhu I. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Pt. 6, 1933, No. 34, pp. 312-325.
51. Dimbulāgala frescoes. *Buddhist*. Vol. 4 (new series), No. 5, September 1933, p. 70.

52. *Epigraphia Zeylanica, being lithic and other inscriptions of Ceylon. Vol III* (1928-1933); ed. by S. Paranavitana. London, Published for the Government of Ceylon by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1933. xvi, 358 p., 38 plates.
53. Epigraphical summary. *C.J.S.(G.)*. Vol. 2, Pt. 3, October 1933, pp. 175-228.
54. Excavation and conservation at Polonnaruva. *A.B.I.A.* Vol. 6, 1931, pp. 19-22, 2 plates, 1 plan.
55. Kaṭugaha-Galgē pillar-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Pt. 6, 1933, No. 35, pp. 325-331.
56. Matrilineal descent in the Sinhalese royal family. *C.J.S.(G.)*. Vol. 2, Pt. 3, October 1933, pp. 235-240.
57. The Statue at the Potgul Vehera, Polonnaruva. *C.J.S.(G.)*. Vol. 2, Pt. 3, October 1933, pp. 229-234.
58. The Tamil-inscription on the Galle trilingual slab. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Pt. 6, 1933, No. 36, pp. 331-341.
59. Two inscriptions of Sena I. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Pt. 6, 1933, No. 31, pp. 289-294.
60. Two Tamil pillar-inscriptions from Budumuttāva. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Pt. 6, 1933, No. 33, pp. 302-312.
61. Velmilla slab-inscription of Sena III. *E.Z.* Vol. 3, Pt. 6, 1933, No. 32, pp. 294-302.

1934

62. Archaeological summary 1934. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 33, No. 87, 1934, pp. 4-7.
63. *A.S.C.A.R.* 1933. 20 p., 7 plates.
64. Māda-Ulpota pillar-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 1, 1934, No. 7, pp. 54-58.
65. Medicine and hygiene as practised in ancient Ceylon. *Transactions of the Society of Medical Officers of Health of Ceylon*, Vol. 3, No. 1, July 1934, pp. 75-85. (For reprints *see* Nos. 170 and 179).
66. Poḷonnaruva: Council Chamber pillar-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 1, 1934, No. 5, pp. 34-49.
67. Polonnaruva: pillar-inscription of Mahinda V. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 1, 1934, No. 8, pp. 59-67.
68. Recent epigraphical discoveries in Ceylon. *A.B.I.A.* Vol. 7, 1932, pp. 33-35.
69. Saṁgamu Vihāra rock-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 1, 1934, No. 1, pp. 1-8.
70. Vihāregama pillar-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 1, 1934, No. 6, pp. 50-54.

1935

71. *A.S.C.A.R.* 1934. 23p., 15 plates.
72. Batalagoda-Väva slab-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 2, 1935, No. 10, pp. 73-82.
73. Conservation of the Royal bath at Poḷonnaruva. *A.B.I.A.* Vol. 8, 1933, pp. 25-27, 1 plate.
74. Gadalāḍeṇiya rock-inscription of Dharmmakīrtti Sthavira. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 2, 1935, No. 12, pp. 90-110.
75. The history of Ceylon from the early beginnings to the end of the reign of Mahasena. *Buddhist.* Vol. 6 (new series), No. 5, September 1935, pp. 82-84. (Synopsis of a lecture).
76. Polonnaruva: fragmentary slab-inscription of Sundaramahadevi. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 2. 1935, No. 9, pp. 67-72.
77. Report on a Pali document in Cambodian characters found in the Malvatte Vihare, Kandy. *Second Report of the Ceylon Historical Manuscripts Commission.* (Sessional paper XXI-1935). Appendix IX, pp. 58-61.
78. Two rock-inscriptions at Koṭṭangē. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 2, 1935, No. 11, pp. 82-90.

1936

79. Anurādhapura: slab-inscription of Khudda-Pārinda. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 3, 1936, No. 13, pp. 111-115.
80. Brāhmī inscriptions recently discovered in Ceylon. *A.B.I.A.* Vol. 9, 1934, pp. 18-19.
81. Excavation of the Kaṇṭaka Chetiya at Mihintale. *A.B.I.A.* Vol. 9, 1934, pp. 19-21, 1 plate.
82. *The Excavations in the Citadel of Anurādhapura.* Colombo, Ceylon Government Press, 1936. vi, 38 p., 25 plates, 5 plans. (Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of Ceylon, Vol. 3).

83. Four rock-inscriptions from Vessagiriya at Anurādhapura. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 3, 1936, No. 15, pp. 128-136.
84. Inscriptions on the steps near 'Burrows Pavilion', at Anurādhapura. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 3, 1936, No. 16, pp. 136-141.
85. The Kaliṅga Dynasty of Ceylon. *J.G.I.S.* Vol. 3, No. 1, January 1936, pp. 57-64.
86. Nāgirikanda rock-inscription of Kumāradāsa. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 3, 1936, No. 14, pp. 115-128.
87. Seven Sinhalese inscriptions of the seventh and eighth centuries. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 3, 1936, No. 17, pp. 142-150.
88. Tiriyāy rock-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 3, 1936, No. 18, pp. 151-160.
89. Two Royal titles of the early Sinhalese and the origin of kingship in ancient Ceylon. *J.R.A.S.(G.B.)* July 1936, pp. 443-462.

1937

90. Age of the colossal dagabas. *Buddhist.* Vol. 7 (new series), No. 11, March 1937, pp. 473-476.
91. Epigraphical discoveries in Ceylon during the year 1935. *A.B.I.A.* Vol. 10, 1935, pp. 37-38.
92. Galapāta Vihāra rock-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 4, 1937, No. 25, pp. 196-211.
93. Inscription on a pillar-fragment at the Gonnāva Dēvāle. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 4, 1937, No. 23, pp. 186-191.
94. Malaganē pillar-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt, 4, 1937, No. 22, pp. 180-186.
95. Recent archaeological work in Ceylon. *Indian Art and Letters.* Vol. 11, No. 1, 1937, pp. 24-34, 4 plates.
96. Recent archaeological work in Ceylon. *Mahā Bodhi.* Vol. 45, 1937, pp. 303-317.
97. A Tamil slab-inscription from Pālamōttai. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 4, 1937, No. 24, pp. 191-196.
98. Three rock-inscriptions at Rāssahela. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 4, 1937, No. 20, pp. 169-176.
99. Treatment of animals in ancient Ceylon. *The Animals Magazine* (*London*). Vol. 16, No. 5, May 1937, pp. 108-109, 1 illus.
100. Two rock-inscriptions of Vihāra-Mahā-Dēvi from Magul-Maha Vihāra. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 4, 1937, No. 19, pp. 161-169.
101. Viyaulpata pillar-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 4, 1937, No. 21, pp. 176-180.

1938

102. Anurādhapura, the city. *Buddhist.* Vol. 9 (new series), No. 1, May 1938, pp. 10-12.
103. The Archaeological interest of Ceylon. *Ceylon Tourist and Trade Journal.* Vol. 3, No. 1, April 1938, pp. 52-55, 2 illus.
104. Arthur Maurice Hocart [Obituary notice]. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.).* Vol. 34, No. 91, 1938, pp. 264-268.
105. [Description and identification of some bas-reliefs at Nāgārjunakoṇḍa]. *The Buddhist Antiquities of Nāgārjunakoṇḍa, Madras Presidency;* by A. H. Longhurst. Delhi, 1938. (Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India—No. 54) Part 2, pp. 34-62.
106. Examples of Andhra art recently found in Ceylon. *A.B.I.A.* Vol. 11, 1936, pp. 15-18, 1 plate.
107. The History of inscriptions in Ceylon. *Buddhist.* Vol. 9 (new series), No. 6, October 1938, pp. 96-99.
108. *Tri Sinhala: the last phase* 1796-1815, by P. E. Pieris (1939) [Review]. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.).* Vol. 34, No. 91, 1938, pp. 279-281.

1939

109. A Fragmentary pillar-inscription in the Colombo Museum. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 5, 1939, No. 32, pp. 246-252.
110. The Graffiti of Sīgiriya. *A.B.I.A.* Vol. 12, 1937, pp. 34-37.
111. Habässa rock-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 5, 1939, No. 26, pp. 213-217.
112. A Note on the Iṅdikaṭusāya copper-plaques. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 5, 1939, No. 30, pp. 238-242.
113. Polonnaruva. *Mahābodhi.* Vol. 47, 1939, pp. 523-534.

114. A Rock-inscription of the reign of Goṭhābhaya at Timbirivāva. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 5, 1939, No. 28, pp. 223-228.
115. The Ruvanvälisäya slab-inscription of Queen Kalyānavatī. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 5, 1939, No. 33, pp. 253-260.
116. Sīgiriya graffiti: earliest extant specimens of Sinhalese verse. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 34, No. 92, 1939, pp. 309-346.
117. The Trikāyastava in an inscription at Mihintalē. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 5, 1939, No. 31, pp. 242-246.
118. Vallipuram gold-plate inscription of the reign of Vasabha. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 5, 1939, No. 29, pp. 229-237.
119. Vessagiriya rock-inscription of Sirināga II. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 5, 1939, No. 27, pp. 218-222.

1940

120. *A Grammar of the Sinhalese language*, by Wilhelm Geiger. 1938. [Review]. *J.R.A.S.(G.B.)*. January 1940, pp. 108-110.
121. Tamil householder's terrace, Anurādhapura. *A.B.I.A.* Vol. 13, 1938, pp. 13-14, 1 plate.
122. Tamil householder's terrace, Anurādhapura. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)* Vol. 35, No. 93, 1940, pp. 54-56.

1941

123. Archaeological summary, 1940. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 35, No. 94, 1941, pp. 65-68.
124. Art of ancient Ceylon. *New Review (Calcutta)*. Vol. 13, No. 75, March 1941, pp. 185-195.

1943

125. Alutnuvara slab-inscriptions. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 6, 1943, No. 34, pp. 261-270.
126. Archaeological summary, 1941. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 35, No. 96, 1943, pp. 187-188.
127. *Epigraphia Zeylanica, being lithic and other inscriptions of Ceylon; Vol. IV* (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 plates.
128. A Fragmentary inscription from Jetavanārāma now in the Colombo Museum. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 6, 1943, No. 36, pp. 273-285.
129. A Nāgarī legend on some mediaeval Sinhalese coins. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)* Vol. 35, No. 96, 1943, pp. 162-163.
130. Nilagama rock-inscription of Daḷa-Mugalan. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 6, 1943, No. 37, pp. 285-296.
131. Sagama rock-inscription of Bhuvanaikabāhu V. *E.Z.* Vol. 4, Pt. 6, 1943, No. 38, pp. 296-312.

1944

132. Archaeological summary, 1943. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 36, No. 97, 1944, pp. 236-237.
133. Magul Uyana (Royal Park) of ancient Anurādhapura. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 36, No. 97, 1944, pp. 193-209, 3 plates.
134. Negapatam and Theravāda Buddhism in South India. *J.G.I.S.* Vol. 11, No. 1, January 1944, pp. 17-25.

1945

135. Archaeological summary, 1944. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 36, No. 98, 1945, pp. 93-94.
136. Brāhmī inscriptions in Sinhalese verse. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 36, No. 98, 1945, pp. 58-65.
137. Geḍigē. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 36, No. 99, 1945, pp. 126-129.
138. Humphrey William Codrington. [Obituary notice]. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 36, No. 98, 1945, pp. 55-57.
139. The Pāḍakaḍa Sannasa. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 36, No. 99, 1945, pp. 130-133.
140. *Progress of Greater Indian research*, 1917-1942; by U. N. Ghoshal. Calcutta. 1943. [Review]. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 36, No. 98, 1945, p. 87.

1946

141. Archaeological summary, 1945. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 37, No. 101, Pt, 1, 1946, pp. 43-44.
142. Bodhisattva Avalokitesvara in Ceylon. *B.C. Law Volume*, Pt. 2; ed. by D. R. Bhandarkar. Poona, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1946, pp. 15-18.
143. History of Ceylon [from Vasabha to Moggallāna I]. *The Vākātaka-Gupta Age* (*circa* 200-550 A.D.); ed. by R. C. Majumdar and A. S. Altekar. Banaras, 1946, (New History of the Indian people—Vol. VI). Ch. 13, pp. 231-243.
144. Recent archaeological finds at Ruvanväli Dāgāba. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 37, No. 101, 1946, pp. 3-7, 3 plates.
145. *The Stūpa in Ceylon*. Colombo, Ceylon Government Press, 1946. [8], 105 p., 13 text figures, 22 plates. (Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of Ceylon, Vol. 5).

1947

146. *A.S.C.A.R.* 1940-1945. 41 p., 14 plates.
147. Perhaps the greatest archaeological find in Ceylon: a unique ivory statuette and exquisite gold reliquaries. *Illustrated London News*. Vol. 210, No. 5621, January 11, 1947, pp. 52-53, illus.
148. The Subject of the Sīgiri paintings. *India Antiqua*—a volume of Oriental Studies, presented by his friends and pupils to Jean Philippe Vogel.....Leyden, Kern Institute, 1947. pp. 264-269.

1948

149. An Ancient sanctuary newly revealed: discoveries and reconstructions in the Ceylon jungle. [Madirigiriya Vihare]. *Illustrated London News*. Vol. 212, No. 5696, June 19, 1948, pp. 698-700, 12 illus.
150. *A.S.C.A.R.* 1946, 18 p., 9 plates.
151. *Guide to Polonnaruva*. Colombo, Archaeological Department of Ceylon, 1948. [2] 9 p., 2 plates. (For the 2nd. ed. *see* No. 160).
152. Upulvan shrine at Devinuvara. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 38, No. 106, 1948, pp. 37-41, 2 plates.

1949

153. Archaeological summary, 1948. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 38, No. 107, Pts. 3 and 4, 1949, pp. 140-142.
154. *A.S.C.A.R.* 1947. 17 p., 8 plates.

1950

155. Archaeological summary, 1949. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 1 (new series) 1950 (Centenary Volume 1845-1945), pp. 195-197.
156. *A.S.C.A.R.* 1948, 25 p. 15 plates.
157. *A.S.C.A.R.* 1949. 34 p., 10 plates.
158. The Bodhi tree. *Buddhist*. Vol. 21 (new series), No. 7, May 1950, pp. 97, *contd.* 107.
159. Buddhist mission to Burma. *Buddhist*. Vol. 21 (new series), No. 5, 1950, pp. 80-81.
160. *Guide to Polonnaruva*. Colombo, Archaeological Department of Ceylon, 1950. 2nd. ed. 24 p., 9 illus., 4 plates.
161. Recent discoveries at the Ruvanväli Dāgaba (Mahā thūpa) of Anurādhapura. *A.B.I.A.* Vol. 15, 1940-1947, pp. xiii-xiv, 1 plate.
162. Sīgiri, the abode of a God-king. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 1 (new series) 1950 (Centenary Volume 1845-1945), pp. 129-183.
163. Sinhalese art and culture. *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts*. Vol. 98, No. 4822, 1950, pp. 588-605. (For reprint *see* No. 171).
164. The word *navakarmi* in the Kanishka Casket inscription. *Indian Culture*. Vol. 15, 1950, pp. 229-233.

1951

165. *A.S.C.A.R.* 1950. 34 p., 7 plates.
166. The Dāgaba newly discovered at Mihintale. *Buddhist*. Vol. 22, (new series) No. 2, June 1951, pp. 18-20.

1952

167. Archaeological summary, 1950. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 2 (new series). Pt. 1, 1952, pp. 55-60.
168. *A.S.C.A.R.* 1951. 65 p., 15 plates.
169. Les Fetes Bouddhiques á Ceylan, trad. de l'anglais par S. Karpeles. *France-Asie, Revue Mensuelle de Culture et de Synthese (Saigon)*. Vol. 8, No. 71, April 1952, pp. 49-54; Vol. 8, No. 72, May 1952, pp. 124-129. (Reprint of No. 28).
170. Medicine and hygiene as practised in ancient Ceylon. *Ceylon Medical Students Magazine*. Vol. 3, No. 1, 1952, pp. 102-144. (Reprint of No. 65).
171. Sinhalese art and culture. *Souvenir Catalogue of International Exhibition of Paintings, Colombo Plan Exhibition*, 1952, pp. 9-21, 6 illus. (Reprint of No. 163).
172. Statue at Potgul-Vehera, Polonnaruva. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 2 (new series), Pt. 2, 1952, pp. 123-125.
173. The Statue near Potgul-Vehera at Polonnaruva, Ceylon. *A.A.* Vol. 15, No. 3, 1952, pp. 209-217, 2 text figures, 2 plates.
174. Unique bronzes found at Mahiyangana. *C.T.* Vol. 1, No. 1, September 1952, pp. 14-17, 3 illus.
175. Les Vestiges des cités antiques. *La Revue Francaise de l'elite Europeene*. Vol. 4, No. 38, 1952, pp. 55-59, 9 illus.

1953

176. Archaeological summary, 1951. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 3 (new series), Pt. 1, June 1953, pp. 85-90.
177. *A.S.C.A.R.* 1952. 43 p., 13 plates.
178. The Chakravala [at Panduvas Nuvara]. *C.T.* Vol. 2, No. 2, February 1953, pp. 7-10, 3 illus.
179. Medicine and hygiene as practised in ancient Ceylon. *C.H.J.* Vol. 3, No. 2, October 1953, pp. 123-135. (Reprint of No. 65).
180. The Sculpture of man and horse near Tisāvāva, at Anurādhapura, Ceylon. *A.A.* Vol. 16, No. 3, 1953, pp. 167-190, 5 illus.
181. *The Shrine of Upulvan at Devundara*. Colombo, Ceylon Government Archaeological Department [Oxford University Press, printers] 1953. viii, 89 p., 34 pl. (Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of Ceylon, Vol. VI).

1954

182. *A.S.C.A.R.* 1953, 28 p., 9 plates.
183. *Art and architecture of Ceylon. Polonnaruva period*. Colombo, Arts Council of Ceylon, 1954. 84 p., coloured frontispiece, 73 illus. (For reprint see No. 190).
184. The Progress of archaeological work in Ceylon. *U.N.P. Souvenir of the visit of Elizabeth II, Queen of Ceylon, April* 1954; compiled by T. W. Perera. Colombo, 1954. pp. 109-115, 3 illus.
185. A Royal paradise of ancient Ceylon: a "Xanadu" of 1500 years ago, revealed beside the lion rock of Sīgiri. *Illustrated London News*. Vol. 224, No. 5998. April 3, 1954, pp. 530-532, 7 illus.
186. The Significance of Sinhalese "Moonstones", *A.A.* Vol. 17, Nos. 3-4, 1954, pp. 197-231, 3 illus.

1955

187. Archaeological summary, 1952. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 4 (new series), Pt. 1, May 1955, pp. 82-88.
188. Archaeological summary, 1953. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 4, Pt. 1, May 1955, pp. 89-92.
189. *A.S.C.A.R.* 1954. 39 p., 15 plates.
190. Art and architecture of Ceylon: Polonnaruva period. *C.H.J.* Vol. 4, Nos. 1-4, July 1954-April 1955, pp. 69-90, 32 plates (40 illus.). (Reprint of No. 183).
191. The Bodhi-ghara of Nitolava. *Buddhist*. Vol. 26 (new series) No. 1, May 1955, pp. 29-30.
192. Ceylon's Bo-shrine. *C.T.* Vol. 4, Nos. 5-6, May-June 1955, pp. 20-24, 5 illus.
193. Chronology of Ceylon Kings: Mahāsena—Mahinda V. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Pt. 1, 1955, Appendix to No. 7, pp. 86-111.

194. *Epigraphia Zeylanica, being lithic and other inscriptions of Ceylon. Vol. 5, Pt. 1*; ed. by S. Paranavitana, Colombo, Ceylon Government Press, 1955. 176 p., 7 plates.
195. Fragmentary Sanskrit inscription from Trincomalee. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Pt. 1, 1955, No. 14, pp. 170-173.
196. Hiṅguregala rock-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Pt. 1, 1955, No. 8, pp. 111-119.
197. Interpretation of *Vaharala*. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Pt. 1, 1955, No. 4, pp. 35-65.
198. Kandakāḍu rock-inscription of Upatissa II. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Pt. 1, 1955, No. 6, pp. 73-80.
199. Kapārārāma Sanskrit inscription of Saṁghanandin. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Pt. 1, 1955, No. 13, pp. 162-169.
200. Koṇḍavaṭṭavan pillar-inscription of Dappula IV. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Pt. 1, 1955, No. 10, pp. 124-141.
201. Kuḍā-Ratmalē rock-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Pt. 1, 1955, No. 3, pp. 30-34.
202. Minipe slab-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Pt. 1, 1955, No. 12, pp. 146-161.
203. Murutava rock-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Pt. 1, 1955, No. 2, pp. 27-29.
204. Panākaḍuva copper-plate charter of Vijayabāhu I. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Pt. 1, 1955, No. 1, pp. 1-27.
205. The Rock-cut image at Avukana. *C.T.* Vol. 4, No. 9, September 1955, pp. 20-21, 1 illus.
206. Rock-inscription of Daṭhopatissa near Dakkhina-Thūpa, Anurādhapura. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Pt. 1, 1955, No. 5, pp. 65-72.
207. Śaṁkha and Padma. *A.A.* Vol. 18, No. 2, 1955, pp. 121-127, 2 illus.
208. Some aspects of the divinity of the King in ancient India and Ceylon. *Proceedings and Transactions of the All-India Oriental Conference. 16th Session, University of Lucknow, October* 1951. Vol. 2 (Select papers). Lucknow. 1955. Section VIII, No. 28, pp. 217-232.
209. Ṭāṁgoḍa Vihāra pillar inscription of Sīmegha. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Pt. 1, 1955, No. 7, pp. 80-86.
210. Tiriyāy Sanskrit inscription of the reign of Aggabodhi VI. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Pt. 1, 1955, No. 15, pp. 174-176.
211. Viraṁdagoda pillar-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Pt. 1, 1955, No. 9, pp. 119-124.

1956

212. Archaeological investigations near Pomparippu. *C.T.* Vol. 5, No. 11, November 1956, pp. 13-15, 8 illus.
213. *A.S.C.A.R.* 1955. 36 p., 7 plates.
214. The evolution of the Sinhalese language. *Śri Sumangala Śabdakōsaya: a Sinhalese-Sinhalese dictionary*; by W. Sorata *Thera*. Pt. 2 (Colombo, 1956), pp. 1181-1199.
215. Glimpses of the political and social conditions of mediaeval Ceylon. *Sir Paul Pieris Felicitation Volume*. 1956, pp. 69-74.
216. *Sīgiri graffiti, being Sinhalese verses of the eighth, ninth and tenth centuries*. Published for the Government of Ceylon by Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, 1956. 2 vols. Vol. 1 (Introduction and plates). ccxxi, 55 plates; Vol. 2 (Texts and translations with notes, glossary). [4], 472 p.
217. *Sinhalese social organisation: the Kandyan period*; by Ralph Pieris. 1956. [Review]. *U.C.R.* Vol. 14, Nos. 3-4, July-October 1956, pp. 162-163.
218. *Sir Paul Peiris Felicitation Volume*, presented by his friends and admirers; ed. by S. Paranavitana and Julius de Lanerolle. Colombo, Sir Paul Pieris Felicitation Volume Committee [Colombo Apothecaries' Co. Ltd., printers], 1956. viii, 174 p., coloured frontispiece (portrait), 1 plate.

1957

219. Architecture [Ceylon]. *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*; ed. by G. P. Malalasekera, Volume of specimen articles. Colombo, Lanka Bauddha Mandalaya and Dept. of Cultural Affairs, Government of Ceylon, 1957, pp. 8-22, 10 illus.
220. A Bas-relief at "Isurumuṇi", Anurādhapura. *A.A.* 19, Nos. 3-4, 1957, pp. 335-341, 2 plates.
221. *Ceylon, paintings from temple, shrine and rock*. [Paris], New York Graphic Society, by arrangement with Unesco, 1957. (Unesco world art series—No. 8). Introduction, pp. 17-28.

222. The Panākaduva copper-plate of Vijayabahu I. *J.R.A.S.(G.B.)*. 1957, pp. 213-214.
223. Religious ties between Ceylon and Burma. *Buddhist*. Vol. 28 (new series), No. 4, August 1957, pp. 137-139.
224. Shrine of art crowning the Lion's Rock. *Unesco Courier*. 10th year [Vol. 10], No. 12, December 1957, pp. 24-29, 1 col. pl., 9 illus.
225. Was there a Gonisa vihāra in ancient Ceylon? *U.C.R.* Vol. 15, Nos. 3-4, July-October, 1957, pp. 127-133.

1958

226. Archaeological discoveries in Ceylon 1948-1953. *A.B.I.A.* Vol. 16, 1948-1953, pp. lv-lviii, 1 plate.
227. *The God of Adam's Peak*. Ascona (Switzerland), Artibus Asiae, 1958. 78 p., coloured frontispiece, 1 text figure, 16 plates. (Artibus Asiae Supplementum—XVIII).
228. The Hiṅdagala rock-inscription. *U.C.R.* Vol. 16, Nos. 1-2, January-April 1958, pp. 1-5, 1 plate.
229. Mahinda day. *University Buddhist Annual: the magazine of the Ceylon University Buddhist Brotherhood*. Vol. 8, 1957-58, pp. 8-10.
230. Padalāñchana at Anurādhapura. *U.C.R.* Vol. 16, Nos. 1-2, January-April 1958, pp. 56-61.
231. Perimiyankuḷam rock-inscription of Vasabha. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 5 (new series), Pt. 2, 1958, pp. 129-137, 1 plate.
232. Sanskrit in Ceylon epigraphy. *Bhāratī* 1957-58: *Annual of the Indological Society*. University of Ceylon, Peradeniya. pp. 3-7.
233. Some regulations concerning village irrigation works in ancient Ceylon. *C.J.H.S.S.* Vol. 1, No. 1, January 1958, pp. 1-7.

1959

234. The Ancient names and builder of the Padaviya and Nāccadūva tanks. *U.C.R.* Vol. 16, Nos. 3-4, July-October 1958, pp. 70-77.
235. *University of Ceylon History of Ceylon. Vol. 1 From the earliest times to 1505, Part I. Up to the end of the Anurādhapura period;* edited by S. Paranavitana. Colombo, Ceylon University Press Board, 1959. xxxiii, 409 p., xxxi plates, 6 maps.

Contributions by the Author

(*a*) Introduction, pp. xxvii-xxxiii.
(*b*) Aryan settlements: the Sinhalese. Bk. 1, Ch. 6, pp. 82-97.
(*c*) The Introduction of Buddhism. Bk. 2, Ch. 2, pp. 125-143.
(*d*) Triumph of Dutthagamani. Bk. 2, Ch. 3, pp. 144-163.
(*e*) Saddhatissa to Sabha. Bk. 2, Ch. 4, pp. 164-178.
(*f*) Lambakanna dynasty: Vasabha to Mahasena. Bk. 2, Ch. 5, pp. 179-193.
(*g*) Civilisation of the early period : economic, political and social conditions. Bk. 2, Ch. 8, pp. 216-240.
(*h*) Civilisation of the early period (continued): Religion and art. Bk. 2, Ch. 9, pp. 241-268.
(*i*) Civilisation of the period: economic, political and social conditions. Bk. 3, Ch. 6, pp. 359-377.
(*j*) Civilisation of the period (continued): Religion, literature and art. Bk. 3, Ch. 7, pp. 378-409.

236. Mahayanism in Ceylon. *Présence du Bouddhisme. France Asie*. Vol. 16, Nos. 153-157 February-June 1959, pp. 515-527, illus. (Abstract of No. 7).
237. A Sinhalese hero-stone. *A.A.* Vol. 22, Nos. 1-2, 1959, pp. 153-158, 1 plate.

1960

238. Ceylon. *Enciclopedia Universale dell' Arte*. Roma, Instituto per la Collaborazione Culturale, 1960. Vol. 3, Columns 415-420, 1 text figure (map).
Also in:—Encyclopaedia of World Art. (English language edition). New York, McGraw-Hill, 1960. Vol. 3, Columns 325-330, 1 text figure (map).

239. Ceylon, correnti e tradizioni. *Enciclopedia Universale dell'Arte*. Roma, Instituto per la Collaborazione Culturale, 1960. Vol. 3, Columns 420-428, Illustrazioni: Tavv. 210-219.
Also in:—Encyclopaedia of World Art (English Language edition). New York, McGraw-Hill, 1960. Entitled "Ceylonese art". Columns 330-339, plates 174-183.

240. Ceylon and Malaysia in mediaeval times. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 7 (new series), Pt. 1, 1960. pp. 1-42.

241. *University of Ceylon History of Ceylon. Vol 1. From the earliest times to* 1505. *Part 2. From the Cola Conquest in* 1017 *to the arrival of the Portuguese in* 1505; ed. by S. Paranavitana, Colombo, Ceylon University Press Board, 1960. xvi, 411-910 p., plates xxxii-l, 4 maps, 1 diagram, 8 genealogical tables, bibliography, index.

Contributions by the Author

(*a*) Civilisation of the Polonnaru period: political, economic and social conditions, Bk. 4, Ch, 7, pp. 529-552; 558-562.
(*b*) Civilisation of the Polonnaru period (continued): Religion, literature and art. Bk. 4, Ch. 8, pp. 563-584; 589-612.
(*c*) The Dambadeni dynasty. Bk. 5, Ch. 1, pp. 613-635.
(*d*) Gampala and Rayigama. Bk. 5, Ch. 2, pp. 636-652.
(*e*) The Pedigree of the Alakesvaras, Bk. 5, Ch. 2, Appendix, pp. 653-659.
(*f*) The Kotte Kingdom up to 1505. Bk. 5, Ch. 3, pp. 660-683.
(*g*) Civilisation of the period: economic, social and political conditions. Bk. 5, Ch. 7, pp. 713-744.
(*h*) Civilisation of the period (continued): Religion. Bk. 5, Ch. 8, pp. 745-769.
(*i*) Civilisation of the period (continued): Art. Bk. 5, Ch. 9, pp. 778-793.
(*j*) A Chronological list of Ceylon Kings and Notes. pp. 843-850.
(*k*) Note on genealogical table V. pp. 851-856.

242. Laṅkātilaka inscriptions. *U.C.R.* Vol. 18, Nos. 1-2, January-April 1960, pp. 1-45, 2 plates.

243. Professor Jean Philippe Vogel [obituary notice]. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 7 (new series), Pt. 1, 1960, pp. 117-118.

244. The University History of Ceylon. *C.T.* Vol. 9, No. 9, September 1960, pp. 1-5, contd. p. 9.

1961

245. The Arya Kingdom in North Ceylon. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 7 (new series), Pt. 2, 1961, pp. 174-224.

246. *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. xiv, 368 p., 20 plates, 9 maps.

Contributions by the Author

(*a*) Aryan settlements and early Kings. Ch. 2, pp. 17-32.
(*b*) The Rise of Buddhism in India and its introduction to Ceylon. Ch. 3, pp. 33-53.
(*c*) The Heroic age and the later Kings of the Vijayan dynasty. Ch. 4, pp. 54-76.
(*d*) The First Lambakanna dynasty. Ch. 5, pp. 77-94.
(*e*) Civilisation of the early Anurādhapura period. Ch. 6, pp. 95-121.
(*f*) The Dambadeniya dynasty. Ch. 15, pp. 277-290.
(*g*) Gampala and Rayigama. Ch. 16, pp. 291-304.
(*h*) The Kotte Kingdom up to 1505. Ch. 17, pp. 305-317.
(*i*) Civilisation of the period of decline. Ch. 18, pp. 318-340.

247. Cyril Wace Nicholas [obituary notice]. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)*. Vol. 7 (new series), Pt. 2, 1961, pp. 258-260.

248. The Emperor of Kotte when the Portuguese arrived in 1505. *U.C.R.* Vol. 19, No. 1, April 1961, pp. 10-29.

249. New light on the Buddhist Era in Ceylon, and early Sinhalese chronology. *U.C.R.* Vol. 18, Nos. 3-4, July-October 1960, pp. 129-155, 1 plate.

1962

250. The significance of the paintings of Sīgiri. *A.A.* Vol. 24, Nos. 3-4, 1961. Felicitation volume presented to Professor George Coedes on the occasion of his seventy-fifth birthday. Special number edited by A. B. Griswold and Jean Boisselier. pp. 382-387.

1963

251. Brāhmī inscriptions in caves at Mihintale. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Pt. 2, 1963, No. 18, pp. 209-234.
252. Brāhmī inscriptions in caves at three sites in the Vavuniya district. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Pt. 2, 1963, No. 19, pp. 234-252.
253. *Epigraphia Zeylanica, being lithic and other inscriptions of Ceylon.* Vol. 5, Pt. 2, ed. by Senerat Paranavitana and C. E. Godakumbura, Colombo, Archaeological Dept., Ceylon, 1963, pp. 177-314, plate Nos. 8-37.
254. Gallena-Vihāra inscriptions. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Pt. 2, 1963, No. 20, pp. 252-259.
255. An inscription of Niśśaṁkamalla on a pillar near the Rankot-Vehera at Polonnaru. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Pt. 2, 1963, No. 22, pp. 266-269.
256. Kalkulam rock-inscription of the 10th year of Sirisaṅgbo. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Pt. 2, 1963, No. 21, pp. 259-265.
257. Notes on the Tamil inscription from Panduvasnuvara. *U.C.R.* Vol. 20, No. 1, April 1962, pp. 16-18.
258. A revised edition of the Badulla (Horabora) pillar-inscription. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Pt. 2, 1963, No. 16, pp. 177-195.
259. Rock inscriptions at Tiṁbirivāva and Andaragollāva in the Vilpattu Sanctuary. *U.C.R.* Vol. 19, No. 2, October 1961, pp. 95-104, 2 pl.
260. Rummindei pillar inscription. *Journal of the American Oriental Society.* Vol. 82, No. 2, April-June 1962, pp. 163-167.
261. A scholar of rare attainments [The Ven. Weliwitiye Sorata Nayaka Thera]. *C.T.* Vol. 12, No. 8, August 1963, pp. 22-23.
262. A slab-inscription of Niśśaṁkamalla at Polonnaru, wrongly attributed to Vijayabāhu II. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, Pt. 2, 1963, No. 17, pp. 196-208.
263. Some Sinhalese inscriptions of circa sixth century. *U.C.R.* Vol. 20, No. 1, April 1962, pp. 1-11, 2 pl.

1964

264. Ceylon and Malaysia; a rejoinder to Nilakanta Sastri. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.)* Vol. 8 (new series) Pt. 2, 1963, pp. 330-377.
265. An inscription of circa 200 B.C. of Rajagala commemorating Saint Mahinda. *U.C.R.* Vol. 20, No. 2, October 1962, pp. 159-162.
266. Mahanama, the author of Mahavamsa. *U.C.R.* Vol. 20, No. 2, October 1962, pp. 269-286.
267. A Sanskrit inscription from Padaviya. *J.R.A.S.(C.B.).* Vol. 8 (new series), Pt. 2, 1963, pp. 262-264.

1965

268. Brahmi inscriptions in Caves at Kaduruvāva, *E.Z.* Vol. 5, No. 3, 1965, pp. 408-418, 2 pl.
269. Kahaṁbiliyāva (Kavuduluvāva) slab inscription of Vikramabahu I. *E.Z.* Vol. 5, No. 3, 1965, pp. 404-408.
270. Linguistic studies in ancient Ceylon and Sri Vijaya. *Transactions of the University of Ceylon Linguistic Society,* 1964, pp. 79-100.
271. Princess Ulakudaya's wedding. *U.C.R.* 21, No. 2, October 1963, pp. 103-138, 3 pl., fold. chart.
272. Rameswaram inscription of Niśśaṅkamalla. *E.I.* Vol. 36, Pt. 1, January 1965, No. 3, pp. 23-31, 1 pl.

1966

273. *Ceylon and Malaysia.* Colombo, Lake House Investments Ltd., 1966. x, [4], 234 p., 6 pl. (fold.).

1967

274. Ceylon and Srī Vijaya. *Essays offered to G. H. Luce by his colleagues and friends in honour of his seventy-fifth birthday;* ed. by Ba Shin and others. Ascona, Artibus Asiae, 1967. Vol. 1, pp. 205-212.
275. The interpretation of the old Sinhalese word *"vaharala". Journal of the American Oriental Society.* Vol. 87, No. 2, April-June 1967, pp. 166-169.

276. *The Jānakīharana of Kumāradāsa;* ed. by S. Paranavitana and C. E. Godakumbura, with indexes, notes, tables and appendix. Colombo, Sri Lanka Sahitya Mandalaya (Ceylon Academy of Letters) (Ceylon Govt. press, printers), 1967. lxxii, 401 p. (Introduction (ii). The poet by S. P. pp. li-lxxii).

1968

277. Newly discovered historical documents relating to Ceylon, India and South-East Asia. *Buddhist Yearly* 1967. *Jahrbuch für Buddhistische Forschungen.* (Buddhist Centre, Halle). pp. 26-58.
278. *Sinhalayo.* Colombo, Lake House Investments Ltd., 1967, [i.e. 1968]. [6], 45 p., 106 text illus.
279. Two Buddhist historians. *Mahabodhi.* Vol. 76, Nos. 5-6, May-June, 1968, pp. 96-99.
280. Two decades of archaeological work in Ceylon. *C.T.* Vol. 17, Nos. 2-4, February-March-April 1968, pp. 64-75, 11 illus.

1969

281. Dambulla in ancient times. *Vesak Number.* (Colombo, Dept. of Cultural Affairs, Ceylon) [No. 2] 1969, pp. 65-69.
282. The Grāmaṇi (Gāmaṇi) in ancient India. *C.H.J.* Vol. 10 (Nos. 1-4) July 1960-April 1961, pp. 1-7.
283. A Greek prince who was a Buddhist missionary. *Maha Bodhi* 77 (4-5) Vaishakha Number, April-May 1969, pp. 122-124.
284. The learning of Pāli and Sanskrit and its influence on Sinhala literary trends of the period. *Education in Ceylon (from the sixth century* B.C. *to the present day). A Centenary Volume.* Colombo, Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs, Ceylon, 1969. Vol. 1, Pt. 1, Ch. 16, pp. 163-173.
285. The Mahāvihāra and other ancient seats of learning. *Education in Ceylon (from the sixth century* B.C. *to the present day). A Centenary Volume.* Colombo, Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs, Ceylon, 1969. Vol. 1, Part 1, Ch. 6, pp. 51-59, map, plate.
286. Medirigiriya. The rediscovery of an architectural gem. *Times of Ceylon Annual* 1969 [7] p., 14 illus. (3 col.).
287. Roruka: was it Mohenjodaro? *Studies in Asian History. Proceedings of the Asian History Congress,* 1961. ed. by K. S. Lal. New Delhi, Asia Publishing House, 1969, pp. 111-116.

1970

288. Buddhist art in Ceylon. *Daham Suwanda.* Vesak Number 1970. (Colombo, Department of Cultural Affairs) pp. 5-11.
289. The designer of Barabudur. *Maha Bodhi* Vol. 78, Nos. 5-6, May-June 1970, pp. 165-168.
290. *Inscriptions of Ceylon.* Vol. 1. *Containing cave inscriptions from 3rd century* B.C. *to 1st century* A.C. *and other inscriptions in the early Brāhmī script.* Colombo, Department of Archaeology, Ceylon, 1970. [4], xi, cxxix, 136p., 130 plates (of inscriptions), 1 plate, fold. map., fold. chart. (Archaeological Survey of Ceylon).
291. Stepping stones in the migration of the Indus script to Easter Island. *C.T.* Vol. 18, Nos. 7 and 8, July-August, 1970, pp. 27-32.
292. Traditions about Kālidāsa that were prevalent in Śrīvijaya. *Añjali. Papers on Indology and Buddhism. A Felicitation Volume presented to Oliver Hector de Alwis Wijesekera on his sixtieth birthday;* ed. by J. Tilakasiri. Peradeniya, The Felicitation Volume Editorial Committee, University of Ceylon, 1970. Ch. 17, pp. 105-111.

ALPHABETICAL INDEX OF TITLES

The numbers attached to the titles refer to the serial numbers in the Bibliography

Two rock-inscriptions of Vihāra-Mahā-Devī from Magul-Maha-Vihāra, 100.
Two Royal titles of the early Sinhalese and the origin of kingship in ancient Ceylon, 89.
Two Tamil pillar-inscriptions from Budumuttāva, 60.

Unique bronzes found at Mahiyangana, 174.
University History of Ceylon, 244.
University of Ceylon History of Ceylon, Vol 1. From the earliest times to 1505. Part 1. Up to the end of the Anurādhapura period, 235.
University of Ceylon History of Ceylon, Vol 1, Part 2. From the Cola conquest in 1017 to the arrival of the Portuguese in 1505, 241.
Upulvan shrine at Devinuvara, 152.

Vallipuram gold-plate inscription of the reign of Vasabha, 118.
Velmilla slab-inscription of Sena III, 61.
Vessagiriya rock-inscription of Srināga II, 119.
Vestiges des cités antiques, 175.
Vihāregama pillar-inscription, 70.
Village communities of Ceylon, 36.
Viraṇḍagoḍa pillar-inscription, 211.
Viyaulpata pillar-inscription, 101.

Was there a Gonisa-vihāra in ancient Ceylon? 225.
Word *navakarmi* in the Kanishka Casket-inscription, 164.

REVIEWS

I

Asian Bureaucratic Systems Emergent from the British Imperial Tradition.

Edited by Ralph Braibanti, Duke University Commonwealth Studies Centre, (Duke University Press, Durham, N.C. 1966). pp. xx+733.$ 17.50.

The most significant political development of the twentieth century has been the end of the colonial era and the emergence of the newly independent states of Asia and Africa. The countries of these two vast continents, though differ in a variety of ways, are caught up in a process of social change and development. In this period of change and development, the administrative systems of these countries are expected to play an important role.

The ability of the administrative systems of the underdeveloped countries to fulfill this role in economic development has, in fact, become a special field of investigation by writers who specialise in the study of underdeveloped nations.1 Another aspect of the inquiry has been the problem of adaptation of the colonial bureaucracies to the political and economic patterns which have emerged after the achievement of independence. Professor Braibanti and his associates, in producing this massive volume, have added another useful work to the growing mass of literature on the administrative systems of the developing nations.

In discussing the bureaucracies of India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, Malaya and Nepal the authors have attempted to investigate certain significant aspects of the public bureaucracies in these newly independent nations. The colonial bureaucracy, which these countries inherited at independence, had been devised by the colonial powers in a colonial situation, and the colonial characteristics of the bureaucracy—structure and procedure, the traditions associated with the maintenance of law and order—constituted an 'administrative legacy', which affected bureaucratic adaptation and responsiveness.

The move from 'patronage' to 'competition' in the recruitment of administrators in the colonies, in fact, represented a significant contribution of mid-nineteenth century British rule. The break up of the 'patronage' system in recruitment followed the emergence of the concept of the omnicompetence of the generalist administrator, the acceptance of which in the end created the 'elite cadre' system in these countries. The sons of the indigenous aristocratic classes and the growing middle classes were permitted entry into this carefully guarded fortress of the colonial bureaucracy, and contributed in their own way to develop a class of administrators who, by their ivory-tower outlook, social status, and touch-me-not attitude, formed themselves into an 'administrative Brahamin caste'.

The omnicompetence and the elitist nature of the public bureaucracies, though experienced hostility and unpopularity at and after independence, have displayed resilience and signs of adaptation despite the absence of the colonial power. The espirit de corps, which the higher civil servants cultivated in the context of a colonially-oriented administrative system, has undergone remarkably little change, and it continues to dominate all the fields of administration. The skills, the attitudes, and the elitist characteristics have been criticised as significant impediments for better administrative performance in these countries where economic planning, public corporations and community development programmes have become important instruments of economic development. The authors, who describe these administrative systems, strongly stress the unsuitability of the colonial-oriented public bureaucracies for economic development and nation-building activities.

In the words of the editor,

> 'there has been resilience and adaptability, continuity and change. The change has been forced by external pressures, but the response has been made within traditional patterns. This is no small accomplishment for ex-imperial bureaucratic systems which have been buffeted by competing forces in a context of development no longer ideologically hospitable to the concepts of Platonic guardianship, 'gentlemenly power', and literary-generalism on which these bureaucracies were so strongly constructed'.

This is certainly a remarkable achievement. In the case of Ceylon, this form of adjustment was facilitated by the process of Ceylonisation, which had been virtually completed at independence. In the first decade after independence, the adjustment was partly due to the fact there existed an unity in social orientation between the British-oriented Ceylonese

1. See Braibanti, Ralph. *Research on the Bureaucracy of Pakistan.* (Durham, N.C., U.S.A. 1966.)

public bureaucracy and the political leadership to which power was transferred in 1947. Despite achievements of this kind, the question has arisen whether such bureaucracies can keep pace with the processes of political modernisation. In this connection, Professor Braibanti takes issue with some of his colleagues who are arguing that foreign aid should be specifically directed at hastening political modernisation process rather than at administrative reform. In short, the meaning of this argument is that foreign aid needs to be utilised to modernise the political systems, and thereby to avoid disparities in the developmental process. Professor Braibanti, on the contrary, argues that

> 'the impact of administrative modernisation may not always be detrimental to the participative aspect of politicisation. ...It is doubtful if administrative modernisation can wait for the maturation of the political process; on the contrary, it must proceed irrespective of it'.

This exposition, in other words, represents an understanding of the relationship between political and administrative modernisation, the combined effect of this should not be interfered with merely because these societies are characterised by the exaggerated notions of the Riggsian 'prismatie' model.[2] This is another significant sphere in which further investigation is necessary, primarily to analyse the modes of modernisation.

In this volume, there are certain aspects—the role of the judiciary in Pakistan, the militant public service trade unionism in Ceylon, Whitleyism in Malaya—which, in fact, are unique characteristics, and they are certainly useful areas of further research. This work, though competent in a variety of ways, still leaves a relevant question unanswered. It would have been useful to investigate the extent to which a bureaucracy brought up in the tradition of colonial rule prevented the speedy march of these countries towards the goal of political independence.

The individual contributions to this volume, though characterised by a high level of scholarship, vary in approach, and the theme too is not fully comparative. Professor Braibanti's colleagues in this volume are all Americans and Britishers, and the failure to include some nationals is, to my mind, a fundamental mistake. One other point—why include Nepal which was never strictly a colonial country, in this survey?

W. A. Wiswa Warnapala.

II

H. A. I. Goonetileke, *A Bibliography of Ceylon* 2 vols. (Zug. Switzerland, Inter Documentation Company), Bibliotheca Asiatica No. 5.
Preface, v-xxii, Introduction, xxiii-xxviii, List of Abbrevations, Plan of classification etc. xxix-lxxx, pp. 865. $ 28.00.

As a novice engaged in research for a doctoral dissertation over a dozen years ago, I spent several weeks in preparing a critical bibliographical essay on an aspect of Ceylon history for a Seminar conducted by my supervisor. The weariness induced by this time-consuming effort left me with a profound respect for the professional labours of the skilled bibliographer. Besides the experience—and tedium—of collecting material for a bibliography was not made any the more palatable by the fact that I found fellow students from other countries engaged in producing similar bibliographical essays for their own fields of historical research, and for the same seminar, had their tasks rendered so much easier by the wealth of published bibliographical material on their countries. Indeed in some cases they were consulting bibliographical works on bibliographies. Thus my introduction to historical research began with the sobering realisation that the research student working on Ceylon in any of the major social science fields lacked one of the basic research tools taken almost for granted in relation to other countries—a competently produced bibliography.

At that time the late Lyn de Fonseka of the Colombo Museum was in the process of publishing, in regular instalments, a bibliography of books (and some articles in periodicals) on Ceylon, but this work, unfortunately, was never completed. The arrangement was basically alphabetical and the bibliography stopped abruptly at the letter 'K'. Then in 1964 an American bibliographer, Edith Ware published a bibliography of Ceylon of more substantial proportions but one so hastily and carelessly compiled, and so full of flaws that far from filling a gap it only underscored its continued existence. This bibliography produced by Ware seemed to provide proof of the belief held by cynical research students that most

2. See Riggs, Fred. *Administration in Developing Countries. The Theory of Prismatic Society*. (Boston. 1964.)

bibliographical work operated on the "vacuum-cleaner principle', that is to say, you hold the nozzle of the vacuum cleaner firmly and it relentlessly but with complete lack of discrimination sucks in everything in its path.

It is against this dismal background that one needs to assess the merits of H. A. I. Goonetileke's superbly constructed 2 volume *Bibliography of Ceylon*. To say that it fills the gap which Ware's effort so signally failed to do, would be to say very little. For Goonetileke's achievement is altogether more substantial. It is one of the finest pieces of research produced by a Ceylonese. This assessment too has its self-imposed limitations. The author's achievement has to be set in the perspective of a wider world of scholarship—as a bibliographical work it ranks with the best bibliographical studies prepared for other parts of the world.

As the subtitle of the bibliography indicates, it is a guide to the literature on the land, people, history and culture published in the western languages from the sixteenth century to the present day. And for once a book lives up to the promise held out in its subtitle. In a work which contains as many entries as this—over 11,000—skillful classification is vital to make the most and best of a formidable mass of material. The author points out that the material has been classified in accordance with a scheme especially designed *ad-hoc* for the purpose. The classification, it strikes me, has served its purpose, efficiently and most effectively. In the hands of an author whose judgement was less mature, and discernment less sophisticated this mass of material could have developed into a forbidding thicket into which only the most desperate student would have ventured.

However exciting the hunt for material may be to the bibliographer, the end product is almost always overwhelmingly dull. This is as it ought to be for nobody has invented a technique of making a bibliography attractive to the general reader. But in most cases the dullness, one suspects, is contrived. Or it may stem from a slipshod technique and lack of a prolonged acquaintance with the subject. Now, these criticisms cannot be levelled at Goonetileke's bibliography. Almost all the material has been compiled at first hand, and virtually all of it has been personally examined. It is the distillation of a life-time of dedicated labour. This however is normally no guarantee that a bibliography would be anything other than a prosaic business, at best a sophisticated catalogue. If Goonetileke's work rises well above this—and it quite clearly does—it is because he is a bibliographer who has read many of the books he has catalogued.

One final point. The author himself states quite firmly that his bibliography represents a preliminary effort towards an over-all picture of the great wealth of writing on Ceylon. What remains to be done now are specialist bibliographies compiled by experts in various fields of Ceylon studies, critical bibliographies in short where merely bibliographical skills alone would be inadequate. When such works are produced their compilers will find that the standard by which they are judged would be Goonetileke's impeccable work of scholarship.

K. M. de Silva.

III

R. C. Majumdar: *Historiography in Modern India* (Asia Publishing House for the Heras Institute of Indian History and Culture) 1970, pp. 61, Rs. 12/-.

Professor Majumdar is one of the foremost of the first generation of Indian historians trained in the modern discipline of his subject and his Heras Memorial Lectures of 1967 deliver a message of value to a generation that has succeeded his own and has benefitted from valuable new techniques and aids provided by the sociologist and the statistician but is at the same time beset not only by the perils and pitfalls involved in their adoption but also by those arising from the greater involvement in the conflicts and trials of this age that press on the scholar of this generation. But if the reader is consequently inclined to be a little disappointed that the first of the lectures carries his survey of Historiography in Europe no further than the mid-nineteenth century, he is compensated by the clearer appraisal, which this self-abregation renders possible, of the continuing relevance of the basic values which the early teachers and exponents of the historical discipline have passed on to their successors. For in his second and third lectures Professor Majumdar has with admirable impartiality and scholarly restraint exposed some of the more notable lapses committed in turn by British and Indian scholars in works which nevertheless remain the classics of historical writing on India in the English language. And it is almost superfluous to point out that these perils beset the modern writer in the same field, whatever the language he employs.

W. J. F. LaBrooy.

IV

M. D. Raghavan, *India in Ceylonese History, Society and Culture*, (Indian Council for Cultural Relations, New Delhi), Second Edition, 1969, pp. [16] 200, 16, 16 plates, 2 maps, 7 figure illustrations.

The study of interaction between Ceylon and her vast neighbour is a subject of profound interest and intellectual appeal to both the historian and the anthropologist. Yet, it is as demanding as it is attractive and requires of the scholar who undertakes this formidable task an intimate knowledge of the historical trends of the two lands and a thorough grasp of their historical sources. The present work by a mature scholar from India who had the advantage of spending over nine years in Ceylon, though certainly one of the better books published on this theme, shares with some of its predecessors a common failing in the amateur handling of the historical sources of Ceylon. Some essays in Dr. Raghavan's collection had been previously published in the daily press and readers would notice that the journalistic flavour is retained in certain chapters in which "poetic" description tend to take the place of analytical treatment.

A comparison with the first edition reveals improvements to certain chapters and the incorporation of two new maps. However, it is disconcerting to find that a fair number of mistakes have escaped the attention of the author in the preparation of the revised edition. The more meticulous students would find a source of annoyance in the wrong and inconsistent spelling of Sinhalese terms and names [e.g., *alariya, panchanga lipe* (p. 164): *genudenu, telegana avurudda* (p. 165); *kadayampot* (p. 185)] while all readers would be surprised by such howlers like the conversion of the "year 1884 before Buddha' as 1301 B.C., even if they were to bear with Dr. Raghavan's uncritical acceptance of the authority of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. The same lack of careful attention to details is evident in the caption of Plate 13 figure ii which reads, "Hindagala Frescoes of the 12th century—Scenes from the life of the Buddha and the Jataka tales—on the walls of the Tivanka shrine at Polonnaruva" and the description of Mädirigiriya as a place located to the 'north of Minneriya in Anurādhapura". Similarly, the map of Ceylon reveals errors, as in the location of plates like Mantai, Mannar, Kandy and Dambulla, which could have been easily rectified. Such carelessness and violence to well-known, basic topographical facts are the more disappointing when one realizes that an experienced scholar like Dr. Raghavan is responsible for them.

In the historical sections, which are probably the weakest in the book, Dr. Raghavan's disregard of the need for a cautious approach in the handling of sources like the *Mahāvaṃsa* and, particularly, the *Rāmāyaṇa* impose a severe strain on the credulity of the reader. For Dr. Raghavan, "Vijaya's arrival in Lankā in c. 483 B.C. is a convenient point from which to view the heterogeneous growth of society in Ceylon" and he finds no difficulty in accepting the Yakkhas and Nāgas "as representing the real, indigenous people of Ceylon". Not only does he readily and uncritically incorporate the concept of "Indian periods of Ceylon history" in his writings, but also he gives this idea a rather extreme formulation in terming the period up to Mahāsena "the Asokan period of Ceylon history".

Dr. Raghavan is more interesting and useful when he turns to his familiar field of ethnology. His chapters on "Dance in Ceylon: Simhala Natyam", "The Angam" and the "Society and the Social Complex" with their fresh ethnographic data are the most stimulating in the book. The evidence he presents in these chapters points to the close affinity that the culture of the Kerala region bears not only with the culture of the Jaffna Tamils but also with the popular culture of the Sinhalese. This material is of particular significance at a time when theories interpreting references to Kerala in the literray works of medieval Ceylon as denoting not Malabar but a South East Asian region have gained currency among some prominent scholars in Ceylon. It is unfortunate that this fascinating theme of Malabar-Ceylon relations is not adequately elaborated in Dr. Raghavan's book. It demands a detailed investigation and should prove to be a most profitable field of study for research workers in history and anthropology equipped with a knowledge of Dravidian languages, particularly Malayalam, and Sinhalese.

R. A. L. H. Gunawardana.