ANCIENT CEYLON

Journal of the Archaeological Survey Department of Sri Lanka

No. 4 May 1981

The Formation of Sri Lankan Culture

Susantha Goonatilake

EDITED AND PUBLISHED BY THE COMMISSIONER OF ARCHÆOLOGY
DEPARTMENT OF ARCHÆOLOGY, COLOMBO 7. SRI LANKA

THE FORMATION OF SRI LANKAN CULTURE

REINTERPRETATION OF CHRONICLE AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL MATERIAL*†

SUSANTHA GOONATILAKE

Early history of Sri Lankan culture (and for that matter of Sri Lankan society as a whole) is highly dependent on material from the chronicles although this is occasionally corroborated by epigraphic and other evidence. The "history" of the period prior to the 2nd century B.C. is largely dependent on chronicle material specially as to the introduction of Buddhism and Sinhala Language to form what later came to be called Sinhala Buddhist culture. Early Sri Lankan history thus rested until very recent times on reading into and interpretation of the near mythical references in the Mahavamsa. Hard archaeological evidence prior to the introduction of Buddhism has hardly been sought for until very recent times. This paper attempts to summarise recent archaeological evidence of the early history and thereby partially reconstruct the economic and the social system in that era. With this firm data as background, the paper also attempts to reinterpret the descriptions in the chronicles as to the introduction of both Sinhala Language and Buddhism to Sri Lanka, and hence indirectly, the formation of "Sinhala Buddhist" Culture.

Archaeological Evidence

Artefacts and remains of stone tool using man have been found in several sites in Sri Lanka, with the site at Bellan Bandi Palassa being dated by thermoluminiscent testing of associated artefacts at circa 4500 B.C. (Wintle and Oakley 1972). Excavations on a carefully stratified basis at the Gedige area of Anuradhapura (S. Deraniyagala 1972) have also brought out artefacts associated with this culture indicating thereby that this culture was widespread in the country. But it is not with stone age man or his cultural products to whom one could possibly assign several cave paintings (S. Deraniyagala 1971 p. 38) that we are interested in ; it is with the culture associated with settled agriculture.

Settled agriculture especially when associated with tank irrigation is often considered to be an introduction of the "Sinhalese culture" that was brought by the waves of speakers of a North Indian dialect. However, there is considerable evidence both direct and indirect that settled irrigated agriculture arose before, and independent of, the coming of the North Indian language speakers.

---

* This paper in essence constitutes the first part of a longer paper prepared for a UNESCO sponsored symposium on traditional culture held in Colombo in 1977. However, as the symposium dealt only with the contemporary scene, this part of the paper dealing with the formation of Sri Lankan culture—which to me was the most challenging was not discussed. The paper was discussed more fully at a meeting of the Social Scientists Association in February 1979. The final part of this paper—a concluding note—is an outcome of some questions raised at that meeting. I wish to thank participants of this seminar specially for raising some interesting questions and giving valuable comments.

† This paper is a development of some of the author's previous views on the sociology of culture (Goonatilake 1975*a*, 1975*b*, 1976*a*, 1976*b*, 1976*c*,) I am indebted to those who commented on and criticised these papers. In this particular piece I am grateful to my wife Hema Goonatilake for valuable help in my understanding of, and alerting me to Pali, Sanskrit and (old) Sinhala sources.

Possible indirect literary evidence is in the Mahavamsa story of the Buddha's three visits to Sri Lanka to local kingdoms at least half a century before the latter's story about the coming of Vijaya. The references to such kingdoms makes one speculate on the presence of settled agriculture giving a sufficient surplus (which hunting and gathering is not capable of) for the upkeep of a kingdom. Such agriculture would have been based on irrigation as two of the three kingdoms, namely Mahiyangana and Nagadipa coincide with the red soil dry zone of the country. The third Kelaniya is in the heavy rainfall area. (The latter is an interesting anomaly, both in this mythical history as well as in actual history—it was in the 2nd century B.C. the seat of Kelanitissa—in that it is outside the main red soil dry zone area).

Further the Vijaya story, as well as other sources which could be dated to almost times contemporareous with Vijaya also point to the existence of other economic activities which could not have existed without settled agriculture. The incident in the Vijaya story relating to Kuveni describes her activity of spinning of cotton. References to Sri Lanka's export trade during these early times in gems and pearls exist in Kautilya's *Arthasastra* and the *Mahabharata* (referred to in Ellawala 1969 p. 138) Both these economic activities of spinning cotton and export trade in gems could not have existed, we should note, without the primary activity of settled agriculture.

The earliest indication of settled agriculture that we have some direct evidence of, is in the "Megalithic" culture whose remains have been found scattered in many parts of Sri Lanka. The existing sites as indicated in a map in the Colombo Museum shows a spread of these sites (Pomparrippu, Gurugalhinna, Katiraveli, Padiyagampala, Walawe Basin) in the red brown earth soil region of the dry zone of the country. The stratigraphic excavation at the Gedige area in Anuradhapura (S. Deraniyagala 1972) indicates that, "artificial reservoirs of water existed at Anuradhapura from the period represented by stratum 2 onwards" (ibid p. 159). Stratum 1 was associated with artefacts of the stone age and comparable with the "Balangoda Culture" of 4500 B.C., whilst stratum 3 had arte facts "whose closest cultural correlatives in the early iron age Megalithic culture of peninsular India which is datable to 800–100 B.C" (ibid p. 159) The dating of this particular site is by strata and no dating by physical means–say by thermoluminecence testing of the pottery available at the site has been made and therefore we cannot say with precision the exact dates of the megalithic culture layer, or the one associated with irrigation in stratum 2. But within this limitation we can state with Deraniyagala that, at least by the period represented by stratum 3a which was before the advent of "Mauryan traditions" in the 3rd century B. C., the inhabitants "cultivated rice through tank irrigation and were culturally closest to the early iron age 'megalithic' man of middle and South India, although certain culture traits were characteristic of the North". (ibid p. 50).

The characteristics of this 'megalithic' culture common to both Sri Lanka and South India are well known "In one respect the settlements differed from each other ; burial practices and funerary monuments varied. The variety includes dolmens, cists, stone squares and urn burials" Senaratne 1969 p. 30). Further, the culture was metal using, the pottery was of a black and red type and "a settlement had four distinct areas : a habitation area, a cemetery, a tank and fields. Irrigation was practised and the introduction of this technique to these regions is now thought to be the work of these people" (ibid).

It is in these settlements associated with the South Indian megalithic culture, (which were from available physical evidence, practising an irrigated agriculture-before the so-called "coming of the Aryans" that we have to look for the first beginnings of our traditional culture, which, as is well recognised is intimately tied with the growth and spread of irrigation in this country

The culture associated with this village tank based irrigation also had houses of wattle and daub (Deraniyagala 1972), used iron and pottery (Senaratne 1969), had implements like grinding stones (the latter being found even in the late stone age of Sri Lanka) and very probably had wooden spoons, and artefacts associated with weaving. An important aspect of significance indicating the belief system of this culture were its funerary monuments. Associated with these megaliths have been found "urnfields in which the remains of the dead have been buried in large pots, together with the offerings made to them contained in smaller pots." (Paranavithana 1967 p. 8) Clearly the burial practices have a religious significance, as do the megaliths associated with it and here one finds a close identification of the irrigation tank and the religious/belief centre, a direct parallel between the dagoba and the tank of the later "Sinhala-Buddhist" times

The physical basis for early Sri Lankan culture was in the village tanks associated with this South Indian megalithic culture. The major socio-economic changes in the next millenium and half are intimately related to the expansion, interconnection and consolidation of this incipient irrigation system so as to give an increased surplus from the land. And it is within this growth of the consolidation which is well documented, that we have to see the crucible as it were, of traditional Sri Lankan culture.

In the absence of extensive archaeological excavation there is no general indicator of how widespread the "megalithic" irrigation was. In the absence of excavations of tank bunds that could date them we do not have a direct physical indicator (the references in Mahavamsa to the founding of a few important tanks is an indirect reference to the existence of some tanks) about the extent of expansion of the irrigation system in the pre-Christian era. Yet in the pre-Christian epigraphic remains we have a good indirect indicator of the extent of this spread assuming that the epigraphic remains reflect the existence of settled tank irrigated agriculture. This is a fairly reasonable assumption to make in that a map of the pre-Christian epigraphic remains coincides strongly with the dry zone reddish brown earth soil region of Sri Lanka which is the tank region of the country as is revealed by the tank network that survived to the 19th century. (An examination of the epigraphic map of Sri Lanka and C.R. Panabokke's soil maps indicate this. Such a comparison has been done in two maps published in October 1975 issue of the *Economic Review*). Evidence exists to indicate that by the dawn of the Christian era the tank culture had spread throughout the country. These were very probably a collection of irrigation units "nothing larger than the village tank " (Nicholas 1960 p. 44) and we could reasonably speculate that most such tanks were built on technology associated with the megalithic South Indian culture.

With time these tanks grow larger, streams are dammed and an irrigation network covers the whole dry zone region. The 1st century sees the steps towards the construction of major tanks and canals as long as thirty miles (ibid). The first collosal reservoirs are assigned to King Mahasena in the 3rd century, with irrigation activities continuing in the 4th and 5th centuries (thus Kalawewa with a bund 3½ miles long, 40 feet high and irrigating 7,000 acres ; and the great canal Jaya Ganga 54 miles in length carrying water to Anuradhapura). In the 6th and 7th centuries the building activities of Aggabodhi II almost rivalled those of Mahasena, with the total length of the major canals in the 7th century being over 250 miles (ibid). The 8th , 9th and 10th centuries were a period of apparent affluence, but little new irrigation works are adduced to this era (ibid). The next spurt in irrigation activity is in the 11th century by Parakrama Bahu.

after whose reign begins a slow collapse of the hydraulic systems due to warfare and other reasons and from the 13th century a drift of the socio-economic centre to the South West of the island occurs.

It is the "hydraulic" civilization which arose in the roughly 1500 years upto the 13th century that nurtured traditional Sri Lankan culture. The most significant socio economic impact of the extensive growth of the irrigation system was that it increased the available yield from the land and thereby the disposable surplus available for disbursement. The manner in which this surplus was used gives us important clues to the socio economic system of the time, specially the nature of its class relations. We can know to some extent by the living standards of the peasants and others how the surplus was used.

We know that until very recent times the use of tiles and bricks were restricted to those related to royalty and the church (Pieris 1922 p. 23) and that consequently all houses of the peasantry were wattle and daub structures. These were rudimentary and it is very doubtful if the structures changed much from the wattle and daub structures of the megalithic period of which we have evidence (Deraniyagala 1972 p. 58). The basic structure still survives in various parts of the island and was very prevalent in the North Central Province for example before the tile and brick structures spread there during the last fifteen years.

If the living quarters in Sri Lankan classical period was of wattle and daub, what of the other requisites of living, clothes, household items etc. We know that cotton was widely grown in Sri Lanka (Paranavithana 1967 p. 11) and if the Kuveni story is to be believed even from "pre-Vijayan" times. We also know from sculptural remains and extant paintings that even the royalty of the time used comparatively scanty clothing, with mostly a dhoti around the waist as fitting a hot climate. The peasantry undoubtedly wore a similar type of clothing of coarse material and with the average peasant owning very probably only a single change or two of clothing. We know that just like there were social strictures on the types of building allowed to the peasantry there were similar strictures on clothing (the upper half of the body not to be covered by the lower castes for example) a practice that survived till a few decades ago in several parts of the country. If we are to use the Kuveni story as evidence of the use of cotton before " Vijayan " times, we can hypothesise with a fair degree of reasonableness that the pre-Sinhalese Sri Lankan probably had the same type of dress as the later Sinhalese.

The artefacts used in the home can also be reconstructed from remains of pottery etc. and from extrapolation backward of the possessions of the present day peasantry. Pottery used during this period would have been very similar to the ones used till very recently in Sri Lanka as indicated by a successful classification of ancient pottery (Gunasekera at al 1971) using existing types, in fact pottery remains at the "megalithic" site of Pomparippu conforms to some recent traditional types. (ibid). (Types of pottery are a good indicator of life styles as well as standards of living, a particular pot being in existence for a more or less specific use, the persistence of a similar type over millenia thus indicates persistence of a similar life style and standard of living).

At Anuradhapura a folk museum has been put up recently which has collected items of everyday use in the area which are indicative of the life style of the premodern type. The museum classification does not differentiate on the basis of class, for example the Serakkali an eating stand on which the bowl of rice was placed and whose use was only restricted to the upper strata being kept alongside other artefacts. But with observations in the life style of the peasantry of even very recent times we can draw the following items from the museum as indicative of their possessions ; pots, wooden spoons, coconut scrapers, winnowing pan, mats, wicker baskets, betel pouch,

betel cutter, gourd containers, knives, mammotties, axes, grinding stones, ropes etc. From our knowledge of descriptions during early histroic times and available remains in the form of pottery and ironware, it is very unlikely that the life possessions of the early historic peasant whould have differed much from this, it might possibly have been marginally lower or higher but by not much*. The possessions of 'megalithic' man, whom we know used iron, possessed pottery, had artefacts like grinding stones and probably used cotton would not have differed very much.

If then the life possessions of the peasant has not increased, except perhaps marginally, from megalithic through the Sinhalese hydraulic times, where has the surplus generated by the improved irrigation technology gone?. One ansewr would be that it was all absorbed by a population explosion, but this is unsatisfactory as we know that there were quantum jumps in the technology with rapid increases in irrigated land at certain times which would have certainly overtaken the population increase.

Not all the population in the land was involved in agriculture ; there were artisans like metalsmiths, potters, brick and tile makers, workers in stone and carpenters. We also know from the possessions the peasant had, that only a part of these craftsmen could have created utensils for the peasant. Thus the output of brick and tile makers fed only the courts and the temples as probably did the major output of such persons as painters, sculptors etc. In addition to these non-agricultural personnel the agricultural surplus also supported the court, officials and the monks, the latter in Anuradhapura alone numbering in the tens of thousands.

A quite significant part of the surplus was spent especially indirectly through the support of stone masons etc. in setting up the massive edifices and buildings for the temples and the court. The Mahavamsa and the present surface remains provide adequate evidence of this.

The first edifice in this genre was the Thuparama stupa which with a diameter at its base of 59 ft. was built in the 3rd century B.C. During the next two centuries the stupas reach massive proportions, in Dutugemunu's time, the Mirisvatiya having a diameter of 108 feet at the base and Ruwanveliseya having 289 feet diameter with a hieght of 300 feet. The Abhayagiri and the Jetavana built in succeeding centuries had diameters at the base of respectively 355 feet and 367 feet and heights of 350 feet and 400 feet. These stupas were built of solid brick masonry. Most of the non-peasant dwellings were of wood and literary works refer to " splendid masnions of kings and nobles " (Paranavitana p. 16). Dwelling quarters of monks were also imposing and generally of wood structures, the most well known of these being the nine storey structure Lovamahapaya. In addition we know from structural remains that these edifices were ornamented with sculpture and bas reliefs, often having a religious significance and sometimes reaching colossal dimensions as in the Buddhist sculptures of Aukana, Buduruwagala, Gal Vihare etc. Similarly both court and temple had carefully done paintings.

Thus, in the division of the benefits that accrued from the improved agricultural system we see a sharp cleavage in the class structure. A continuing period of accumulation at Anuradhapura and other centres benefitted the upper classes of this feudal civilization whilst the peasantry

---

*In parentheses we should also note that the material possessions at another museum, the Veddah exhibit at Colombo museum, indicate that life possessions of the historic and recent peasant would not have differed much from that of the historic Veddah. The Veddah artefacts at the Colombo museum display include, bows and arrows, axes, rope, sandals made of skin, gourd containers, wicker baskets, mats, betal bags and pouches, coconut scrapers, winnowing pan, coconut spoons, pots, bead strings, ola books and a toy cart. This is a list almost identical to that of the peasant except for the tools of livelihood ; bows and arrows in the case of the Veddah ; mammoties and ploughs in the case of the peasant.

continued to live at roughly the same living standard with perhaps only a marginal increase in their standard of living. We also know that the surplus was generated without the use of much organised violence and without the extensive use of slaves-slaves and serfs පවේණි දස *praveni dasas* existed in the thousands even in Buddhist temples but in comparison with the total population it was not significant as a factor in the accumulation process. The social cleavage extended to all aspects of life and consumption items. We know that Sri Lanka exported items in the luxury category like " precious stones, conch shells, tortoise shells, and ivory " and imported luxury items like gold, silver, glass, ceramic and porcelain etc. (Paranavitane ibid p. 12) The exchanges that occurred in the import and export trade were exchanges principally between the consumption items of the affluent classes of Sri Lanka and those of other countries. The literary references are also replete with references to the luxurious and easy life led by those associated with the feudal centre.

The question that has to be framed is how and by what mechanisms were this differential access to resources and social cleavage made acceptable to the mass of the peasantry, who were the principal producers of this surplus. There is evidence that the legitimisation of this social cleavage at the level of royalty was done specially in the later centuries of the hydraulic civilization by a particular cult of kingship. Thus Hema Goonatilake (1974) has traced the growth of the cult of Bodhisattva as an ideology of kingship in Sri Lanka and shown how the rule by royalty was made acceptable. It is within the framework of this social cleavage as well as the use of symbols including the arts in the maintenance of this system, that clues to the nature of our traditional culture have to be found.

The Introduction of Buddhism and Sinhala Language

Customarily the beginnings of our traditional culture meaning those that have a bearing on arts and crafts, are placed at the era of the coming of both the Sinhalese and Buddhism. Both these events we should note occurred at a time when the irrigation system was in the process of consolidation, giving rise to a fair surplus, which in turn could support a royal court. We have seen how with the further consolidation of the irrigation system in the following centuries visible symbols of this surplus accumulation at the centre emerged in the form of gigantic edifices. The two great events of the cultural history of this country namely the introduction and spread of Sinhala Language and the Buddhist religion can be related to the time when the irrigation system was giving a sufficient surplus for a central kingdom to emerge. What is the nature of the relationships of the emergent centralised kingdom with these two broad cultural elements? An examination of the formal introduction of Buddhism in the 3rd century B.C. for which much historical detail exists, (unlike details of the introduction of Sinhala language) provides us interesting insights into this process.

Buddhism was officially introduced by Devanampiyatissa from Asoka's India through the latter's son Mahinda. We know from the Mahavamsa the events that preceded this introduction and the nature of the relationship that existed between the two countries. The evidence suggests a strong patron-client relationship between the Indian and his Sri Lankan counterpart. Thus Devanampiyatissa's envoys bear precious gifts to Asoka, although not perhaps signifying tribute, at least signifying the latter's supremacy in the region. Asoka responds in return by sending gifts (interestingly enough indicative about the nature of the Buddhist Kindgom, the gifts include " a maiden in the flower of her youth " Mahavamsa XI). The gifts significantly included " all that was needful for consecrating a king " and whilst sending a message about Asoka's adoption of Buddhism and recommending Tissa to do likewise he also advised Tissa's

ministers to " consecrate my friend yet again as king " (ibid). Asoka's envoys who returned with Tissa's ministers put this admonition into practice and these envoys " most faithful to their king (Asoka) consecrated the ruler of Lanka, whose (first) consecration had been held" earlier. (ibid). After thus getting consecrated once agian by the envoys of the powerful neighbour Tissa also took the same prefix- Devanampiya ('friend of the gods'-ibid) as his mentor.

Mahinda who brought official Buddhism to Sri Lanka leaves no doubt about the particular relationship between the two kings when he discusses the most opportune moment to come to Sri Lanka for conversion purposes. He states "In that great festival of consecration *commanded by my father** shall the great king Devanampiyatissa take part ,and he shall know the splendor of the three things, when he has heard it from the envoys." (ibid xiii) The actual conversion story and the events thereafter are of the overawing of the king by apparent supernatural events and the testing of the king on his intellectual abilities and the subsequent conversion of the royal court and nobility.

It would be over simplistic to suggest that the conversion of the king and the royal court was only a cultural imposition on a small ruler by his overload. This aspect we may call after Joseph Needham, the external dynamic, but there were equally important internal dynamics for the adoption of the religion. We had earlier indicated that this was a time when the hydraulic civilization was in the process of consolidation and a surplus was growing that could support a royal court. We also know that Devanampiyatissa sent gifts ("tribute" one could even say), to Asoka, was "commanded" to be consecrated by the latter inspite of being already consecrated and changed his name to Devanampiya, all of which acts clearly indicates that Tissa was seeking legitimization for his rule. That is, he was seeking means to consolidate at a level of ideology his hold on the country. It is within this context of a means of consolidating power by acts of legitimacy that one has also to view his acceptance of Buddhism which was recommended by his mentor Asoka. In this sense acceptance of Buddhism is—apart from the intrinsic merits and truths of the religion—a means of providing justification for secular power, and this marriage of the state with religious ideology is a theme that echoes through the subsequent centuries.

The fact that the marriage was at least partially unconnected with the truths and otherwise of the religion and that it was adopted as a unifying cultural product of a powerful neighbour is illustrated by many "un-Buddhistic" (or almost anti-Buddhistic) elements that were given expression in its manifestation in Sri Lanka. Thus Buddhism in being introduced did not in fact disturb many of the existing social institutions of "feudalism" whilst on the other hand it tended to bolster them by legitimising the existing rule. Thus on the completion of the Thuparama "the women of the royal household, the nobles, ministers, townspeople and all the country folk brought each their offering" (Mahavamsa XVII) indicating that not only the existing social structure survived but was strengthened by Buddhism. In fact even the dwellings of monks, the viharas, were named to take into account their social origins based on their class and caste affiliations, Issarasamanaka for the monks from noble families and Vessagiriya for those belonging to the Vaisya caste (Mahavamsa XX).

The Sri Lanka example of the relationship between the state and religion is in contrast to the key Indian royal figures in Buddhism namely Buddha and Asoka. The former "ran away" from state power and tended to undermine some of the underpinnings of that society, like the caste structure. Asoka similarly turned away from brutal secular power "*Digvijaya*"

*Emphasis mine

and turned to "*Dharmavijaya*". The contrast occurs more strongly in the second royal figure of Sinhala Buddhism after Devanampiyatissa, namely Dutugemunu. Like Aoska, Dutugemunu is remorseful at the number he has killed in his war but the *Sangha* consoles him by saying that really not thousands were killed but only one and a half, one being a fully ordained monk and the half a lay follower ; all others killed were "unbelievers and men of evil life" and so "not more to be esteemed than beasts" (ibid) Further, Dutugemunu himself marched in war with a Buddhist relic in his spear, as complete a symbolic act that could occur illustrating the use of religion to defend the state power at the expense of even a fundamental reversal of the teaching.

The echoes of the use of Buddhism in support of a state with a strong social cleavage occurs in the centuries to come. The art, architecture, and literature that arose in the coming centuries are to be seen in this light. But before discussing this it is necessary to speculate on the other cultural strand of the country namely Sinhala Language and its introduction for which there is less hard evidence than in the case of the introduction of Buddhism. For the introduction of Sinhala too, one has to view it from within Needham's categories of the internal dynamic and the external dynamic.

We have indicated earlier that settled agriculture based on irrigation in the country was associated in its early stages with the "megalithic" culture of South India. We also know that the legendary reference to Vijaya speaks of only 700 adventureres (who incidentally obtained wives from South India and not from the North) a much smaller figure than the population that we can assume existed at the time. Small populations of conquerors like say the Romans in Europe we know, have left the imprint of their language in the conquered lands. In the case of Sinhalisation of Sri Lanka it was not a case of a Rome—like imperial power establishing its will and culture sustained over centuries by a carefully laid out military and governmental framework co-ordinated from a foreign imperial centre.

In Sri Lanka it was the case of a group of adventurers who established a literal beachhead, and a generation later had only established a few settlements (not to mention that this generation by then was already half north Indian and half south Indian, a process of rapid miscegnation that was to continue in the centuries to come) and who compared to the overall pouplation was still a very small proportion. For a reasonable explanation to Sinhalisation one has to go in a more plausible direction than that of pure military imposition. It is here then one can speculate that the forces that helped Sinhalisation were the same internal dynamic as that which helped the adoption of Buddhism, namely a desire to accept a foreign import and obtain legitimacy at the time of an increasing surplus and consequent increasing tendency towards centralisation and the growth of a kingdom.

Although the Sinhalisation process we have sketched above as a cultural imposition to strengthen the secular state sounds plausible, we however know definitely that the subsequent development of culture in the country was within the context of a state with a strong social cleavage. We have already seen how concurrent with the development of the irrigation system massive stupas and similar structures had grown up. There have been suggestions that the stupa has similarities to the burial mounds of later pre-historic period with a possible linear relationship between the two (Senaratne 1965) from which view point the *gharba* of a *stupa* (as the one at display at Anuradhapura museum) does not become the cosmological symbol that Paranavitana imagined but a simple burial cist, which it very closely resembles.

Whatever the possible connections of the stupa with the pre-Buddhistic burial mounds these structures have no direct significance to the objective of Buddhism, namely the attainment of *Nirvana*. The massive size the stupas and other monuments reached in Sri Lanka, suggests comparisons between the use of massive architecture as forms of ideological control in other contexts to overawe the population, examples in the Western context vary from imperial Rome to Hitler's Germany. The growth of massive stupas and collosal architecture is in keeping with our central thesis of the use of "Buddhism" and its associations as a system of state control by the holders of state power. The growth of colossal sculpture is again related to this use of ideology—early Buddhism which was a movement away from the material had no statues of the Buddha.*

Apart from the use of stupas and sculpture in this way other cultural products like architecture including layout and interior decoration, sulpture, painting, music and dancing and literature also divided itself on the basis of the social cleavage. We have already mentioned that architecture demarcated itself strongly into one of the court and those associated with it including the monks and one of the common folk. The former's buildings were formally disigned, laid out on formal aesthetic criteria, built of quality materials of large size, with decorative motifs including sculpture and paintings, and with almost modern toilet facilities. The grandness of these structures increased dramatically with the increase in surplus The architecture of the common folk on the other hand were largely mud hovels "designed" organically out of the interaction of scores of generations of persons living in and struggling against a common physical environment at only subsistence level. No individual sculpture or painting except of most rudimentary kind adorned their dwellings. Similar contrasts existed in lay out and interior decoration. Archaeologically we are aware of the formally laid out parks, e.g. the Ran Mas Uyana or the Sigiriya complex as well as of sets of buildings with proper inter-relationships to each other as for example the Polonnaruwa complex around Kirivehera. Non-habitable architecture as we have already noticed, specifically the *stupas*, grew to gigantic proportions in Sri Lanka, to serve an ideological function. The king erected these and though he himself visited and enjoyed them, their ideological function in helping to maintain the state structure was that they were seen by, and paid homage to, by common folk. These factors are again repeated in the sculpture of the land which also often grew to gigantic proporations. Paintings (though extant remains are not so widespread as sculpture due to their rapid physical deterioration) also performed a religious function with the possible exception of Sigiriya which might have been a secular painting for the private benefit of the king and his court.

Personal dress and ornaments also likewise varied according to the class structure. The surviving sculptures as well as paintings depicted those around the court with jewelled head dress, jewellery on arm band and waist wearing fine clothes with a studied deportment about them. As for the common folk, one can surmise that they lacked a formal coiffure as well as expensive jewellery.

---

*The use of religions and religious symbolism to bolster state and secular power was also paralleled by an opposite trend, viz. that of the religious authorities to become increasingly tied directly to surplus extracting processes. Initial large grants of land to the Sangha, (usually villages with the associated *Villagers* who gave rise to the surplus) turns in later centuries (10th) into heavy monastic landlordism, whilst in the Kandyan period one is aware of close blood ties between the holders of secular power and religious power (a custom which one must observe still persists today) (Gunawardene 1965, Evers 1971)

We are aware from sculptural remains and the available literature that dancing and music, very similar in nature to those of our immediate neighbours existed in the royal courts. There was also music and dancing in the ceremonies of the capital, for example those associated with water cutting, and the tooth relic ; and, in the villages in the ceremonies associated with the harvest. Although dancing and music in the royal court would have been largely for the needs of pleasure ; the function of music and dancing in the case of the public would have been to draw the populace towards religion. Thus dancing in a Perahera like that associated with the Temple of the Tooth would have performed this function in contrast to the dancing in the king's court which was for his private pleasure. An exception seems to be festivities connected with harvesting etc., which although connected with religious overtones do not necessarily tie with the forma religious system legitimised by the state.

Literature is a vast corpus of material which can be analysed in the light of the framework we have indicated. This is significant specially in the context of the importance that the written word had in transmitting information to the people through the intermediary of village level monks. We will not touch on this in detail except to make the following brief remarks that are indicative of our thinking.

The Mahavamsa, one of Sri Lanka's most proud literary products is a direct offspring of the marriage of state power and Buddhism being a narrative of both. It is also significant that the appearance of Dipavamsa and the Mahavamsa coincide with the maturity of the irrigation network and the growth of large scale dagabas and colossal sculptures. The Mahavamsa leave no doubt as to its ideological import when it ends every chapter with the exhortation " Compiled for the serene joy and emotion of the pious ". This exhortation at the end of a chapter occurs, it should be noted, after some chapters describing in a very *real politik* and partisan manner, bloody wars, dynastic feuds and blood letting on a massive sacle, drawing echoes of Kautilya and Machiavelli. It is also significant to note in considering the worldly attitudes of the Mahavihara monks that the Mahavamsa records very avidly the structures put up, lands and other gifts donated to its sect but it is comparatively silent on the detailed spiritual attainment of its members. (The excegetical literature of Buddhism at its early phase is replete with such attainments). The ideological function becomes more explicit with the passage of time as is evidenced in the excerpts in the footnote below of excegetical stories from the Saddhamalankaraya (1953 ed.) on the giving of alms to the monks even at the expense of tremendous personal suffering are extolled*. This indicates strongly the marriage of this worldliness and religion and an exhortation for the average listener (that is for the average peasant) to accept the worldly order of things and yield to both Caesar and Christ even his last morsel of food and his last shawl.

We have not looked at in this brief overview of culture either the vicissitudes of conten and form in art, the impact of various strands of Buddhism, as well as the dynamics of the cultural processes at the village level, apart from listing out the limited access to culture the peasant had

---

*Thus a daughter of a certain poor man was slaving in a household to clear a debt. The father worked very hard and earned the necessary Kahavanu to redeem the daughter. On his way to fetch the daughter, he saw a monk and changing his mind, he bought a meal with the money for redeeming the daughter and offered it to the monk. Later the man told the daughter what happened and partook of the merit . (p. 555)

During a famine, a certain household tied the little rice available in a cloth, boiled it in water and satisfied their daily hunger with that. The process was upset when a monk came to their house. They thought " Just because we had not given alms in the previous birth, we are starving like this. If we obtain merit now by offering a meal to the monk, we will never have a time like this ". They cooked the little rice in the bag and offered it to the monk. (p. 675)

A popular metaphor used today (I believe it is after Martin Wickremasinghe) to describe the socio-economic as well as the cultural life of the village is the twin symbols of the tank and the dagoba. These in our terms respectively signify at the village level the means of sustenance for the villagers (as well as surplus creation for the non-peasant classes) and the main centre of information and symbol disbursement. We have discussed how at the centre a marriage between those having access to the surplus namely the "feudal" court on the one hand and religion on the other arose to provide a system of legitimisation of rule. These factors in the centre of administration in the country are also paralleled at the village level. The king and his court, who are the ultimate beneficiaries of the surplus have at the village level, surplus extractors in the form of officials for tax collecting etc., who hold primacy in secular matters at the village level. The main religious fraternity and its associated body of symbols, images etc. also have their counterpart in the village represented by the local *pansala*. The latter performed the function of transmitting downwards the literature and the thought coming from the central monastic establishment. In this way, specially the monks, perform the useful function of keeping the populace tied to the legitimised *status quo*. It is this local monk who in face-to-face encounters with the peasant population reads out the Mahavamsa view of society and history ending with the exhortation " compiled for the serene joy and emotion of the pious ", naturally, with pious cries of " Sadhu " from the populace one may add. It is the monk who reads from the Saddhamalankaraya and Pujavaliya the relevant passages of giving both to Caesar and Christ, again amidst cries of " Sadhu ". The ideological control on the population from centre to periphery seems to be complete. In this light the role of the dagoba and the tank appears in effect as respectively the giver of surplus to those above and the maintainer of law and the given order and not the romanticised functions that is purveyed by Martin Wickremasinghe.

Further we have shown the increasingly—worldly economic and social ties between the secular power on the one hand and the religious on the other, at the level of the country's centre in the form of large scale monastic land lordism and the like. A similar parallel process occurs at the village level with very probably the main *Dayakas* of the *pansala* being both the king's tax collectors and the maintainers of law and order. The connection between the religious centre and the tank at the village level we should note reach back, as we have already indicated, beyond the time of both Buddhism and the Sinhalese, to the pre-Buddhistic magalithic times. Urn burials associated with the megalithic culture and which had a particular religious significance were always beside the tanks they served.

We have discussed very briefly the class context within which the culture was created, transmitted and observed. However, within the settings of class and the particular requirements of the growing state in Sri Lanka, which determined the broad outlines of the culture a definite content and form was also transmitted and formed. If we look at first the religion itself, religious thought as well as associated philosoply, psychology etc., were absorbed by this cultural complex. We have drawn attention only to the ideological uses of these factors, but not of neccessarily to the intrinsic uses and merit they would have had. We have drawn attention to the ideological uses of Buddhism but there were also those who really cared for its fundamental goals and truths in the spirit of Buddha's search for truth. There would have thus been many individuals who whould have reached the heights of meditative powers and psychological perceptions described in Buddhism. There were personnel motivated by the intrinsic goals set by Buddha and sought to achieve a view of truth by following the Buddha (and other sages in the primary Indian tradition) in a personal renunciation and individual search for truth. These monks would have existed in small groups or sometimes like the later Vanavasins would have banded together. But the

basic design that Buddhism in its marriage to state power in Sri Lanka meant that the activities of these individuals were not necessarily the primary goals of Sri Lanka State Buddhism. The institutionalised goals were those implied in our earlier descriptions.

The formalised state pattern* which religion took also coloured the functioning of so called non-orthodox traditions. Abhayagiri itself we know was in size as large an edifice as those of the so called orthodox tradition and Fa-hsien records the same order of magnitude of monks there as in the case of the Mahavihara. In later centuries with the growth of Mahayana in the sub-continent, religious centres of Sri Lanka follow suit at least to some extent reaching even international eminence. Thus the Chinese Emperor sends Amoghavjra to Sri Lanka to collect 500 Tantrayana texts in the 7th century indicative of the wide spread of Mahayana. Later Mahayanist influences continue to have a strong impact on the state religion itself as indicated by, the main sculpture complex at Polonnaruwa namely the Galvihara. These accretions in the official theology continue in the years ahead although the official ideological organs continue to call this changing body of thought and practice Theravada. Theravada, therefore in effect becomes not the " original " teaching as is usually implied but the official sanctioned corpus of the state religion with its ideological implications and connotations.

The styles of painting, sculpture and architecture also changed during the entirety of the traditional period. These styles are largely a product of the cultural contacts within the South Asian region and one can delineate parallels to Sri Lankan art within the region, as for example between the painting at Sigiriya and Ajanta. Similar parallels are seen in styles of sculpture literature, etc.

These similarities do not imply however a pure diffusionist view of art from the kingdoms of India to Sri Lanka. On the other hand, these kingdoms and ours are to be seen as an interconnected cultural matrix mutually influencing each other. Within this common cultural matrix Sri Lanka makes also original contributions as for instance in the characteristic Sri Lankan styles in both the seated as well as standing Buddhas. The Sri Lankan tradition also fashioned with a possible parallel in South India (at Nagarjunakonda) a unique decorative door step, the Moonstone having a possible religious symbolic meaning (although we must note that this presumed symbolism only exists in the minds of romantic arachaeologists, in the 20th century than in the official chronicles or other ancient descriptions). Similarly guardstones developed into a distinctive Sri Lankan style with a certain floridity about it.

In literature too (all the four languages, Sinhala, Tamil, Pali, Sanskrit, of Sri Lankan literature being of mainland origin) major styles like the Mahakavyas are followed as for example in the *Kavsilumina*, *Sasadavata* and *Muvadedaveta*. (One of the earliest extant Sinhala work is a translation of Dandin's *Kavyadarsana*, one of the major works on Sanskrit poetics). The Sandesa poetry form although it was probably derived from Sanskrit models like Kalidasa's Meghaduta, similarly develops into a distinctive genre of its own. But in these works too, the descriptions and the ideology supports the existing social order. The Indian *Jataka* stories were

*The overpowering effect of the formal religious body of thought tied to state power has apparently had a stultfying effect on intellectual originality in this field. It is therefore, significant to note that Sri Lanka with its tradition of state patronage of Buddhism (or may be because of it) has not produced a single major thinker of any originality compared with the mainland names like Nagarjuna, Dinnaga etc. Commentators like Buddhaghosa and Dharmapala are not in this category of original thinkers. The only Sri Lankan religious thinker of any originality, Aryadeva a disciple of Nagarjuna was nurtured in a foreign clime and is never mentioned in the local literature (with possibly one oblique reference in the Mahavamsa) although biographies of him exist as far away as in Japan and China.

also translated into Sinhala but although these described sometimes the life of everyday people of India, the underlying social ideology, as opposed to an individualised ideology of personal liberation—was that of supporting the existing social order.

We have in the descriptions above given a broad outline of the growth of our traditional culture within a particular socio-economic framework. To summarise these ; the twinpillars of the culture, Sinhala Language and Buddhism were introduced at a time of consolidation of state power on an all Island basis with the growth of an adequate surplus. Buddhism, specially, closely allied itself with state power. The cultural artefacts that grew in the country can be demarcated into a culture of the peasant masses and the culture of the overlords. The growth of massive architecture and collosal sculpture is to be explained within the context of this dischotomy and the growth of state power. The cultural artefacts of the masses remained throughout this period at roughly the same level as those of the megalithic period or perhaps marginally higher. At the village level intermediaries exist between the peasant and the organs at the centre exemplified in physical terms by the tank and the dagoba. However the tank provides the surplus which is extracted by the local official for transmission upwards and the monk at the dagoba provides the ideological justification for the *status quo*, the surplus extracting official being probably the chief *dayaka* of the temple, However, within this cultural ideological control system serving the surplus extraction towards the centre and keeping the peasant at roughly the samle living standard level through virtually 2500 years, real aesthetic experiences occur. The scuptor of stone gets a sense of accomplishment as do the later onlookers of the finished product get a feeling of *rasa* if their artistic consciousness was sufficiently high. But such high consciousness is again dependent on exposure to the arts and descriptions and discussions about them, which in turn means such aesthetic experiences were limited only to the elite either at the centre or at the village level—although of course significant sections of the masses could have seen such finished artistic products and being overawed by them.

Concluding Note

The above discussion relating to the growth of Sri Lankan culture as almost a necessary adjunct to the growth of a centralised kingdom based on the surplus from irrigated agriculture has not referred to the mechanisms by which this surplus was collected or to the relations of production. This concluding note will briefly refer to these aspects specially in view of the fact that some of the writers on the political economy of early Sri Lanka (such as Murphy 1957) have used concepts, implied or explicit—such as Witfogel's "hydraulic society " and Marx's Asiatic mode of production which imply a particular social organisation of the production apparatus. However, it should be noted that the arguments relating to the collection of surplus and its use which I have described above can stand without a detailed description of the mechanics by which this is done.

First the system of land tenure. The King was not the sole owner of land (Siriweera 1972 p. 11–19), although he had ownership rights on waste and jungle lands in addition to the plots of land specifically owned by him. Land was owned by individuals as well as bodies such as the monastries, the King himself at times engaging in private transactions to purchase land (ibid p. 48), the resulting system of tenure involved " a wide variety of tenurial obligations " (ibid). Specifically these arrangements mean that in early Sri Lanka there was no collective ownership in land which 19th century writers such as Maine (1876) claimed to have existed in South Asian countries (Siriweera p. 23).

The surplus was extracted by the ruling strata–the king and his district level governors and associated officials–by two principal means, taxes and service obligations. Taxes were on paddy lands, as well as *chena* (ibid p. 36) whilst there were also taxes on trade (ibid p. 39) as well as on irrigation water (ibid p. 40). The system of tax collection was devolved and decentralised to regional chiefs (ibid p. 49) the decentralised system being therefore feudal rather than administrative. Taxes could be paid in kind or cash (ibid).

The extracting of surplus by service obligations, was what later came to be known as *rajakariya*, service for the king. Such *corvee* activity bound every laymen for service in public works such as the construction of irrigation works, monuments etc. (ibid p. 27). The Mahavamsa description of the building of the Mahathupa in the 2nd century B.C. (Mahavamsa p. 199) indicates how service labour was mobilized for public works.Relcase of large amounts of labour for such public works meant, as we have noted earlier that the agricultural system was capable of producing a sufficient surplus to provide for the labour as well as for the craftsmen and the thousands of monks both of which categories were not directly involved in agricultural production.

Murphy (1967) attempted to fit Sri Lanka's irrigation based socio-ecomomic system to Wittfogel's (1957) concept of "Oriental Despotism ". Leach (1959) showed that Wittfogel's scheme did not fit the Sri Lanka case. As Wittfogel's concepts owe heritage to Marx's Asiatic mode of production I am repeating here some of Leach's points as it will facilitate our discussion on the Asiatic mode of production.

Wittfogel's conceptof "Oriental Despotism" is based empirically on his observations on classical China and is theoretically dependent on Marx's original ideas. One of Wittfogel's underlying aims in his work was a polemic with the Soviet Union and was an attempt to show that the Soviet Union was an un-Marxian embodiment of repressive social principles found in "oriental" societies. His view was that "oriental" societies depended on irrigation systems controlled tightly by an overwhelming bureaucracy, and gave rise consequently to a most oppressive state. In these states based on widespread irrigation systems ("hydraulic societies") the ruling political regime was, because of the tight bureaucracy, despotic rather than feudal. Leach correctly pointed out that in the case of Sri Lanka, although it is a society based on large scale irrigation, there has been no tight administratvive control of the system. On the other hand control has been through a more develoved feudal system based on *rajakariya* (the devolved nature is best illustratied by the ancient records referring to the virtual contradictory expression of *disave rajakariya*—"provincial governor's king's work "—Leach p. 17). If then early Sri Lanka does not fall into the category of an administrative despotism, how does its known characteristics compare with Marx's Asiatic mode of production.

Marx's ideas on Asian society were based largely on his readings on India. To Marx the Asiatic was one of the four principle modes of production that he discussed, Asiatic, Ancient, Feudal and Capitalist. Of this the first, the oriental, had as a basis direct communal property and had not yet formed itself into a class society. The central characteristic of this system was "the self sustaining unity of manufacture and agriculture" at the level of the village commune which thus contained "all the conditions for reproduction and surplus production within itself" (Hobsbawm 1964 pp. 70, 83, 91). The Asiatic systems could also be organised in various different ways, decentralised or centralised, "more despotic or more democratic". In this mode cities, according to Marx, have virtually no place ; Asian cities occuring only where "the location is favourable to external trade or where the ruler and his satraps exchange their revenue

(surplus product) for labour, which they expend as a labour fund" (ibid p. 71) The essential works of communication and control of irrigation systems would be done by "the despotic government which is poised above the lesser communities" (ibid). To Marx the "Asian history is a kind of undifferentiated unity of town and country (the large cities, properly speaking, must be regarded merely as a princely camp superimposed on the real economic structure)" (ibid p. 77).

It is also interesting to note that classical Marxist formulation of the Asiatic system left it out of the classification of a "civilization" as Hobsbawm (p. 51) has observed from reading Engel's *Origin of the Family*.Engels* includes under the "three great epochs of civilisation", the slave based (ancient) system, the serf based (feudal) system of the Middle Ages and the wage labour based (capitalistic) system but excludes the Asiatic mode as belonging to the prehistory of "civilisation". Engel's further amplifies the nature of this society in *Anti Duhring* "the ancient communes, where they continued to exist have for thousands of years formed the basis of the most barbarous form of state, Oriental Despotism, from India to Russia" (quoted in Leach p. 3).

How does this brief summary of the characteristics of the Asiatic mode agree with the known characteristics of ancient Sri Lanka ? First the system of land tenure : land was *not* held as communal property, as we have pointed out earlier, instead a complex system of tenurial arrangements existed. Land was held communally in the manner depicted by the Asiatic mode generally only by monks, where almost by definition of a monk's community, land had to be held communally (Sangika) although even here "private " (*puggalica*) ownership was known (Gunewardena 1972 p. 72). Communal holding in the monk's community was not a characteristic of the general socio-economic system but an expression of the system of belief of the Buddhist clergy. comparable say in the case of modern capitalist America to the existence of various idealist groups and " communes " who have property in common, although they exist within a broader privately owned economic system. The system of land tenure and revenue in Sri Lanka characterised itself as a more decentralised system closer to European feudalism than to the system sketched by Marx.

The city in Sri Lanka, (specially Anuradhapura or Polonnaruwa, and to a lesser extent provincial ones such as Tissa, or ports such as Jambukola and Mahatittha) does not correspond to the " Asiatic mode ". These cities were not simple " princely camps for the ruler and his satraps " to exchange their revenue for a labour fund. Anuradhapura, as its massive ruins, as well as written records both Sri Lankan (Mahavamsa) and foreign (for example Fa Hsien) reveal, was a large city that had grown up organically to fit into the role of political, economic, social and cultural centre for the rest of the country side, the only Sri Lankan city that would fit the description of a princely camp being perhaps Sigiriya. There was also a strong differentiation between town (Anuradhapura) and the country, on these dimensions of the political, economic, social and the cultural ; and consequently town and country was not an undifferentiated unit. The strong social differentiation which existed between the ruling strata (the king and his officials in the city, and regional *disavas* and their officials in the country side) and the population also belies the non-emergence of a class society under " Asian " conditions.

However, at the village level (or more accurately at the level of a collection of villages) one could discern a more or less self sufficient unit with both manufacture which was largely caste based) and agriculture meshing into each other, thus to a certain extent agreeing with Marx's

*Gunewardena (1972 p. 27) has pointed out that Marx and Engels have differed somewhat on their interpretations of Asian society, specially on the nature of the "Asian " state, Engel's interpretation giving the picture of a more repressive system than that of Marx.

depiction of a unity of manufacture and agriculture in the Asian village. But I find it difficult to see how this differed in a major way from Medieval European villages which were also more or less self sufficient in this manner.

Marx's main concern was with the emergence of capitalism from (European) feudalism and his interests on and knowledge about previous systems were limited. The knowledge by Europeans of Asian systems at the time Merx was writing over 100 years ago were extremely limited—not to mention being often bigoted and tainted with prejudice.*

Hobsbawm has also pointed out that at the time of Marx's writing anthropological knowledge of non-European "primitive" societies was virtually non-existant, whilst Marx himself was thin on pre-history and on Non-European societies in general although he had a markedly better grasp of the existing knowledge of India and other parts of Asia. The lack of fit of Marx's Asiatic mode of production to Sri Lankan ancient system has to be seen within this context. Marx's attempts being the application of powerful and insightful tools of analysis to the existing incomplete, and even false data of his time.

If then neither Marx's Asiatic mode of production nor Wittfogel's specialised derivative of it does not fit adequately the known facts on Sri Lanka, how can we describe the mechanics of the early socio-economic formation of Sri Lanka. An attempt is made below in the following summary.

The early Sri Lankan system began with the gradual consolidation and centralisation of an irrigation based agricultural system. Although centralised there was also in the final system a high degres of devolvement and autonomy to regional units. The tenure, revenue collection and irrigation repair and maintenance systems was also often decentralised although at times centralised control and mobilisation were resorted to specially in times of war and in the case of really large scale works. The irrigation based agricultural system had social contradictions (in the Marxist sense) with the major contradiction being between a ruling "class" formed around the king and his regional governors on the one hand and the mass of the peasantry on the other hand. Further, the social mechanisms of the caste system gave rise to a social division of labour at the level of crafts and services allowing other economic activities to be undertaken. As the system grew there was an increasing cleavage between town and country, as well as potentially between the rulers and the ruled. The tendencies to cleavage and disruption in the system was not prevented by a strong administrative and despotic system but largely by cultural and ideological means. In the early part of this paper we have discussed in detail how this ideological system operated both at the centre (the town) and the countryside, down to the village. We have indicated how ideological factors played a key role in the formation of the centralised system as well as in its later maintenance.

The growth of a centralised state was paralleled by the growth and consolidation of the irrigation system. Although ideological Sri Lankan history in the form of the Mahavamsa gives the impression that a unitary kingdom was established as early as the 3rd century B.C. (or before at the time of Vijaya if we extend the credibility of the Mahavamsa to the legendary period), there is strong evidence from inscriptions that this was in fact not so. Inscriptions referring to regional rulers are found all over the country upto the 1st century B.C. (Hettiarachchi

*The Indian historian Romila Thapar 1978 has drawn attention to the fact that although Marx was critical of the existing literature on European systems he accepted more or less uncritically the existing literature on Asian systems.

1972 pp. 144, 145) and the existence of regional rulers are also occasionally corroborated by literary references (ibid). The consolidation of central authority on an all island basis was apparently successful according to Hettiarachchi (ibid p. 152) who has studied the kingship system of Sri Lanka, only at the time of Vasabha (2nd century A.D.) in whose time we should also note that the first large scale irrigation systems were constructed (ibid p. 156). These facts push one to the conclusion that centralisation was finally achieved only when the irrigation system reached sufficient dimensions and spread its tentacles to large parts of the country.

However, this delete consolidation of central control was at least four centuries after it was both historically proclaimed in Anuradhapura (during Devenampiyatissa's time) and the ideological glue in the form of State Buddhism to legitimise the rule was introduced. The percolation of State Buddhism to the peripheries of the Island to make this ideological glue reach the various regional units down to the village level would, we could assume, also have taken a few centuries which was also the time taken to consolidate centralised rule.

In conclusion we should note that system of ideological control is a 'soft' system of control in contrast to a despotic and overtly repressive kind. In this it is more reminiscent of how advanced capitalist societies of the late 20th century are held together (ideological and cultural control forming a significant part of the control apparatus) than how early 19th century societies were held together by harsher repressive means.

References to Literature

DERANIYAGALA, S. (1971)—"Pre-historic Ceylon—a summary in 1968", *Ancient Ceylon*, No. 1 Dept. of Archaeology, Colombo.

DERANIYAGALA, S. (1972) *Ancient Ceylon*, No. 2 Department of Archaeology, Colombo.

EVERS, HANS-DIETER (1972) *Monks, Priests and Peasants*, LEIDEN : E. J. BRILL.

GOONATILAKE, HEMA (1974)—*The Impact of Some Mahayana Concepts on Sinhalese Buddhism*, PhD. Thesis London.

GUNASEKERA, U. ALEX *et al* (1971) " A Corpus of Pottery Forms Found in Ceylon ", *Ancient Ceylon*, No. 1 Department of Archaeology, January 1971.

GUNAWARDHANA, R. A. L. H. (1966)—*History of the Buddhist Sangha in Ceylon from the time of Sena* 1 *to the Invasion of Magha* 800—1215, Unpublished PHD Thesis 1966 London p. 282).

GUNAWARDHANA, R. A. L. H. (1972)—" Some Economic Aspects of Monastic Life in the Later Anuradhapura Period : Two New Inscriptions from Medirigiriya ", *The Ceylon Journal of Historical and Socia Studies*, New Series, Vol. II, January—June 1972, Ceylon Historical and Social Studies Publications Board, Peradeniya.

HETTIARACHCHI, TILAK (1972)—*History of Kingship in Ceylon*, Lake House Investmens Ltd. Colombo.

HOBSBAWM, ERIC (1964)—*Pre-Capitalist Economic Foremations* by Karl Marx, LAWRENCE & WISHART, London

LEACH, E. R. (1959)—" Hydraulic Society in Ceylon ", *Past and Present*, No. 15, April 1959.

Mahavamsa (1960) Government Information Department, Colombo.

MAINE, H. B. (1876)—*Village Communities in the East and West*, 3rd Edition, John Murray.

MURPHEY, RHOADS (1957) " The Ruin of Ancient Ceylon ", *Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol. 16, No. 2, February 1957.

NICHOLAS, C. W. (1960)—" A Short Account of the History of Irrigation Works upto the 11th century ", *Journal of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, New Series, Volume VII, Part, I, Colombo.

PARANAVITANA, S. (1967) *Sinhalayo*, Lake House Investment Ltd. Colombo.

PIERIS, P. E. (1922) " Nagadipa and Buddhist Remains in Jaffna ", Part I *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* Vol. 26, No. 70, 1917.

SENARATNE, S. P. F. (1965) *Journal of the National Museums of Ceylon*, Vol. I, Part I March 1965.

SENARATNE, S. P. F. (1969) " Prehistoric Archaeology in Ceylon ", *Ceylon National Museums Handbook Series*, Department of National Museums, Ceylon.

SIRIWEERA, W. I. (1972)—" Land Tenure and Revenue in Medieval Ceylon (A.D. 1000-1500), *The Ceylon Journal of Historical and Social Studies* New Series, Vol. II, January-June 1972, Ceylon Historical and Social Studies Publications Board, Peradeniya.

THAPAR ROMILA (1979) *Ancient Indian Social History* Vikas.

WINTLE, A. G. and OAKLEY, K. P. (1972)—Thermoluminescent Dating of Fired Rock-Crystal from Ballau, Bandi Palassa, Ceylon, *Archaeometry*, No. 14 Pt. 2.

WITTFOGEL, K. (1967)—*Oriental Despotism*, New Haven.

Printed at the Department of Government Printing, Sri Lanka