



















# The Ceylon Antiquary

and

## Literary Register.

Published Quarterly.

Vol. X.

July, 1924.

Part I.

### DIMBULÁGALA: MÁRÁVIDIYE CAVE INSCRIPTION.<sup>1</sup>

By

H. C. P. BELL, C.C.S. (Retired.)

THIS is one of the few lithic Inscriptions—eight in all,<sup>2</sup> so far discovered—of the more or less disturbed period, a century and upwards, covering the reigns of Vijaya Báhu I, and his immediate successors, Vikrama Báhu I (son), Jaya Báhu I (brother), and Gaja Báhu II (grandson); or roughly speaking the latter half of the Eleventh Century and the first half of the Twelfth up to the accession of Parakrama Báhu I.

Photographed and “eye-copied” by Mr. H. C. P. Bell, Archaeological Commissioner, in 1897, and again “eye-copied” by the specially trained Head Overseer of the Archaeological Survey (A. P. Siriwardhana) in 1903, the rock record has been since thrice dealt with by two editors:—

1. For previous Papers on this Inscription, see “*The Ceylon Antiquary*,” 1917, III, pp. 1—12, *Epigraphia Zeylanica*, 1917: II, pp., 154-9., pp.190-202, 1924.

2. *Vijaya Báhu I* : (i) Ambagamuwa, C.P., (Sinhalese), 38th year ; (ii) Polonnaruwa, N.C.P. Tamil, 56th year ; (iii) *Jaya Báhu*: Budumuttáva, N.W.P., (Tamil), 8th year; (iv) Dimbulágala, N.C.P., (Sinhalese), 27th year ; (v) Polonnaruwa, N.C.P., (Tamil), 28th year ; (vi) Polonnaruwa, (Tamil) 38th year ; *Gaja Báhu II* Polonnaruwa, (Tamil) 15th year; (vii) Polonnaruwa (Tamil), undated ; (viii) Kapuru Veda Oya, C.P., (Sinhalese), undated.



(i) In 1917 Mr. Don M. de Z. Wickremasinghe, Epigraphist to the Ceylon Government, issued text, transcript and translation (*Epigraphia Zeylanica*, 1917, Vol. II, Part 4, pp. 184-189), based upon (a) a "squeeze" (ink impression) and (b) a photograph.

(ii) The same year Mr. Bell (*The Ceylon Antiquary*, 1917, Vol. III, Part I, pp. 2-12) published variant text and translation, with (a) reproduction of his photograph taken from the rock inscription itself, and (b) photograph of his own "eye-copy," both made in 1897.

Several notable divergencies exist between versions (i) and (ii)—the most important being Mr. Wickremasinghe's mislection of "Vijaya Báhu," as the name of the King in whose 27th regnal year the Inscription was cut, instead of the actual name on the rock, viz: "Jaya Báhu."

For two years Mr. Wickremasinghe did not reply to Mr. Bell's criticism. But in 1919 a fresh edition of the Inscription by the Professor was forwarded to the Ceylon Government from England, and referred to Mr. Bell for his observations.

Abridged extract from Mr. Bell's report of March 15th, 1919, appears below:—

A revised edition of the Dimbulágala Cave panel Inscription is certainly advisable. But not yet; nor in the form Mr. Wickremasinghe at present contemplates issuing it.

What is wanted (in the interests alike of epigraphical and historical truth) is—not a manifestly unconvincing rejoinder to Mr. Bell's Paper in "*The Ceylon Antiquary*," such as this provisional effort of Mr. Wickremasingha, based, as it is, on doubtful readings from a treacherous "squeeze" and "squeeze photograph," but—*finality*.

As Mr. Wickremasinghe is disinclined to accept Mr. Bell's and Siriwardhana's independent "eye-copy" versions of the text in "*The Ceylon Antiquary*" (obvious clerical and printer's errors, of course, eliminated),<sup>3</sup> supported by the direct photographs, as published by Mr. Bell, he should apply to the Ceylon Government to depute some competent "third party" to make a careful letter-for-letter "eye-copy" of the record, as well as—if considered necessary—a fresh photograph of it, and fresh "squeeze."

---

3. These are (a) three *laksi calami* in copying Sinhalese vowels, *dinu* (Bell, 1897) for *dinú* *Ealinga*, *dema* (Siriwardhana, 1903) for *Kalinga*, *dama*; (b) two quite excusable printer's errors, *ahinnarú*, *Dumbulugale* for *abhinnavú*, *Dumbulegale*, as actually eye-copied (*C.A.*, III, Plate VI) (c) accidental, and very obvious, omission of "at Dimbulágala" after "great Sun Cave" in the English translation, the Sinhalese text giving the word distinctly (*C.A.*, *loc. cit.* pp. 7-8).



On account of the manifestly inchoate form of Mr. Wickremasinghe's second edition of the Dimbulágala record, now advanced, it is most desirable that he should place himself in a really sound position to bring out a final revision.

Mr. Wickremasinghe already admits the main issue of Mr. Bell's Paper in "*The Ceylon Antiquary*"—"Jaya Báhu," not "Vijaya Báhu," as the name of the King in whose regnal year the Inscription was granted.

Leaving aside fairly debatable arguments on minor side issues (which Mr. Wickremasinghe urges with perspicacity), the greater part of this revised version of his rests its strength for disputed readings of the text itself on the evidence of "squeezes"—those too frequently elusive *imaginis umbræ* "shadows without substance"—as opposed to "eye-copies" (two, and independent : Mr. Bell, 1897 ; Siriwardhana, 1903), and a photograph taken by Mr. Bell of the panel record on the Cave's rock roof.

An entirely fresh "eye-copy" by an impartial expert (with possibly further photograph and "squeeze"), as suggested, should carry conviction ; and for this essential light Mr. Wickremasinghe will no doubt be content to wait before publishing any revised edition of the Inscription. It is not, needless to say, a question of *Wickremasinghe v. Bell*, but of relative value of observed facts *versus* presumed theories, which Epigraphical students have the right to count on.

Finally, Mr. Wickremasinghe would, it is submitted, do well to re-write much of his "Preamble," eliminating all recrimination, as unworthy, undignified, and quite out of place in a staid Government Publication."

(iii) After the lapse of a further period of five years—or seven years in all since 1917—Mr Wickremasinghe has just issued (*Epigraphia Zeylanica*, 1924, Vol. II, Part 5, pp. 194-202), a second edition of the Dimbulágala Inscription, which is virtually the same as that put forward in manuscript in 1919, save that—doubtless as the result of judicious pressure in England—the letter-press has been rightly purged of the unjust insinuations and jarring tone which marred it originally.

*Quem deus vult perdere*—the learned Professor can no doubt supply the *aposiopesis*.

Mr. Wickremasinghe has most assuredly been unwise (to put it mildly) in not acting on the salutary, and friendly, advice tendered him from Ceylon in 1919. *In pertusum ingerimus dicta dolium*. He elects to stand to very uncertain guns, unsupported, as they are, by that valuable independent aid which he had but to seek from the Ceylon Government to have readily accorded him.

Mr. Bell has no intention of prolonging the well-intentioned



but undesirable, controversy with his erstwhile colleague in the Archaeological Survey of Ceylon.<sup>4</sup>

It is far better that entirely "fresh blood"—some admittedly well-qualified scholar thoroughly steeped in the History and Epigraphy of the Island—should be infused into the final struggle with this unique Inscription, so that it may be disposed of once for all—a consummation devoutly to be wished by all Ceylon Epigraphists.

Towards this end, it may prove of service to such future investigator to summarise here succinctly the position as it stands today, by :—

(1) Tabulating the points of divergence in the Text between (i) (iii), Mr. Wickremasinghe's two versions, and (ii) Mr. Bell's and Siriwardhana's original readings, which stand advisedly unaltered

(2) Adding adequate supplementary evidence regarding the disputed rendering of one all-important term (*kusalān*.)

(3) Offering brief tentative remarks in regard to Mr. Wickremasinghe's startling chronological solecism—the attribution of a posthumous regnal date to Jaya Báhu, the King to whom (in the commonly understood sense) the Inscription properly belongs, though executed by Sundara Maha Devi, widowed Queen of Vikrama Báhu I.<sup>5</sup>

#### A. Variant Readings.<sup>6</sup>

Line 2 A. (Wickremasinghe, 1917) *lada voṭunu me* (.....n)

4. Mr. Wickremasinghe (educated at Richmond College, Galle), joined the Colombo Museum as Assistant Librarian in 1887. Transferred as Native Assistant to the Archaeological Commissioner from March 1st, 1891, he served with the Archaeological Survey until February 28th, 1893; when he severed his connection in order to proceed to Erlangen University to "fit himself for advanced philological research." From Germany he passed to England, filling the post of Secretary to the Indian Institute at Oxford for some time, with Professorships in Sinhalese and Tamil. Appointed Epigraphist to the Ceylon Government from January 1st, 1899, Mr. Wickremasinghe has in the intervening quarter of a century issued eleven parts of the *Epigraphia Zeylanica*:—Vol. I, Parts 1-6 (1904-1912), Vol. II, Parts 1-5 (1912-1924).

5. "No one after reading it on the rock panel would attempt to rob the Royal Lady (Sundara Maha Devi) of her just rights in the record: clearly she is the authoress, as self declared. But it is no less true that the Inscription as surely 'belongs' to the reign of 'Jaya Báhu Vat-himivá, 27th year'." (Bell, *C.A.*, III, p. 10, 1917).

6. Mr. Bell sees no justification whatever in 1924 for amending his and Siriwardhana's "eye-copy" readings made in 1897 and 1903 respectively, and printed in *C.A.* 1917, III, p. 7 the above specified pen and printer's errors necessarily excepted.

Of the seven variant readings here given, Mr. Wickremasinghe has now (1924) accepted Mr. Bell's version, wholly or for the most part, in four cases: in three he abides by his own view.











B. (Bell, 1897, 1917 ; Siriwardhana, 1903) *de voṭunu mēṇḍe upan.*

C. (Wickremasinghe, 1924) *de voṭunu mēṇḍe upan*

Line 2 A. (Wickremasinghe, 1917) (*vedú*)

B. (Bell, 1897, 1917 ; Siriwardhana, 1903) *lada.*

C. (Wickremasinghe, 1924) *vedú.*

Line 4 A. (Wickremasinghe, 1917) *hiru*

B. (Bell, 1897, 1917 ; Siriwardhana, 1903) *hiri*

C. (Wickremasinghe, 1924) *hiri.*

Line, 4, 5 A. (Wickremasinghe, 1917) *maṅga (dunū evu a . . . rem bu) n (yēdú) kebaligal (hasvá) maṅga pavat koṭa.*

B. (Bell, 1897, 1917 ; Siriwardhana, 1903) *maṅga daṇa eva damavalí yana minisunge duka balá gal gasvá pavat koṭa.*

C. (Wickremasinghe, 1924) *maṅga (or maṅge) dunū ev (or evu) dama elí yana minisunge duka balá gal hasvá maṅga pavat koṭa.*

Line 5 A. (Wickremasinghe, 1917) *leṇa*

B. (Bell, 1897, 1917 ; Siriwardhana, 1903) *leṇa*

C. (Wickremasinghe, 1924) *leṇe*

Line 5, 6 A. (Wickremasinghe, 1917) (*Kaliṅgu le*) *ṇa yá (dánavat Vi) jaya Báhu.*

B. (Bell, 1897, 1917 ; Siriwardhana, 1903) *Kaliṅga leṇayey nam tabá Jaya Báhu.*

C. (Wickremasinghe, 1924) *Kaliṅgu leṇayey nam tabá Jaya Báhu.*

Line 7 A. (Wickremasinghe, 1917) *De (maḷé peḥe siri kusalán) karavá yá bat pudanu koṭa (lov) pavatná.*

B. (Bell, 1897, 1917 ; Siriwardhana, 1903) *De maḷé ve- hesara kusalán karavá pá bat pudanu koṭa leṇa pavatná.*

C. (Wickremasinghe, 1924) *De (maḷé peḥe siri kusalán) karavá yá bat pudanu koṭa (lov) pavatná.*

Line 7 A. (Wickremasinghe, 1917) *Devime.*

B. (Bell, 1897, 1917 ; Siriwardhana, 1903) *Devima*

C. (Wickremasinghe, 1924) *Devimu (or Devimha).*



## B. Kusalán.

Reading “(siri kusalán) karavá” in the Inscription (line 7), Mr. Wickremasinghe translates: (*Epigraphia Zeylanica*, 1917, Vol. II, p. 189.) “Caused the construction of sacred kusalán (vessels ?)”

Mr. Bell (*The Ceylon Antiquary*, 1917, Vol. III, p. 8), finding no siri preceding kusalán on the rock, rendered the two words kusalán karavá, “dedicated for the sake of religious merit”; adding in a footnote. “In modern Sinhalese pin gamak karavá ‘making (it) a village dedicated for the sake of religious merit.’ The expression occurs not unfrequently in inscriptions, e.g. Nakalogane Vihárá, N.W. Province (where it is used several times); Balāḷu-veḡwa, N. C. Province, kusalánaṭa pidí.”

On this Mr. Wickremasinghe (*Epigraphia Zeylanica*, 1924, Vol. II p. 189), now comments:—

“As to what a kusalána is I am still uncertain. According to Clough’s *Sinhalese Dictionary* and the *Piyummala* it means ‘a drinking vessel.’ Mr. Bell thinks that it is a pin-gama (Skt. *punya grāma*), a village dedicated for the sake of acquiring merit; but he gives no authority for his interpretation. His quotation kusalánaṭa pidí gives him no help, but supports my interpretation. Besides, if Mr. Bell’s view is accepted, the clause ‘*daru kusalán maṅga kusalán pera paridden tabá*’ in the Galpota record at Poḷonaruwa (*E.Z.*, 1917, Vol. II, p. 111) would be difficult of explanation.”

Misreading the clause in the Galpota Inscription (lines 23, 24), as “*devadána daru kusalán maṅga kusalán pera paridden tabá dí*,” Mr. Wickremasinghe naturally flounders in his translation—“re-established offerings to gods, *daru kusalán*, and *maṅga kusalán*, as existed in the past.” Regarding the phrases left untranslated, he footnotes: “Probably ‘drinking vessels for children’ and ‘drinking vessels on the roadside for travellers’.”

The excellent “squeeze” photograph of the record reproduced by the Professor should alone have sufficed to steer him clear of the bog into which sheer carelessness has landed him. For the actual reading of the words on the “stone-book” is plainly “*daru kusalán maha kusalán*”;<sup>7</sup> and the real meaning “meritorious benefactions small and great.”

7. *Daru gedí maha gedí*. Common present-day Sinhalese term for small and large coconuts and other fruits.



Mr. Wickremasinghe—not infrequently weighted by unfortunate mislection<sup>8</sup> incumbis—sinks still further into the mire when he meets *kusalán* again in the Ambagamuwa Inscription he has just published (*Epigraphia Zeylanica*, 1924, Vol. II, Part 5, pp. 202-218.)

After stating that Viyaya Báhu I—to quote the Professor's own words (p. 217)—“dedicated (to the sacred footprint) all the properties (situated) therein (*viz.* at Vilbá),” consisting of a garden, *koṭavēli* and their arecanut produce, in several districts and divisions, that record proceeds: “*me tuvák ten kusalán botá koṭa.*”

This sentence Mr. Wickremasinghe reads correctly until he reaches *botá* (end of line 43), which his evil genius has led him to twist into *bó(pá)*; and to translate the whole sentence: “In all these places he set up *kusalán* and *bópá*”; footnoting ingenuously: “The exact meaning of *kusalán* is still uncertain. Cf. *daru kusalán* and *maṅga kusalán* of the Galpota Inscription. *Bópá* may be a derivative of P. *bodhi-páda* ‘the sacred Bodhi tree’ or more likely *bodhi-patta* ‘bowl for the Bodhi tree.’”

*Botá* (derived seemingly from Sanskrit *bhaṭ* “maintain”) is quite clear on the rock; was so read by Mr. Bell when he first copied the Inscription in 1891<sup>9</sup>; as by his Head Overseer Siriwardhana in 1906; and has been again checked very recently (1924). The combined sentence “*kusalán botá koṭa*” bears the appropriate signification “having made (*koṭa*) a meritorious benefaction (*kusalán*) to be (ever) maintained (*botá*) at all these places (*me tuvák ten*).”

Mr. Wickremasinghe desires “authority” for “Mr. Bell's view” that the true signification of *kusalán*, in these ancient lithic grants to Buddhist monasteries, is “religious benefaction for the sake of merit.” There is “authority” galore.

First, as to derivation. The word *kusalán* (“drinking-vessel” only in its secondary sense) is derived from Sanskrit *kusa* “water” *lāna* (Skt. *lana*) “giving” or “receiving” (strictly “placing”), and signifies literally “a benefaction given and received by the pouring of water.”

8. See *Ceylon Antiquary*, 1918-19; IV, pp. 19-35, V, 1919-20, pp. 20-30.

9. Mr. Wickremasinghe (*E.Z.*, 1924, *loc. cit.*, p. 202) unwittingly errs in stating “some 12 or 15 years ago”; for Mr. Bell had copied the Ambagamuwa inscription as far back as 1891 when Archaeological Commissioner. It was briefly alluded to in 1883 by Dr. E. Müller *Ceylon Inscriptions* p. 72 (169).



The Professor will find distinct reference to this archaic religious ceremony in the *Mahāvamsa* (Ch. XV, 24-25), where is recorded a notice of the quaint formalities observed by King Devanampiya Tissa in bestowing the Mahámegha Uyana upon the monks at Anurádhapura.

" 'It is well,' said the King, and taking a splendid vase he poured water, in (token of) giving, over the hand of the Théra Mahinda, with the words, 'This Mahámegha-park do I give to the brotherhood.' " (Geiger)

An illuminating passage in regard to the word *kusalán* occurs in the *Maitri Varnanāva*: "*kusalán gasá kévoda.....é Maitri Budun dekkā nehekmaṃya.*"<sup>10</sup>

How universally recognised the expression "*kusalán*" in the sense of "religious benefaction" became many lithic records sufficiently attest, *e.g.*, Ambagamuwa (C. P.); Dimbulágala (N. C. P.); Polonnaruwa, Galpota (N. C. P.); Batala-goda (N. W. P.); and Nákolagane Viháre (N. W. P.).

The full text of the first three of these Inscriptions has already been published (*E. Z.*, 1915-1924 II; *C. A.*, 1917, III., 1918, IV.); besides allusion to the fifth, and to a short record at Balaḷu-veṃva (N. C. P.).

The record of the Batala-goda and Nákolagane Viháre Inscriptions<sup>11</sup> is now added, so that the oft reiterated use of the term, unmistakable in its technical signification, may be duly emphasised.

#### Batala-goda.

- (15)....*Vihārayāta kusalán karanu kemeti (ve pe) re kusalán*....  
 (16.) ....*Me kusalānāta hasaraṇāyak kaḷa ekek eṭṇam kēvuḍu beḷu bat kēyek baḷu*.... (17.)....*āta maḥha narakeyeḍi duk pesunoya Me apa kaḷa kusala matuvannavun taman kaḷā sé(veyi).*

10. For this reference, and other generous and valuable suggestions, hearty acknowledgment is due to the learned monk Pandit Mābopitiye Medhankara, Vice-Principal, Sangarāja Pirivena, Kandy.

11. Copied by the Archl. Survey in 1895, and recopied in 1909. The record measures 4 ft 7 in. by 2 ft. 7 in., and consists of 18 lines of writing. Categorically stated (*Archl. Survey, Annual Report*, 1895, pp. 10, 13) to belong to Parākrama Báhu I, the clear-cut date (B. V. 2101) and character fix lines 14 onwards to the 16th Century.

Regarding "*Bandāra-pote Pirivatubim Vijaya-navān*," the "*Agusmal*" of the *Mahāvamsa* (LXXX, 32, 38) See *C. A.*, IV., 1918, p. 30.)

With "*Kusalán Digpitiya*" of "*Kusalāna Malal*," a hill in the E. P. with Buddhist ruins and very ancient inscriptions. (*C. A.* IV, 1918, p. 113).



“ Being desirous of making a charitable gift (*kusalān*) of . . . . . to the Vihāré . . . . . (the former) charitable gift . . . . . Should any one cause harm to this benefaction, he will become like one who eats the rice (left for) dogs and crows, and will suffer woe in the Eight Great Hells. May the merit (*kusala*) of this action which we have performed accrue to others in the future, as though done by them.” (C. A. IV. p. 31.)

### Nakalagane.

(1) *Vijaya Bhaṇḍārapotun ambu Sumedhā* (2) *Devīn praveṇīn valandā ā Seriyā* (3) *vyavasthāvata bada tenin Nāgalata* (4) *kusalān koṭe pidū Setaṁaṇḍalas* (5) *say In paṭavanā dakuṇu digin* (6) *pasamunek vaṭanā pasayaṭayi* (7) *Siṭavinen Kusalān Diggipitiyayi* (8) *Mekun put Patkrama Atvara Mind Atvara* (9) *dennā praveṇīn vyavasthā koṭa valandā ā* (10) *Nāgalata vaṭanā pasayaṭa pidū Muṇḡainayi* (11) *Paḷalugode Pantis-yāle bada Valvasarin* (12) *Giribhaṇḍusā Kumārayan Nāgalata kusālān* (13) *koṭe pidū Kuḍa Mugalana Maha Mugalanayi* (14) *Buddha varsha dedās eksiya ekayi Uḍuver* (15) *iye Chuttila Malbyā (ne)ṅgini mekun mehe (ni)* (16) *n samaṇḡiva Nāgalata kusālāna koṭa pidū Kuru* (17) *goḍa idiripīṭa dasamuṇa kusālāna pasamuṇa vaṭanā* (18) *pasanaṭa . . . . .*

(At side). *Nāgala Bambigas-vera pasamuṇa kusālānayi.*

“ From the place (called) *Seriyā* continuously possessed as ancestral property, according to decree, by (his) wife *Sumedhā Devī*, *Vijaya Baṇḍāra Potun* donated *Setaṁaṇḍalassa*, as a charitable benefaction (*kusalān koṭa*) to *Nāgala (Vihāré)*.

“ The existing boundaries (of the land) are (as follows) :— Southwards (the land) of five *amuṇams* set apart for the needs of the priesthood ; (West) from *Siṭavinen* (the land called) *Kusalān Dikpitiya*; (North), (the land called) *Mugayina*, continuously possessed as ancestral property, according to decree, by their two sons *Parākrama Atvara* and *Mind Atvara*, set apart for the needs of the priesthood at *Nāgala (Vihāré)*; (East), (the lands called) *Kuḍa Mugalāna* and *Maha Mugalāna*, from *Valvasara* belonging to *Pan-tis-yāle* (*lit.* thirty-five *yālas*) at *Paḷalugode* gifted to *Nāgala (Vihāré)*, as charitable benefaction, by *Giribaṇḍu Kumāraya* in the year 2101 of the Buddhist era. (A. C. 1557-8).

“ Of the ten *kusalān amuṇams* (of land) opposite *Kurugode* five *amuṇams* are donated, as charitable gift, to *Nāgala Vihāré* by *Malbayā* of *Uḍuveriya*, jointly with his sister and mother, for the



needs of the priesthood....Five amunams of Bambigas-veva at Nágala (are granted as a) meritorious benefaction."

Upon such evidence will any well-advised Sinhalese scholar be rash enough to descend to the bathos and hopeless error of rendering *kusalán*, in the particular connection—repeated as it is, again and again—by "drinking vessels"?

Even at this day, the correct use of "*kusalán*" in the sense of "religious benefaction" is familiar enough among the better-read Buddhist fraternity in Ceylon. The modern expression "*koholammu*" for "tenants of *viháré* property" may derive from *kusalán* through the medium of Sinhalese *koholan* "tenement of *viháré*."

### C. Chronology.

If there be one point more marked than others in regard to the history of the period which intervened between the death of Mahālu Vijaya Báhu I and the accession of his grandson Mahālu Parákrama Báhu I, it is the disagreement in the several Chronicles<sup>12</sup> touching the lengths of the reigns of Vikrama Báhu, Jaya Báhu and Gaja Báhu.

Here is the tale of regnal years in all its confusion:—

CHRONICLE	VIKRAMA BÁHU.	JAYA BÁHU	GAJA BÁHU
Mahāwaṇsa	21	1	22
Pújāwaliya	28	14	—
Rājawaliya <sup>13</sup>	28, 21	3, 1, 14	—
Narendra- Charitāva- lókana- pradipikāva	28	1	—

Yet in the face of this notable variance, Mr. Wickremasinghe would persistently reject a record inscribed on stone which still survives (*littera scripta manet*), to juggle with doubtful figures and haphazard assumptions from those figures, in order to bolster up an astounding theory, viz: that, despite their decease, Sinhalese Kings' regnal years could be considered as still current,

12. "Who will vouch for the accuracy of the written palm leaf chronicles of this period?" (Bell: C.A., 1917, Vol. III, p. 6).

13. *Rājawaliya*. Seven copies consulted: for Vikrama Báhu's reign, six give 28 years; one 21: or Jaya Báhu's reign, four give 3 years; two, 1 year; one, 14 years.



and lithic records deliberately dated under such fiction. *Credat Judaeus Apella.*

Given such glorious latitude, easy were it indeed for the happy Epigraphist to solve such cruses to his own complete satisfaction.

With strange fatuity Mr. Wickremasinghe ventures (*E. Z.* 1924, II., p. 200) on the categorical assertion that "Jaya Báhu was no longer living at the time when the (Dimbulágala) Inscription was indited."

Nathless Mr. Wickremasinghe has to admit naively that "this anomaly of dating from the coronation of a deceased king, the first of its kind yet known in Sinhalese Chronology, requires explanation." Verily does it—much explanation; and will still remain utterly untenable.

The grounds upon which Mr. Wickremasinghe (*E. Z.*, 1924, II., pp. 200-1) rests his case would appear to be these :—....

(i) Jaya Báhu could not reasonably have been "more than fifteen years" younger than his "uterine" brother Vijaya Báhu; consequently "at the time of his coronation he must have been at least 59"; and, therefore, "86" and "97" respectively when the records were out in the cave at Dimbulágala and on the pillar at Polonnaruwa in the 27th and 38th years of his reign.

(ii) "If we follow the sequence of events as narrated in the *Mahávaṇsa* (LXI. and LXII), we are bound to come to the conclusion that Jaya Báhu's death took place in Rohaṇa during the lifetime of Vikrama Báhu (LXII, 1—2), and long before the birth of Parákrama Báhu I."

(iii) "It is stated (*Pujávaliya*) that he (Jaya Báhu) reigned for 14 years."

Taking these allegations one by one.

(i) Here Mr. Wickremasinghe "begs" two questions—(a) the exact relationship of Jaya Báhu to Vijaya Báhu, and (b) his presumed age at his elder brother's death.

So far from Jaya Báhu having been necessarily "uterine" brother of Vijaya Báhu, there is interesting indirect evidence in favour of both Vira Báhu and Jaya Báhu being that King's



*half-brothers*, <sup>14</sup> sons of the same father Mogallāna by a different mother and much later bed.<sup>15</sup> The *Mahāvamsa* (LIX, 31, 43) distinctly states that Vijaya Báhu married two of his daughters by Queen Tilakasundari, namely Subhadra and Sumitta, the one to Vira Báhu, the other to Jaya Báhu.

It would seem, therefore, more than probable that Vira Báhu and Jaya Báhu, though by birth half-uncles of their half-sister Mitta's sons Mánabharana, Kitti Sirimegha, and Siri Vallabha, were of much their age; for those three brothers married the remaining three daughters of Vijaya Báhu and Tilakasundari.

After the deaths of Vira Báhu and Vijaya Báhu, and his own coronation, Jaya Báhu, in the prolonged civil war which ensued, sided with his half-sister, half-nephews, and half-nieces, and shared their fortunes in Southern Ceylon, being forced to abandon Połonnaruwa and the adjacent country to his half-nephew Vikrama Báhu, Vijaya Báhu's son, who was never crowned.

This solution, if correct, at once simplifies matters; and fully explains Jaya Báhu having reigned in the South for at least thirty-eight years since the death of his much older half-brother Vijaya Báhu, and seventeen years after that of Vikrama Báhu; whose son Gaja Báhu reigned contemporaneously with Jaya Báhu at Połonnaruwa, as proved by the Tamil pillar record uncarthed at that old Capital in 1900.<sup>16</sup>

(ii) *Pace* Mr. Wickremasinghe, Jaya Báhu undoubtedly survived Vikrama Báhu. Further, the *Mahāvamsa* narrative of

14. Three alternatives offer, choice depending on their comparatively probability:—

- (i) Mogallāna and Lokhitā (*Mahāvamsa*, LVII, 42) had four children, Kitti (Vijaya Báhu I) Mitta, Mahinda, Rakhita. The last two are not mentioned again under those names. If identical with Vira Báhu and Jaya Báhu (who married two of the daughters of their elder brother Vijaya Báhu, the other three being wedded to their cousins, Mitta's sons) it seems reasonable to assume that they were considerably younger, being born to Lokhitā after a long interval and very late in her child-bearing life.
- (ii) Mr. John Still (*Index to Mahāvamsa*, Table, p. 83, 1907) and Mr. Wickremasinghe (*E.Z.*, 1915, II. Table, p. 59) differentiate between Mahinda and Rakhita and Vira Báhu and Jaya Báhu, but allot all six children to Mogallāna and Lokhitā.
- (iii) As Jaya Báhu lived at least 38 years after Vijaya Báhu's death at 73, he and Vira Báhu may have been not unlikely sons by a later separate bed; and, therefore, only half-brothers of Vijaya Báhu and Mitta.

In this Paper the third alternative is adopted—for the nonce at any rate—as perhaps the most probable in all the circumstances.

15. The Máldivian definition of such relationship is expressive, viz:—*de-badu eb-bafá* ("two wombs, one father"). Oriental Rulers, to whom plurality of wives was the rule rather than the exception, often carried their uxoriousness into late life. Thus, to quote but one instance, the Máldivian Sultán Iskandar Íbráhim (A.C. 1658-1693) begot Kuda Muhammad, the boy who succeeded him, at the age of 62.



events runs quite smoothly in this respect from Vijaya Bahu's death to Parákrama Báhu's accession in A.C. 1153, with one solitary hitch—at first blush apparently clashing with our present certain knowledge from lithic records discovered of late years, but easily explainable.

For the "sequence" of Chapters LXI and LXII, and their context, are rudely broken by the interpolation of Verse I, obviously irrelevant, at the head of Chapter LXII. Manifestly it is quite out of place here, and in reality belongs to Chapter LXIII; wherein it would find fit setting after Verse 37.

The Páli stanza in question (Ch. LXII, I) reads :—

*Rohaṇe nivasitvá va Jaya Báhu mahápati*

*Mittavhá rájiniṇcheva tadá kálamakaṇsu te.*

"That King Jaya Báhu and Mitta, the Queen, died while they dwelt at Rohaṇa."<sup>17</sup>

(iii) The value attaching to regnal years in the Sinhalese Chronicles for this stormy period has been assessed above for what it is actually worth.

Civil war, followed by years of hollowly patched-up peace between Jaya Báhu and his half-nephews on the one side, and first Vikrama Báhu, and later his son Gaja Báhu, on the other, would offer conditions very far from conducive to the thoroughly reliable entry in palm-leaf manuscripts, not contemporary, of historical dates. Not till the accession of Parákrama Bahu I, and his long reign, ushered in an era more or less settled temporarily can such perishable chronological data be deemed at all trustworthy.

Mr. Wickremasinghe sets great store by the *Pujávaliya* as a safe guide for fixing Jaya Báhu's reign at but 14 years in all. To be consistent should he not equally adopt the same Chronicle's recorded period of 28 years for Vikrama Báhu, instead of the 21 years allotted by the *Mahāvamsa*, which he utilises to fit in with his theories?

In conclusion. This Paper has been drawn up in the hope of aiding any fresh scholar who may care to renew attack upon the panel Inscription at the Máraṇḍiye Caves on Dimbulágala

16. *Archl. Survey, Annual Report*, 1909, p. 27.

17. The *Mahāvamsa* Editors have imported into their Sinhalese Text "*negani*" before "*rájini*," as though inclined to understand by "Mitta," Jaya Báhu's sister (or half-sister), daughter of Mogallána and Lokhitá, instead of his wife Sumitta, daughter of Vijaya Báhu I and Tilakasundari.



(" Gunner's Quoin ") in Tamankaḍuwa, and be glad of all the light at present available.

The photo-lithographed print of the Inscription from Mr. Bell's negative of 1897 appearing in "*The Ceylon Antiquary*" (Vol. III, Plate V, 1917) being rather indistinct, an enlargement is here given on Plates I, II. Further, in Plate III appears a photo-lithograph of an accurate tracing of Siriwardhana's "eye-copy" made in 1903. This can now be compared with Mr. Bell's "eye-copy" reproduced as Plate VI, and his Sinhalese text as printed, in *C.A.*, 1917.





## SINHALESE AND THE ARYAN LANGUAGES.

**A Rejoinder to Mr. M. H. Kantawala, C.C.S.**

By GATE MUDALIYAR W. F. GUNAWARDHANA.

(Continued from Vol. IX, Part IV, Page 223.)

**N**OW when we examine the Aryan Vernaculars of India, we are struck with the remarkable manner in which what is here foreshadowed has actually come to pass and is there reflected in realized concrete manifestation. There we find the dative to be the case most in prominence, as widely popular as in Dravidian, and filling many a place which in Aryan some other case should occupy. To illustrate this last proposition, just two examples may be given from Sinhalese, the southernmost member of the group :—

English :	Go to the house.
Sanskrit :	House go (acc. of place).
Tamil :	To the house go (dat.)
Sinhalese :	To the house go (dat.)
English :	I have a book.
Sanskrit :	Of me there is a book.
Tamil :	To me there is a book.
Sinhalese :	To me there is a book.

The principle of declension, too, in Sinhalese is the very same as in Hindi. The terminal suffix of the dative case is derived from a true dative—the Sanskrit word *arthāya*, ‘for the sake of’, which as a suffix now appears in the attenuated form of *hata*, *ata*, and *ta*. Now, from a grammarian’s point of view, this suffix of the dative case appears in Sinhalese not only in its legitimate function to denote its own particular case, but also in extended functions to denote sometimes the accusative and genitive cases, as in the two examples already given.



The grammarian says that 'to the house' and 'to me,' in the two examples given, are in the accusative and genitive case respectively, for the reason that the verb concerned, governs such case in Sanskrit, as seen in the Sanskrit equivalents of the illustrations; and Sanskrit, he says, is the parent language. Whatever be the merits of the claim in favour of the parent language—and that is the very point we are after—we see that, as a matter of fact, the two expressions ('to the house' and 'to me') are in Sinhalese in the dative case with an undeniable dative suffix ('ta' = to the house - *geṭa*; to me - *maṭa*), and that, being in the dative case, they conform in the illustrations not to the Aryan, but to the Dravidian standard. It follows then that where the accusative, dative, and the genitive are identical in Sinhalese, from the point of view of Sanskrit grammar, their identity is due from a broader point of view, to the aggression of the dative case, under Dravidian influence, and that the extension, if any, is in direction from the dative to the other two cases, and not *vice versa*.

We started with the postulate—a postulate drawn from the results of scientific research (*Imperial Gazetteer of India*, pp. 351-2 already quoted)—that the same Dravidian influence was at work in the evolution of the Indian Vernaculars of the family. If, therefore, the same feature appears in the Hindi noun, we are certain that the process of extension was the same too, i.e., from the dative to the other two cases both in regard to function and to form. Therefore, of the Aryan apologists, only Trumpp with his *kṛtē*, which, despite of himself, we have recognised as dative, is now in court, the other two, with their accusative and locative origins of extension, being automatically out of court. Now, we have already seen elsewhere that the Sanskrit *kṛtē* could not have been the origin of the dative suffix *ko* of Hindi; in fact, Trumpp himself does not contend for it; his contention is that *kṛtē* is the origin of the accusative-dative suffix *khē* of Sindhi and *kē* of Bengali, and that the accusative-dative suffix *ko* of Hindi is from a Sanskrit accusative *kṛtam*.

According to the direction of extension we have seen above he, too, like the others, is thus out of court, apart from the question of merits already discussed; and thus we have only one theory left as the only possible alternative within the range of scientific probability, and that is the theory of Caldwell. He suggested that *ko*, the dative-accusative suffix in Hindi, and *kā*, *ki*, *kē*, the suffixes



of the genitive and the different variations of these in other languages of the group, are of Dravidian origin, being connected with the suffix of the dative case appearing in Tamil as *ku*. That theory was assailed at the time, and with enough success to make Caldwell withdraw. But, though assailed, the theory has never been scientifically refuted, and today in the light of the evidence of science, it is entitled to step back again into its place of eminence and to prevail.

### The Noun.

(6) I have already mentioned that in Sanskrit the noun has three numbers and that for each number the case suffixes are different. In other words, there are three sets of terminal suffixes in the declension of a Sanskrit noun. In Tamil, the terminal suffixes are all one set both for the singular and the plural number, the plurality of a noun under inflection being shewn by a suffix (non-terminal in the oblique cases) which to that extent changes the base, the rule being liable to idiomatic exceptions. The Aryan Vernaculars have but one set of terminals for both numbers of the noun, and in that great respect conforms to the Tamil system.

Here the advocates of Aryan structure can properly object that it was not so in the original Prakrit, nor in the Prakrit of the second stage as pictured in Jain Prakrit and Pāli, which were contemporaneous, and which, still preserving the synthetic inflection, do not show the moulding on Dravidian lines. We say in reply that if you go further back and back and settle on Aryan itself, you will be in a better position; that at the stage seen in the early Prakrits, the disappearance of the dual number already shews Dravidian influence; and that further changes under the same influence, continuously though unconsciously exerted by the masses with their patois, were but a question of time. When the vernaculars had fully evolved under such influence, we find them bearing on almost every feature the Dravidian stamp imprinted unmistakably.

On this Beames makes a flank attack in the shape of an observation which loses nothing in rhetorical effectiveness by being embellished with a beautiful figure of speech. He says :—

“ In the Indian languages postpositions took the place of the European prepositions; but in other respects the process (‘ of change from the synthetic to the analytic ’) was precisely identical



in both. It is not pretended that the European languages were subjected to non-Aryan or any other external influence to make them undergo these changes; it is admitted that they grew naturally out of the course taken by the human tongue and the human mind. The flower of synthesis budded and opened, and when full blown, began, like all other flowers, to fade. Its petals, that is its inflections, dropped off, one by one; and in due course the fruit of analytical structure sprung up beneath it, and grew and ripened in its stead." (*Comp. Gr.* Vol. i., p. 45).

Far be it from me to mar the effect of this fascinating picture. But with regard to the Indian vernaculars I have to observe that the appearance of the fruit of analytical structure is mere illusion, due to fancy, as regards the noun with which alone we are here concerned. For if postpositions are the same in character as prepositions, with only difference of place, then postpositions are significant words with an independent meaning and capable of independent existence. The same cannot be said of the apparatus, (*ko* and the other terminals), which help in the declension of the Indian noun; these are mere appendages with no independent existence, and, whatever the theories of their origin, they are true suffixes. That being so, the declension of the noun in these vernaculars is synthetic, and the fruit of analytic structure present in the European languages must be admired independently.

It may be urged that in Sinhalese, the dative suffix *ta*, coming as it does from *arthāya* (Sanskrit *arthāya*—Pali *aṭṭhāya*—Sinhalese *aṭaya-aṭa-ta*) is evolved from a significant word, and thus has not only passed the analytic stage, but is now on the second synthetic stage. The contention must be allowed, but it must be pointed out, at the same time, that it amounts to nothing; for if it is claimed that it shews analytic inflection, then the same can be said in favour of the Tamil verb, in the inflection of which all the terminal suffixes, as will be shewn hereafter, are relics or reminders of pronouns, just the same as *ta* is a reminder of *arthāya*. But both sides take it as a cardinal fact that the Tamil verb is not analytic, and that is one of the *bases* of argument.

### A More Formidable Objection.

Beames urges also a second and more formidable objection—more formidable in that it is more technical and combines the true and the fanciful in such a manner as to invest the whole with an air of reality. This is what he says:—



"Now it is very certain, as certain as anything can well be, that all the non-Aryan languages of India are still in the agglutinative stage. If, then, they exercised any influence on the structure of the Aryan speech, such influence would tend to make that also agglutinative; in other words, the Aryans would have had to go backwards, and try and find out what were the agglutinated particles from which their own inflectional terminations had arisen; and having found them, would have been led to use them no longer conveniently incorporated into their words, but disintegrated and separate. Thus, a vulgar Aryan who said *homi* for "I am," would have had to re-construct out of his inner consciousness the older form *bhavāmi*, and, not content with that, to further resolve *bhavāmi* into its two component elements of *bhū* and *āmi*, and henceforth to use these two words adjacent to each other, but unincorporated. This we see at once is out of the question and absurd." (*Comp. Gr.* vol. i. p. 46.)

Of course it is absurd; but the absurdity arises not from any weakness in the position attacked, but from the many errors into which the talented writer, in his warm advocacy, has fallen. In the first place, he again adjusts his glasses wrongly in supposing that the present Aryan vernaculars of India are an evolution from Aryan speech in the hands of Aryans. We have already seen what modern science has to say on the subject—that it evolved at the hands of Dravidian natives who handled incoming Aryan speech as a "pigeon," i.e. on the principles of their own idiom. There is therefore no point in the suggestion that a vulgar Aryan would have had to make a philological analysis of his inflectional system and recast it first into an agglutinative and then an analytical form. In fact the Aryan dolt and his vulgarity of speech need scarcely count in the business at all, except as subsidiary to the Dravidian peasant.

It was the latter who was responsible with the millions of his kinsfolk, for a readjustment of his language to suit new conditions made a daily necessity by the aggressive influx of a new element causing a general unsettlement. He knew nothing of synthesis or analysis, but did his best according to his habits of thought and ingrained ideas, going in the old ways as far as he could, and making improvements and new departures where the main object, clearness, made it imperative. If in this latter process he sometimes stumbled upon ways and means which science has since called analytical inflection, it was only natural under the circumstances, since it was the same necessity for clearness that led to the same result appearing in the analytical languages of Europe. Like begets like, and the fancy of a general movement of the human



mind sweeping like a wave over a particular family of human speech, is scarcely necessary to account for similar phenomena in two distant parts of the world arising under the same law of necessity. The argument of absurdity thus turns out on close inspection to be a mere bogey.

### Other Objections.

There are other objections brought forward by Beames, but they all have the same trend, due to the same cardinal error with regard to the true locus of evolution of these vernaculars. They therefore need no independent discussion after what has preceded. But there is one argument which should be reproduced if only to show the extent and magnitude of the strange fallacies which inspired the fervour of Beames as an Aryan champion, and indirectly gives us also an insight into the ideas current in his day among other champions of the cause—ideas still holding the field. Beames thus philosophises :—

“The ancient Indian languages are exact structural parallels to the ancient European languages, the modern are also precisely parallel to the modern of Europe ; does it not seem to follow, as a logical consequence, that the method and process of their change, from the one stage to the other, was also parallel, and in both cases, due to internal rather than external influences ?” (*Comp. Gr.* vol. i. p. 45.)

It must be owned that the ancient Indian languages (of the Aryan family, of course,) are exact structural parallels to the ancient languages of Europe (of the same family), but it must be flatly denied that the modern are also precisely parallel to the modern of Europe. Indeed, far from supporting the Aryan view, in the actual truth herein lies the full strength of the case on the non-Aryan side. In the modern languages of Europe which have become analytic, the noun is inflected by means of prepositions ; in modern Indian the declension is by means of what these scholars choose to call postpositions, but which are found to be in reality true suffixes. The analysis that is claimed is not the same in kind or quality if it existed ; but in India it is, as a matter of fact, non-existent.

To say that *ghōrē*, the nom. plur. of *ghōrā*, horse, or *pōthiyām*, the acc. plur. of *pothi*, ‘book,’ is analytic, is as correct as saying that *equ-i* and *litr-os* are analytic. It would be the same if *rājā-om-ko* and its Latin equivalent *reg-i-bus* (dative) were called analytic expressions. Again, in the verb of the European languages,



the ancient structure remains intact whatever changes the body of the expression may have undergone by phonetic wear and tear and shrinkage. In the Indian verb as well as in other parts of speech, phonetic loss is phenomenal, resulting in the wholesale disappearance of consonants. I lay, however, no stress on this; let the difference be dismissed as one of degree rather than of quality; but there are other changes, and those of a vital character, which cannot be accounted for as attendant on the natural course of physical abrasion, since they have reference not to the outer but to inner life and function, and correspond exactly to Tamil analogues. Two of these will here be simply mentioned.

In Aryan languages, as exemplified by Latin, Greek, Sanskrit, the verb carried the power of expressing passivity as much as activity by mere synthetic inflection operating on the stem; and in all these languages, the perfect participle was always passive (except, in a few roots, the deponents). In the Dravidian verb, passivity is unknown; hence, in Dravidian languages, these two characteristics depending upon passivity are unknown; to convey passive sense, a periphrastic form of expression has to be adopted, in which passivity still resides only in the final effect, but not in a verb. Now, what happens when the Aryan verb goes through the Indian village mill and comes out as the verb in the modern vernaculars? Why, its inherent power of passive expression is only a memory kept alive by an obscure dialect here and there, and, as a prominent feature, conspicuously absent from the broad face of the vernaculars as a whole. That was a change on the negative side, corresponding to a want in the Dravidian verb. When we come to the perfect participle, we find the change there still more remarkable: whereas the perfect participle was, in the language of origin, passive (as *visus* in Latin), it now appears with a strongly developed active side to its functional life: thus Sanskrit *dr̥sto bhavāmi*, Pali *dittho hōmi* means *visus sum*; but Hindi *dēkhā hum*, which is identically the same in structure, to say nothing of the origin, means not 'I have been seen,' as in Aryan, but 'I have seen' after Dravidian. What led to the change, the action of the Indian village mill, is patent; but while that should be borne in mind, the point to be noted here is that Beames was very much mistaken when he spoke of exact parallels, precise parallels, etc., in such confident and emphatic language. He says indeed that he was 'very imperfectly acquainted with the non-Aryan languages.'



How far he meant us to understand by that is not clear, but it would seem that he was not quite insensible to some of his outstanding difficulties in that direction, as the following confession shows :—

"It must therefore be always remembered that though the modern Aryan verb presents in its structure certain similarities to the Dravidian or Kol verb, and some analogies also with the Tibetan and Himalayan verb, as well as with the noun of both, yet this very similarity to two such widely sundered groups reduces us to the necessity of admitting that the connection is not one of family, but of stage. Tibetan and Dravidian alike are in the agglutinative stage; and, as mentioned before, the analytical stage, in which the modern Aryan languages are, resembles in many particulars the agglutinative stage, though the difference is generally to be detected by a close scrutiny." (*Comp. Gr.* Vol. i. p. 47.)

His facts here are more valuable to us than his explanation. On the facts then "the modern Aryan verb presents in its structure certain similarities to the Dravidian," and the similarity is to be accounted for on the ground not of family, but of stage, that is to say, as being due to the same stage. Yet, in the same breath, it is not due to the same stage! But let that pass. This is the question: Can the stage meant, whatever that may be, which, in any case, could only be concerned with the anatomy of a vocable, produce such a phenomenon as active functions from the passivity of a verb?

(7) In Sanskrit the singular and the plural forms of a noun are wide apart and never interchangeable. In Tamil, the singular may often be used for the plural, even though the objects be viewed in a state of detachment. Thus: *oru kudirei*, "one horse"; *aindu kudirei ververai vanginen*, "I bought five horses separately." In most Aryan vernaculars, the Tamil idiom prevails. Thus *ēk ghōrā*, "one horse"; *pāñc ghōrā*, "five horses"; *ṛṣikē vacan satya hōngē*, "the words of the sage will become true." (Kellogg, 2nd. ed. p. 396.)

(8) In Sanskrit, (and in the early Prakrits) the adjective was inflected for gender, number, and case, and, when used predicatively, such inflection was compulsory. In Tamil, the adjective is an indeclinable. In the Aryan Vernaculars, the Dravidian influence has so far affected the adjective, that it now halts between the Aryan and Dravidian, and sometimes entirely conforms to the Dravidian idiom. The following is an illustration of this full influence:—*vah aṭi sundar thi*, 'she was very beautiful' (Kellogg, 2nd ed. p. 426) where the form *sundar* has no distinction of gender, number, or case.



(9) In Sanskrit the case of possession is the genitive. Thus : 'I have a book' is *mama pustakan asti*, 'of me there is a book.' In Tamil, it is the dative. Thus : *enakku pustakam irrukiradu*, 'to me there is a book.' In the Aryan vernaculars, the idiom is the Tamil. Thus *mujkhō pōthi hai*, "to me there is a book"; *hamem inā jñān kahām*, "to us where is so much wisdom?" (Kellogg, 2nd ed. p. 403.)

(10) In Sanskrit, verbs expressive of communication (such as say, tell, announce, etc.) may take either the accusative, the instrumental, the dative, the genitive, or even the locative, of the person addressed, there being sometimes an option between two or more of these cases, with the accusative of the thing (see Monier Williams, *Sanskrit Dictionary*, under roots *kath*, *brū*, *vac*, *vad*, etc.) But, in Tamil, the rule is different and rigorous, and stringently requires the person to be in the dative case. In the Aryan Vernaculars the Dravidian idiom rules. Ex: Sanskrit : *satyam mām vada*, 'truth me say'; Hindi : *satya mujhko bōl*, 'truth to me say.' ('*Mujhko*,' though also an optional form of the accusative, is here dative; for, if accusative, its other form '*mujhe*,' would also have been eligible here, which is not the case). Tamil : *unmai enakku (c) col*, 'truth to me say.'

(11) In Sanskrit, verbs of obtaining take the nominative of the person and the objective of the thing obtained. In Tamil the idea is that the thing comes to the person, and while the thing takes the nominative, the person is in the dative case. Example, English : 'You will be getting money'; Tamil : 'To you money will be coming', ('*unakku (p) panam kideikkum*'). In the Aryan vernaculars the idiom is Dravidian. Thus : Hindi *tumko dhan miltā hai*, 'to you money will be coming.' Sanskrit : *dhanam tvam lapsyasé*, 'money thou wilt get' or *dhanam tvam prāpsyasi* (same). Similarly Hindi : *Unkō cārom padārtha miltē haim* 'to them the four blessings come,' i.e., they obtain the four blessings. (Kellogg, 2nd ed. p. 404).

12. On account of one set of terminals serving for both numbers in the inflection of the Tamil noun, the difference of number has to be shewn by an infix (or even two) between the stem and the terminal in the oblique cases, and in the nominative case by this infix itself which may then be called the primary suffix. The following two examples are in illustration :—



1. Stem : *Manicān*, homo. masc.

Singular.			Plural.		
Stem.	Infix	Terminal.	Stem.	Infix.	Terminal.
Nom. Manican	-	-	Manican	- gal	
Acc. Manican	-	ei	Manican	- gal - ei	
Dat. Manican	-	(uk) ku	Manican	- gal - (uk) ku	

2. *Maram* - Tree : neut. Stem. *Mara*.

Nom. Mara	- m	—	Mara(m)	- gal	
Acc. Mara-(t) t		ei	Mara(m)	- gal-	ei
Dat. Mara-(t) t	-	(uk) ku	Maram(m)	- gal - (uk) ku	

In Sanskrit the terminal suffixes being different for the different numbers of the noun, they serve at the same time the purposes of shewing both number and case : hence in that noun such an expedient as infixes is both unnecessary and unknown. But in the Aryan vernaculars, declension is effected by means of infix and terminal. Example :

Noun : *Ghōrā*, horse, masc. Stem : *ghōr*.

Singular.			Plural.		
Stem.	Infix.	Terminal.	Stem.	Infix.	Terminal.
Nom. Ghōr -	ā		ghōr -	ē	—
Acc(1) ghōr -	ā		(1) ghōr -	ē	
2 ghōr -	ē	- kō	(2) ghōr -	ōm	- kō
Dat. (Same as accusative in both numbers)					
Abl. ghōr -	ē	- sē	ghōr -	ōm	- sē

It is plain the picture is purely Dravidian ; and if we take the lineaments and not the canvas into account, the same is the picture presented by the noun in declension in almost every Aryan vernacular. In other words, the principles of declension in the Aryan vernaculars are from the Dravidian.

I have thus given a dozen fundamental principles to illustrate the wide jurisdiction of the Dravidian idiom in the handling of the noun in these so-called Aryan vernaculars. According to Max Muller's opinion, the presence of a single fundamental piece of evidence is enough to determine the true class of a language. A round dozen, and that in the noun alone, ought to be considered, it is deemed, satisfactory even by the most exacting.

(To be Continued)



## THE PETA-VATTHU.

---

Translated by

THE REV. HENRY SNYDER GEHMAN, PH. D.

### BOOK IV.

*(Continued from Vol. IX, Part II. Page 91).*

---

#### 1. The Peta-Story of Ambasakkhara.

NOW comes the *peta*-story of Ambasakkhara. What is the origin of it? While the Blessed One was living at Jetavana, a Licchavin king called Ambasakkhara, who was a heretic and a skeptic, reigned in Vesālī. At that time there was in the city of Vesālī a swamp near the shop of a certain merchant. As they crossed there with leaps, many people became exhausted, and some they splashed with mud. At the sight of this the merchant thought, "These people shall not go through the mire." So he ordered a piece of fragrant sandal wood, which in colour resembled conch shells, to be brought and laid down. Now in disposition he was moral, free from anger, and of gentle speech, and to others he proclaimed virtue correctly. One day, in a spirit of jest, he hid the under-garment of a friend of his who was bathing and carelessly failed to keep his eye on it. Then, after he had vexed him, he returned it.

But his nephew stole goods from other people's houses and deposited them, to our surprise, in the shop of this uncle. The owners of the goods made an investigation and presented him and his nephew with the goods to the king. His Majesty commanded, "Cut off this fellow's head, but impale his nephew upon a stake." The king's men obeyed. After having died, the uncle was reborn among the terrestrial gods. For having made the causeway of sandal wood he received a celestial blood-horse, white in colour and quick as thought; on account of his golden words to the virtuous, a heavenly odour exhaled from his body; but, because he



hid the cloak, he was nude. After he had beheld the deed which he himself committed in his previous existence and thereupon had seen his own nephew raised upon a stake, urged by compassion he mounted his horse which was quick as thought and at midnight he arrived at the place where he was impaled. He stood afar off and continued saying day after day, "Living man, I say, life alone is happiness."

At that time, while King Ambasakkhara was comfortably riding on the back of an elephant and making a solemn procession around the city, he saw a lady looking at his royal splendour from an open window in a certain house. He was captivated, and to a man who was sitting near by, he made a sign meaning, "Investigate the house and that lady." In due course he entered the royal palace and sent for the man, saying: "Go, sir, and find out whether that lady be married or single." He went, and, upon learning that she had a husband, he told the king. The latter, after considering a means of taking possession of her, summoned her husband and said, "Come, sir, and wait on me." Although against his will, yet out of fear he agreed to serve His Majesty, thinking: "If I do not obey his word, the King may inflict upon me his royal punishment." Accordingly he came day after day to minister to the ruler. The monarch, on his part, had his board and wages given him, and, after the lapse of several days, he thus spoke to him as he came to his work early in the morning: "Come now, in such and such a place there is a lotus-pond; bring me from there some red earth and red lotuses. If you do not return this very day, you shall not live." When he was gone, he told his door-keeper: "To-day, exactly at sunset, all the gates must be closed."

Now the lotus-pond was three *yojanas* from Vesālī. And so this man, frightened by the fear of death, with wind-like speed came to the lotus-pond that same forenoon. In the first place he thought, "This lotus-pool is guarded by a demon," but, being quite without fear as far as this idea was concerned, he circum-ambulated the pond completely, thinking, "Well, here to be sure there is some danger." When the guardian of the pool, a demon who looked as though he had some conception of pity, came up in human form and saw him, he said, "Man, pray why have you come hither?" He told him the state of affairs. As the supernatural being showed his heavenly form, he disappeared with the



words, "If so, take what you need." Then he took some red earth and red lotuses and, exactly at sunset, arrived at the city gate. When the gate-keeper saw him, he closed the door on him in spite of his cries. When the portal was shut and he could not obtain admission, he addressed the man who was transfixed upon a pale near the gateway and made him his witness, saying: "These have closed the gate upon me, even though I got here exactly at sunset and I called out; I arrived in time; it is not my fault; let this be known by you also." When the convict saw him, he said: "Impaled upon a stake, I am facing death and about to die. How can I be your witness? But a *peta* who possesses supernatural power will come here into my presence; make him your witness." "But how am I to see him?" "Stay right here and you shall see for yourself." So he stood there, and in the middle watch he saw the *peta* coming whom he made his witness.

At dawn the king said to him: "You have transgressed my commandment; therefore I shall inflict upon you the royal punishment." He, however, replied: "Lord, I have not violated your order, since I arrived here at sunset." Then the king asked, "Who is your witness?" Then, pointing to the naked *peta* who came near the man impaled on the stake, he stated, "This one is my witness." In reply to the king's question, "How are we to believe this?" he said: "To-night you shall believe, send a man with me." When the king heard this, he himself in person went with him to the place and waited. But after the *peta* had come thither and said: "Living man, I say, life alone is happiness," he asked him with the five stanzas beginning with the line, "Here you have no bed or couch." But the first stanza which begins with the words, "There is a city of the Vajjins called Vesāli," was placed here by the redactors of the Holy Scriptures in order to show the connexion of these.

1. There is a city of the Vajjins called Vesāli; in that place lived Ambasakkhara, the Licchavin. When he saw the *peta* outside the city, he wished to know the cause and asked him on the spot:

2. "Here you have no bed or couch nor do you go forwards or backwards; you do not have the pleasure of clothes nor of enjoying food and drink. As regards a maid, that also is something which you do not have now.

3. "Your kinsmen and friends whom you had seen and of whom you had heard, who were compassionate to you in your



previous existence, now they do not have the opportunity even of seeing you. Alas you are forsaken by those people.

4. "There are no friends for him who has gone down. When companions see one in misery, they desert him; and while they see his prosperity, they throng about him. For him who has gone up, there are many friends.

5. "For having enjoyed all pleasures, it necessarily follows that one must have low purposes. His body shall be entirely destroyed and broken all around. Just as the clinging dew-drop, so to-day or to-morrow shall life be annihilated."

6. Him who was in this condition, frightened, and enduring the most intense agony at the pale of *nimb* wood, he addressed with the following words, "Now, *yakkha*, why did you say, 'Living man, I say, life alone is happiness'?"

When the king had asked him, the *peta* declared his thoughts and spoke four stanzas:

7. "This man was my kinsman; I remember his previous existence. When I saw him, I felt pity for him, lest with his low morality he should fall down to hell.

8. "When, O Licchavin, this man will have departed from here, for having committed sinful deeds he will be reborn in hell, a place which is crowded with living beings; it is a dreadful-looking region, exceedingly hot, severe, and frightful.

9. "Even this stake with its various features is better than that hell. May he not fall down to the severe and frightful hell which is always horrible and has nothing but suffering.

10. "Now if this man hears this statement of mine, being brought to misery, he will depart from life. Therefore I do not say it in his presence, lest I be the one through whom he lose his life."

Thus the *peta* declared his purpose. But the king took occasion to ask for information about the *peta* and spoke this stanza:

11. "I understand this case of the man, but there is something else I desire to ask you. If you grant us permission, we shall put the question to you, but you must not become angry at us."

This stanza is the *peta*'s reply to the king's speech:

12. "Truly then I got a proposition. It will not be a story by an unbeliever. Though it be against my will, I assert facts as utterances to be believed. Ask me what you like, and I shall reply as I am able."

Since the *peta* in these words had given an opportunity to ask questions, the king spoke the following stanza:

13. "Whatever I behold with mine eye, absolutely in all of it I shall have full faith. If I should not believe even when I have seen, then, *yakkha*, you may make it mine own affair."

When the *yakkha* had heard him, he spoke as follows:



14. "Let me have your faithful promise. When you have heard the Law, accept the faith; it is connected with knowledge and does not have a wicked thought. Whatever Law has been heard or even not heard by you, all I shall proclaim as knowledge."

*King*: 15. "Upon a decorated white horse you come hither to him who is impaled upon a stake. This is a means of going that is wonderful and worthy to be seen. Of what deed is this the consequence?"

*Peta*: 16. "In the middle of this city of Vesālī, in the path through the swamp there was a troublesome spot. One day, in a religious mood, I took some white sandal wood and laid it in the place that was hard to cross.

17. "As we placed our feet upon it, both others and I went across. This is a conveyance that is wonderful and worthy to be seen. Of that very deed is this the result."

*King*: 18. "Your countenance illuminates all the regions, and in all directions your fragrance is wafted. You possess the supernatural power of a *yakkha* and have great might, but you are naked. Of what is this the result?"

*Peta*: 19. "Free from anger and always of a believing mind, I approached the people with gentle words. Of that same deed is this the result; my divine countenance is continually resplendent.

20. "When I noticed the fame and renown of those who were firm in the Law, I proclaimed it with religious intent. Of that very deed is this the result; my heavenly perfume is continually wafted forth.

21. "While my companions were washing themselves in the bathing-place, I took their raiment and hid it on the land. I wished to play a joke and had no evil motive. On that account I am nude, and my condition is miserable.

22. "If any one commits evil in sport, such, they say, is the fruit of his deeds; but if one does it intentionally, what do they say is the result of his acts?"

23. "Whatever men have wicked thoughts in the mind and are impure in word and deed, beyond a doubt at the dissolution of the body they enter hell as their future state.

24. "But others, hoping for happiness, find delight in charity and hold themselves in restraint; at the dissolution of the body, these beyond a doubt enter bliss as their future state."

When the *peta* had thus clearly distinguished and shown in a mere abstract the fruits of *karma*, the king, who did not believe what he heard, spoke this verse:

25. "Why, pray, should I really believe this: 'This is the fruit of virtue and of sin?' Or what have I seen that I should sincerely believe? Or who too could make me believe this?"

In reply the *peta* spoke these stanzas:

26. "When you have seen and heard, have a resolute faith; here you see the result of virtue and wickedness. If both virtue and wickedness are non-existent, would it be that beings are blessed or distressed?"



27. "And if human beings did not commit virtuous and wicked deeds here in the world of men, not would people, the high and the low, be blessed or distressed in the world of men.

28. "And because human beings commit virtuous and wicked deeds in the world of men, therefore people, the high and low, are blessed or distressed in the world of men.

29. "Of two sorts, they say to-day, is the result of deeds; one must understand that of the blessed one and that of the one in trouble. The gods attend upon (the blessed ones), but the unconverted, those that do not see this twofold result, are tormented in hell."

He was asked the question: "But you who thus believe in the fruit of *karma*, why do you successively undergo such misery?" In that connexion he spoke this stanza:

30. "I myself have not done any (good) deeds, and there is no one who in bestowing gifts would ascribe (to my credit) clothes and a bed besides food and drink. Therefore I am nude, and my condition is miserable."

When the king heard that he desired the advantage of clothes and other gifts, he spoke the following stanza:

31. "Now, verily there must be some means, O *yakkha*, whereby you may obtain clothes. Tell me what is their source; we shall listen to a trustworthy statement of the wherewithal."

Then the *peta*, in telling him the means, replied in these stanzas:

32. "There is here a monk by the name of Kappitaka; he is meditative and moral, an emancipated saint; he restrains his senses, keeps his precepts secret, is calm, and has attained the highest doctrines.

33. "He is kind in speech, affable, meek, and pleasant, and his greeting is sincerely expressed. Peacefully he dwells in the region of virtue and deserves gifts from gods and men.

34. "He is tranquil and has dispelled the haze of wicked thoughts; he is free from suffering and lusts; he is emancipated and has rid himself of pangs. He is upright and without egotism; he is not attached to the conditions of renewed existence, and all his spiritual impediments have ceased. He has attained the three-fold knowledge with majesty.

35. "Although they have seen him, he is little known and has few acquaintances; among the *Vajjins* they regard him as a sage. The *yakkhas* know him as free from desire, a man of good principles, who dwells upon earth.

36. "If you give him in my name a pair of garments or a double set, and he accepts them, me also you will see furnished with garments."

Then the king asked him where the saint lived:

37. "In what place does the ascetic dwell? We shall go and see him now. He is the one who today can dispel from me doubt and uncertainty, the puppet-shows of heresy."

Then the *peta* said:



38. "He is seated in Kapinaccana, surrounded by many gods. He is delivering a sermon, doing justice to his name and earnest in his own abstinence from anger."

When the *peta* had thus informed him, the king was anxious to meet the saint without delay and spoke this stanza :

39. "Now I will go and do as you suggested. I will array the ascetic in a pair of garments, and he shall accept them. Then you too we shall see provided with clothes."

Now the elder was instructing the *petas* in religion. Therefore in this connexion in his advice about the proper time of approaching him, the *peta* spoke this stanza.

40. "I do not go to an ascetic at an inauspicious occasion. Very well ! Licchavin, this is not a proper time for you. Visit him later on at a seasonable moment and find him sitting all alone in that very same place."

Upon this counsel of the *peta*, the king said, "All right!" and straightway returned home. When a fitting opportunity arrived, he took the eight pair of garments and went up to the elder. He took a seat near him and with a friendly greeting said : "Reverend sir, accept these eight pair of garments." Upon hearing him, for the sake of starting the conversation, the elder addressed him : "Great king, formerly you were not disposed to give and were inclined to injure the mendicant monks and the brahmans ; how happens this desire of handing out excellent clothes ?" In reply the king told him the affair and related to the elder his association with the *peta* and all that he had learned from him. Then he donated the clothes and ascribed to the *peta* the credit of the gift. In consequence of this celestial garments were presented to the *peta*. Adorned and dressed up, he appeared on horseback before the elder and the king. When the monarch saw him, he was pleased and delighted and in his joy and satisfaction he formed a friendship with the *peta* and said : "Verily with my own eyes I have seen the result of one's deeds ; I will not give an inauspicious gift ; just a meritorious one will I bestow." In reply the *peta* said : "O Licchavin king, if from now on you renounce wickedness and do nothing but practise righteousness, I shall become your friend and I shall visit you. Then quickly release from the stake the man who is impaled. Thus the latter will obtain life and in his exercise of righteousness will be freed from his misery. On the other hand you go to the elder from time to time, and having heard



religious instruction, perform worthy deeds." Thereupon the *peta* went his way.

Then the king saluted the elder, and upon his entrance into the city, he convoked the Licchavin assembly without delay. When he had asked their permission, he released the man from the pale and sent for a physician, saying, "Heal this man." Thereupon he called on the elder and asked him : "Now, reverend sir, can one obtain release from a permanent abode in hell after having committed deeds which lead to perdition?" The elder responded : "It is possible, great king ; if he performs eminent merit, he is released," and he established the king in the refuges and the five moral precepts. Since he stood firm in these principles, he remained under the instruction of the elder and became a convert. Moreover the man who had been impaled, was cured, and being greatly moved, he became a monk. Only a little later he attained Arhatship. In explaining this matter, the redactors of the Holy Scriptures spoke these stanzas :

41. When he had spoken, the Licchavin, surrounded by his servants, went to that place. He approached the city and reached his house, his own abode.

42. And then in due course he performed his householder duties : he bathed and took a drink of water. Having chosen a fitting opportunity and having selected from a basket eight pair of garments, the Licchavin delivered them in company with his servants.

43. When he arrived at that place, he saw the ascetic of undisturbed thoughts who had returned from his meal. He was tranquil and sat on the root of a tree.

44. When he came up to him, he spoke to him in these words and asked him about his health and well-being : "I am a Licchavin from Vesālī, if you please, and I am known as Ambasakkhara, the Licchavin.

45. "Accept from me, reverend sir, these eight pair of excellent garments ; I give them to you. Just for this purpose have I come hither that I might be happy."

*Ascetic* : 46. "Even from afar the ascetics and the brāhmanas avoid your dwelling. In your home the bowls are broken and also the monks' cloaks are rent.

47. "Now others with low and wicked women made the ascetics fall head foremost ; such annoyance the monks and the ascetics meet at your hands.

48. "Not even sesame oil with grass did you give them nor do you tell the road to him who has lost his way. From blind men you yourself take a stick. Such a man you are, niggardly and



unrestrained. Now just what have you seen and in what form will you make a distribution among us?"

*King* : 49. "Reverend sir, I acknowledge the truth of what you say. I injured the ascetics and the brāhmins. Fun was not my motive, and my thoughts were wicked; verily, your reverence, that offence of mine was nothing less than a sin.

50. "Verily he engendered wickedness in jest. Having imperfect happiness, he experiences pain. He is young and youthful, but he suffers nakedness of body. Now what is worse for him than this?

51. "Reverend sir, I saw him in terror and in sin; therefore I give a gift. Lord, accept eight pair of garments, and let these presents go to the credit of the *yakkha*."

*Ascetic* : 52. "Surely the gift in many ways is acceptable and may it have endless virtue for you, the giver. I accept from you the eight pair of garments; may these presents redound to the credit of the *yakkha*."

53. Then forsooth the Licchavin sipped water for purification and gave the elder the eight pair of garments, thinking, "May they be acceptable; behold the *yakkha* wearing clothes."

54. Then he saw him anointed with the essence of sandal wood, of good birth and of noble appearance. He was mounted on horseback and was adorned and wore excellent clothes. He was surrounded (by attendants) and had attained the supernatural power of a *yakkha*.

55. Joyfully and with gladness the king saw him. The monarch had happy thoughts and appeared agreeable and handsome; for he had seen his deed and its great result; he had beheld it in reality with his own eyes.

56. He went up to him and addressed him as follows: "I will give a gift to the ascetics and the brahmins; in fact I do not have anything which is not to be given away. You, *yakkha*, have been for me a great benefactor."

*Peta* : 57. "And you, Licchavin, have given me gifts, this portion which has not been in vain. I for my part shall form friendship with no one but you, I, the superhuman, with you, the human."

*King* : 58. "The way, a kinsman, a refuge, a friend you have been to me, yea also a deity to me. I beseech you with an *anjali*; *yakkha*, I desire to see you again."

*Peta* : 59. "If you become unbelieving, appear miserly, or entertain false opinions, and in that same state you are allowed to see me, even though I notice you, I will not talk to you.

60. "If you have respect for the Law, find delight in liberality, keep yourself restrained, and are a fountain of supply for the ascetics and the Brāhmins, and if you in that condition have the opportunity to see me and I take notice of you, I shall speak kindly to you.



61. "Quickly free this man from the pale, since through this event we have formed intimate relations. I am thinking of the tortures of the man transfixed upon the stake ; we have here made a mutual friendship.

62. "And if this man is quickly released from the stake, he will zealously practise virtuous deeds and be freed from this veritable hell. One may have merit without having to make it known.

63. "Go to Kappitaka and at the proper time share (some of your substance) with him. Take a seat before him and ask him yourself. He will tell you about this affair.

64. "Visit this same monk and ask him ; he desires the good and does not have wicked thoughts. According to his knowledge he will explain what has not been heard by the common run of people, yea all of the Law he will proclaim."

(And thoughtfully he preached on the Law and on happiness.)

65. When he had conversed there in secret and formed a friendship with the superhuman being, he departed to the Licchavins ; then he addressed the assembly which was in session :

*King* : 66. "Lords, listen to a word from me ; I shall choose the better course ; I shall obtain my desire. A man of covetous deeds has been fastened upon a stake. Punishment has been inflicted upon him, and he has gotten the appearance (of one in that torment).

67. "So far, for the space of twenty nights, since he has been impaled, he has been neither alive nor dead. Now I will release him so that the Church may forgive my intention."

*Assembly* : 68. "Both this one and another one quickly release. So let them act, wondering, 'Who might have declared this ?' According to what is your enlightenment, so do, that the Church may forgive your intention."

69. He went up to the place and liberated without delay the man who was impaled. Then he said to him : "Friend, do not fear," and he provided him with physicians.

70. The Licchavin went into the presence of Kappitaka and in due course shared with him (a portion of his substance). He himself took a seat in front of him, and in wishing to find out the means, asked him with these very words :

*King* : 71. "A man of covetous deeds has been transfixed upon a stake. Punishment has been inflicted upon him, and his appearance shows the effects of torment. So far, for the space of twenty nights, since he has been impaled, he has been neither alive nor dead.

72. "Now I went and released him ; for, reverend sir, it was the advice of this *yakkha*. Pray now, might there be some reason or other that he will not enter hell ?

73. "Reverend sir, tell me if there is a way out ; we shall listen to a trustworthy means from you. Is it not possible to



erase or remove those deeds, although we do not understand it here ?”

*Ascetic* : 74. “ If night and day, earnestly and zealously, he should perform good works, for that reason he would be freed even from hell ; but his deed should be known elsewhere.”

*King* : 75. “ This affair of the man is not known. Now, reverend sir, pity me also. Teach me, admonish me, very learned one, that I may not enter hell.”

*Ascetic* : 76. “ Not later than to-day with a pious mind find refuge in the Buddha, the Law, and the Church and similarly take upon yourself the five moral precepts whole and unbroken.

77. “ Refrain forthwith from the taking of life ; reject in this world what is not given to you ; do not indulge in strong drink, nor speak falsely ; and be content with your own wife.

78. “ And solemnly undertake this eightfold noble and excellent precept ; it is good and leads to happy results.

79. “ With a serene mind give to the upright their requisites, the Buddhist robe, the alms collected in the bowl, a dwelling-place, food and drink, solid food, raiment, and a bed and a chair.

80. “ Refresh with food and drink the mendicant friars who abound in the moral precepts and are free from passion and erudite. A good deed always increases.

81. “ And so by practising righteous acts earnestly and diligently night and day you may free yourself even from that hell. There may be merit that is to be known on another occasion.”

*King* : 82. “ To-day forsooth with a pious mind I find refuge in the Buddha, the Law, and the Church ; similarly I take upon myself the five precepts whole and unbroken.

83. “ I shall forthwith refrain from the taking of life ; I shall reject that which is not given to me in this world ; I will not indulge in liquor nor speak falsely ; and I shall be content with my own wife.

84. “ And I solemnly undertake this eightfold noble and excellent precept ; it is good and leads to happy results.

85. “ To the mendicant friars who abound in moral precepts and are free from passion and erudite, I shall give the requisites, the Buddhist robe, the alms collected in the bowl, a dwelling-place, food and drink, solid food, raiment, and a bed and a chair. Finding delight in the doctrine of the Buddhas, I shall not change (my intention) ”

86. Such a man became Ambasakkhara, the Licchavin, and in him Vesālī had another layman. He was gentle and believing, and in performing services, he then zealously supported the monks and the Church.

87. When the man who had been impaled was healed, happily and of his own accord he entered the ascetic life and came to the monk Kappitakuttama. Both of them then attained the fruits of asceticism.



88. Heeding the pious is attended with such great reward for a hundred wise men. He who had been impaled attained the foremost reward, but a very small one was received by Ambasakkhara.

The venerable Mahākappitaka, who had gone to Sāvatthi to pay homage to the Teacher, reported to the Blessed One the incident which had there been told to the king by the *peta* himself. The Teacher made the matter his theme and preached a sermon to the crowd that was present. This discourse was useful to many people.

(To be Continued.)





## NOTES ON THE DAMBADENIYA DYNASTY.

By H. W. CODRINGTON, C.C.S.

IN Mr. W. A. de Silva's note on "The Buddhist Era" (N. & Q. 1914, Part II, XXIX), the date of the coronation of Bhuvanaika Báhu I. is given from the medical work *Yogarnava* as follows:

අප මහ ගෞතම තපාගතයන්ගේ ප්‍රථම බොධියේ පටන් එක්වාදනස් අවසිය අවලොස් අවුරුද්දක් ඉකුත්—අපිව—ශ්‍රී ලක්කාද්දි පොත්පත්ති විජේඤ්ඤාදි නරේඤ්ඤ එකසියක එකානු දෙකක්නුගේ අතික්‍රමණයෙහි අප ශ්‍රී සභබො ශ්‍රී චූචනේක බාහු නරේඤ්ඤයන් ලක්කා විජයකොට අභිෂෙක මංගල්‍යයෙන් විජුම්භීත කල්හි ඔහුම ගෙම්ම ප්‍රත්‍යවාන පුත්‍රග්‍රහ කවිවාන වතා ශ්‍රී පඵභයෙහි විර අනුගත් කාලයක් වැස සඵ ස්ථානයෙහි කරණලද තපාගත ප්‍රාණිතා ඇති මසුරපාද පිරිවෙණාදි පති තපාගත පුත්‍රවු සුචිරයන් විසින්

This may be translated:

"On the expiry of 1818 years from the first Enlightenment of our great Gautama the Tathágata, moreover after the passing away of...kings, who have appeared in the Island of Śrī Laṅkā including King Vijaya, when our King Siri Sanga Bo Śrī Bhuvanaika Báhu having conquered Laṅká displayed himself at the festival of his coronation, (this work was written) by the Elder, the son of the Tathágata, chief of the Mayurapáda College, who was imbued in every state with the desire to become a Tathágata and who dwelt for a considerable time on the Vátagiri Hill, receiving the necessities from him (the King) himself."

(i) The year from the Enlightenment and (ii) the number of kings who had reigned appear in this and two other manuscripts thus:

- (i) (a) එක්වා දනස් අවසිය අවලොස් අවුරුද්දක්
- (b) එකවා ධනස් අවසිය අවලොස් ඔරුඛක්
- (c) එකවා දනස් අවසිය අවලොස් අවුරුද්දක්
- (ii) (a) එකසියක එකානු දෙකක් නුගේ
- (b) එකසියක එකානු දෙකක් නුගේ
- (c) එකසිය එකානු දෙකක් නුගේ



All these texts are corrupt but come from one original. Mr. de Silva's translation of (ii) as "192" cannot stand, and the date 1818 from the Enlightenment manifestly is incorrect, as we know from the *Attanagalu Vansa* that Bhuvanaika Báhu's father Parákrama Báhu II. was crowned in 1824. The corruption, however, is of some standing, as the forged Padidora Sannasa gives the same date (J.R.A.S., Ceylon Branch, Vol. XXII, No. 65, pages 275, 291 and errata.)

Now the author of the *Yogarnava* must be identical with or at least of the same school as "Mayurapáda Parivenádhpati Buddhaputra Sthavira" who composed the *Pújávaliya* only a few years before the accession of Bhuvanaika Báhu I, and clues as to the correction of the text are to be found in the last mentioned work, where in the case of the number of kings we find :—

මාඝරජය විජයබාහුය පරාක්‍රම බාහුයෙහි සුඵලංගයෙහි රජකළ අනුදෙනෙකු හා මෙසේවූ රජ එක්සිය තෙපණස් දෙනෙක් සිරි ලක රජකළාහ.

"King Mágga, Vijaya Báhu (III), Parákrama Báhu (II), that is 90 who reigned in the *Suluvansa*, thus 153 kings have ruled over Śrī Laṅká."

The emendation of දෙකක්කුණේ into දෙනෙක්කුණේ is obvious. එකසිය must be correct; we are left with කඵකානු. Now if Parákrama Báhu II. was the 153rd sovereign, his son Vijaya Báhu IV. was the 154th and the original text must have read සුපණස්. In old and worn manuscripts the confusion of ක and ස is not uncommon as shown by the variant readings in the *Mahāvansa* of Mahánágakula,—sula,—hula. The substitution of සු for ක, therefore, is not impossible and the mediaeval form of ණ in an abraded ola could well be read as කා. It is submitted that the text as written by Tathágataputra Sthavira was එකසිය සුපණස් දෙනෙක්කුණේ.

It will be observed that the *Pújávaliya* adopts the same mode of dating as the *Yogarnava*, the year in which it was composed being given at the beginning of chap. XXXIV. thus :

අප මහා භෞතම බුදුන්ගේ ප්‍රථම බෝධියෙහි පටන් මාසේ මේ භෞති පුරාවගේ අවශානයට එක්දහස් අවසිය සුපණස් අවුරුදු දෙක අතික්‍රාන්තවිය මෙවකට සිංහලාධිපති රජතු එක්සිය තෙපණස් දෙනෙක් ඔවුහු පැලඳ රජකළාහ.

"From the attainment of the first Bodhi of our great Gautama Buddha to the end of this my thank-offering 1854 years have ex-



pired. Up to this time 153 kings, rulers of Sīṃhala, had worn the crown and reigned."

As we have seen, the last of these kings was Parākrama Báhu and the book must have been finished shortly after his abdication, which as stated later on in the same chapter occurred in his 34th year; the date is that given in the *Nikāya Saṅgraha* as A.B. 1809, apparently for the completion of the king's reform of the Saṅgha. I assume that the 34th year coincided in part with 1854.

Parākrama Báhu II.'s accession, therefore, must have taken place about 1821 (A.D. 1233/4); his first coronation was in 1824 and, if the *Dambadeni Asna*<sup>1</sup> is to be trusted, at the Vap Magula, that is on September 16, A.D. 1236. When did he die?

B. Gunasekara's translation of the *Pūjāvaliya* states that Parākrama Báhu II. "entrusted the reins of government to the eldest prince Vijaya Báhu, and went to heaven in the 33rd year of his reign." The printed text of 1913, however, reads in place of the last sentence භූමි දෙතිස් වර්ෂද්දක් රාජ්‍යයකළ "he reigned 32 years." All manuscripts consulted agree with this, but have "33 years."

The account of Parākrama's reign in the *Pūjāvaliya* is parallel with that in chapters LXXXII-LXXXVII of the *Mahāvamsa*. But this work continues its history of the reign during the regency of Vijaya Báhu IV in the two following chapters. In these we read of the restoration of Polonnaruwa and of the second coronation of the old king who "after he had placed the burden of government on his own son, and by him had performed a great amount of merit during a long period, departed for heaven in the five and thirtieth year of his reign." It is clear, therefore, that Parākrama Báhu did not die when he virtually abdicated in favour of his son in his 34th year. This is indirectly confirmed by the use of the expression පළමුවන අභිෂේක මධිමලය "the first coronation festival" in the *Pūjāvaliya*.

The death of Parākrama occurred, therefore, about 1855 or 1856. Vijaya Báhu thereupon "reigned over the whole kingdom of Laṅkā" (*Mhv.* XC., I), and was assassinated at the instigation of his general Mitta in the second year of his reign. According to the received chronology which dates the commencement of his father's rule in 1824, this event took place in 1859 or 1860.

1. The date A.B. 1824 in the *Dambadeni Asna* is an error for 1824 from the First Enlightenment.



Now the අටළොස් of the *Yogarnava* cannot have been, I think, corrupted from any combination of සැට "sixty" and the easiest emendation is අටළොස්, the last letter being the same as in අටළොස් and the top of the C with the *elapilla* a conceivable corruption of the mediaeval *ଶ*. I take it then that the coronation of Bhuvanaika Báhu I. took place in 1858. In *Mahāvamsa*, chap. XC, 4-11, it is stated that Bhuvanaika Báhu, hearing of his brother's death, fled from Dambadeniya in a litter but was pursued and attacked by Mitta's partisans. He thereupon leapt out of the litter and fled on foot to Kālagalla where he continued his flight on an elephant and made good his escape to Yapahu "after that he had crossed the great river Kolabhinna (Kolamunu Oya), which was then in flood." The assassination of Vijaya Báhu, therefore, took place during the rains of the South-West or North-East Monsoon.

To decide the period of the year we have to turn to the close of Bhuvanaika Báhu's reign which lasted 11 years: he thus died in his twelfth year. The year 1858 began on May 7, A.D. 1270, and ended on April 25th, A.D. 1271. Thus the earliest possible dates for Bhuvanaika Báhu's first and twelfth years are May 1270-April 1271, and May 1281-April 1282, while the latest possible dates for the same are approximately April 1271-April 1272, and April 1282-April 1283. The embassy despatched by this king to the Sultan of Egypt travelled by sea up to the head of the Persian Gulf and thence by land to Baghdad and so across the Syrian Desert, and was received in Cairo on 14 Muharram A.H. 682, that is in April A.D. 1283 (J.R.A.S., C.B., XXVIII, No. 72, p. 82). The voyage is given in detail and there is no record of undue delay. The passage from Ceylon to Basra in the North East monsoon is said to take from 15 to 18 days and it may be regarded as practically certain that Bhuvanaika Báhu was alive in the early part of A.D. 1283; he must have died shortly after the despatch of the embassy, as otherwise he would have completed his 12th year. We therefore are obliged to consider the latest possible dates as nearer the truth than the earliest possible. This places the coronation at the end of 1858, that is early in A.D. 1271. Vijaya Báhu IV., therefore, probably was murdered during the break of the North East Monsoon of the preceding year, say in or about October 1270, the intervening months being occupied by the usurpation of the general Mitta, and the intrigues between Bhuvanaika Báhu and the Ārya



general Thakuraka described in *Mahāvamsa* XC, 12-25. The expression ලංකා විජයකොට, "having conquered Laṅkā," in the *Yogarjaya* is thus justified.

We are now in a position to ascertain Vijaya Báhu IV.'s regnal years, in the second of which he died :—

	Earliest possible.	Latest possible.
1st year —	c. Nov. 1268-1269	c. Sept. 1269-1270
2nd year —	c. Nov. 1269-1270	c. Sept. 1270-1271.

Now the 35th year of Parákrama Báhu II fell in part in 1855 from the the first Bodhi, and so in its entirety at the earliest between April A.D. 1267 and April 1268, and at the latest between March 1268 and March 1269. We must place the accession of Vijaya Báhu as sole king between November 1268 and March 1269, the average giving January 1269.

The above dates have been obtained by taking the 35th year of Parákrama Báhu II. and the 2nd of Vijaya Báhu IV. in our modern sense, that is, as the 34th and 1st expired. But there is reason to believe that the Sinhalese vulgarly reckoned otherwise. Taking one example out of many, Sena I. is said in the *Mahāvamsa* to have died in his 20th year; yet the *Pūjāvaliya* gives him a reign of 20 years. The conclusion is that in the mind of the author of this work the 20th year was the 20th year expired, that is, our 21st year. Now the *Mahāvamsa* itself at least in three places is of the same opinion. Thus Vattagāmaṇi fled in his fifth month, yet his first period of rule is reckoned as five months (*Mhv.* XXXIII, 37, 102); Silākāla is said to have governed 13 years and to have died in his thirteenth; and again Mahánāga is promised a reign of 3 years, yet died in his third (*ib.* XLI, 27, 41; 84, 102). The *Dīpavamsa* also makes Buddha die 8 years after Ajātasattu's coronation (අසකනාමරාජයා සමඵලො පරිනිබ්බුතො) and Vijaya to arrive in the eighth year from that event (අරාමසඤ්ඤ අසමෙ වසෙස, *Dpv.* III, 60; XI, 8); the death of Buddha and the landing of Vijaya, of course, are synchronized. The *Samantapāsādikā* states that Muṭasiva's death and Tissa's accession occurred in Asoka's 17th year (අසොකබම්මරාජයා සතරසම වසෙස); in the *Dīpavamsa*, XI, 13, 14, on the other hand Muṭasiva dies when 17 years had elapsed (අසොකනාමරාජයා සතරස වසෙස අනු මුටසිවො නදතො) and his successor is crowned when 17 years 6 months had passed. Here the 217th year clearly is



that year expired. In the tenth century the reckoning by expired years also accords better with the facts as the last year of Kassapa V., counted backwards from Mahinda V.'s capture about A.D. 1017, falls in A.D. 919, and his unlucky campaign in company with the Pāṇḍyan king is mentioned in an inscription of Parāntaka I. dated A.D. 918/919. This calculation, therefore, is to be preferred.<sup>2</sup>

According to this Parākrama Báhu II. died in what we should call his 36th year, and Vijaya Báhu IV. in his third. Therefore :—

Parākrama Báhu.	Earliest possible.	Latest possible.
35th year	April 1267-1268	March 1268-1269
36th do	do 1268-1269	do 1269-1270
Vijaya Báhu.		
1st year	c. Nov. 1267-1268	c. Sept. 1268-1269
2nd do	do 1268-1269	do 1269-1270
3rd do	do 1269-1270	do 1270-1271.

Thus the reign of Vijaya Báhu is reckoned from Parākrama Báhu's abdication in A.D. 1267/8.

In the longer version of the *Pūjāvaliya* the great ordination festival held at Dahastota is assigned to Parākrama Báhu's 35th year (expired); his death is not mentioned, and some time must have been taken in writing the continuation of the original work, corresponding with chapters LXXXVIII and LXXXIX of the *Mahāvamsa*. Parākrama Báhu, therefore, died some appreciable time after Vesak, perhaps at the end of A.D. 1269 or even early in 1270. The *Mahāvamsa*, chap. XC, 1, 2, records nothing of Vijaya Báhu's sole reign, and, if our reading of history is correct, the old king's death left his son at the mercy of the discontented soldiery. That their pay was in arrears is fairly clear from *Mahāvamsa*, XC, 15, 31, a state of affairs not to be wondered at in view of the royal fiscal policy described in chapter LXXXVII, 50. It does not follow that the discontent at once led to the plot which ended in the king's murder.

Our results are as follows :—

Parākrama Báhu II.	Accession	c. A.D. 1234
	Coronation	A.D. 1236, Sept. 16.
	Abdication	c. A.D. 1276/8
	Death	c. A.D. 1269 January, or A.D. 1269/70.

2. It does not follow that the reckoning by expired years was used in official documents e.g., the Ambagamuwa inscription, *Ep. Zeyl.* II, 35. But the employment of the expression "the year following such and such a year" shows a tendency to the vulgar reckoning.



Vijaya Báhu IV.	Accession	c. A.D. 1269 January, or c. A.D. 1267/8
	Death	A.D. 1270 about October.
Bhuvanaika Báhu I.	Coronation	A.D. 1271 Jany-April.
	Death	A.D. 1283 before full moon of April.

We are now in a position to proceed further. Vijaya Báhu III., the father of Parákrama Báhu II., reigned for 4 years only ; his body was burnt at Attanagalla. The *Pújávaliya* merely says that he was one of the Siri Sangabo race ; the *Attanagala Vansa* makes him a son of Vijaya Malla narádhipá, descended from the princes who brought the Bo tree to Lańká. Both documents date from his son's reign. The later *Daładá Pújávaliya* speaks of him as Vijaya Vathimi of Palábatgala. As an important establishment of hermits was founded here by Parákrama Báhu, it is possible that his father was connected with the place : perhaps it was his headquarters before he came into power. The *Dambadeni Ásna* calls him Nanbambara Kálinga Vijaya Báhu, and his son Nanbambara Kalikála Sańgíta Sáhitya Sarvagna Pańđita Parákrama Báhu. Nanbambara is in Kalundawa village, not far from Dambadeniya, and was the birth place of Parákrama, who dignified it with the name of Śrīvardhana-pura ; the current legend concerning these place-names is given in the Kalundá-*paṭuna*.<sup>3</sup>

The title " Kálinga Vijaya Báhu," also given to Vijaya Báhu by the *Rájaratńakaraya*, appears as the name of Mágħa in the *Nikáya Sańgraha*, but the authority for this unique attribution is unknown and even the *Kalundá-paṭuna* makes its hero's father a Kalinga king. It is worthy of notice that the termination of Vijaya Malla's name is the same as of those of Niṣṣańka Malla and Sáhaas Malla, both of the Kalinga Dynasty, and it is possible that his son had Kalinga blood in his veins. The question is complicated by the claim of Parákrama Báhu II. in his own poem the *Kavsilumina* to be of the Lunár race, descended from king Pańđu. The reference to the rain miracle (*Mhv.* LXXXVII) in the colophon fixes the identity of the royal author ; presumably he was a member of the Pańđyan branch of the Sinhalese royal family, to which Parákrama Báhu I. had belonged.

3. " Sirivaddhanapura," J.R.A.S., C.B., XII, no. 43.



At this period there were several such branches. The Gaṇave-si and the Maha Pāṇḍi-vaṇsa appear in the colophon of the *Pūjāvaliya*: the first traced its descent from prince Sumitra, who accompanied the Bo tree and became Jaya Maha Le; the second presumably from the husband of Vijaya Báhu I.'s sister Mittá. A third, the Kiliṅg or Káliṅga, is mentioned with the Gaṇave-si in the time of Parákrama Báhu IV. and possibly had several sources, the prince who brought the Tooth Relic, the queen of Mahinda IV., Tiloka-sundarí who married Vijaya Báhu I., or even later direct from Kalinga. The branches contracted alliances with one another, and we may suppose that Vijaya Báhu III. espoused a lady of the Pāṇḍyan clan, and that his son preferred to trace his origin to his mother's family, "the pure race of the Moon, which is considered by the whole world as the head of the generation of all kings" (*Mhv.* LXII, 5).

Mágha's reign is reckoned by the *Mahávaṇsa* as lasting 21 years and by the *Pūjāvaliya* as 19 (එකුන්විසි). The former account is preferable being in verse and so less liable to corruption; accordingly the reign lasted from c. 1215 to 1236, that is, the date of Parákrama Báhu's coronation. This must be taken as the official Sinhalese reckoning of the reign, as we find Mágha at Polonnaruwa some years later (*Mhv.* LXXXII, 27; LXXXIII, 15). Now Parákrama Báhu's *Katikāvata*, after rehearsing the reform carried out in A.B. 1708, states that discipline declined during the 36 years following the death of Parákrama Báhu the Great, and then passes on to the Convocation held under Saṅgharakkhita and the two Medhaṅkaras in the reign of Vijaya Báhu III., and finally to that held in his son's time. Parákrama Báhu I. died about A.D. 1186, and 36 years later brings us to A.D. 1222 in the middle of Mágha's reign.

This date presumably is that of Vijaya Báhu's Convocation, and, as the reform was carried out after he had placed the Relics on Beligala and had built the Vijayasundarārāma, fell somewhere in the middle of the reign, which we may fix provisionally between 1220 and 1224.

The dates so obtained can be checked by another calculation. Vijaya Báhu came to the throne in his old age (*Mhv.* LXXXI, 65). At the end of his reign he took his elder son, "seated him on his lap and poured kisses on the crown of his head" (*ib.* 73, 74). Parákrama Báhu can hardly have been more than 12 years of age



at the time, and both he and his brother were placed by their father under the guardianship of the priesthood (*ib.* 77). Now in Parákrama Báhu's eleventh ear (elapsed, c. A. D. 1245/6), Vira Báhu, his sister's son,<sup>4</sup> defeated the invader Chandrabhānu (*Mhv.* LXXXIII, 36). We are also told that this prince and his first cousin, afterwards Vijaya Báhu IV., in their childhood played together in the sand (*ib.* LXXXVIII, 6); thus they were approximately of the same age. Now if Parákrama Báhu II. succeeded immediately on his father's death when he was about 12 years old, Vira Báhu could not have been of age to lead an army in 1245/6. If this prince had attained his majority and was 16 years old in that year, he and Vijaya Báhu must have been born about 1229. Parákrama Báhu, if he was 16 at his eldest son's birth, was born about 1213 and was 57 years old at his death. And Vijaya Báhu III.'s reign, at the end of which the heir apparent was 12 at the most, must fall between 1221 and 1225.

It may be contended that Vira Báhu was merely a nominal royal general in 1245/6 and was only 7 or 8 years old. If this be so, Parákrama Báhu would have been born about 1221 and might have been 12 shortly before accession in 1234. But in this case, what event is signalized by the date 1222? The supposition that Vira Báhu was of age when he defeated Chandrabhānu seems to be the more probable.

The explanation of non—age does not suffice for the postponement of Parákrama Báhu's coronation for two years, as on our calculation he must have attained his majority before his accession in 1234. But such delay seems to have been not unusual; Parákrama Báhu VI. waited 4 years to be crowned, and Kīrtisīri's inauguration was celebrated in January, 1751, when he was 20 years of age, though he came to the throne in the middle of August, 1747.<sup>5</sup>

We still have to account for the interregnum between 1224/5 and 1234, and I would suggest very tentatively that this period of ten years is that of the usurpation of Vathimi. The legend embodied in the *Kalundá-paṭuna* seems to refer to our Paṇḍita Parákrama Báhu; Śrīvardhana-pura and Nanbambara are mentioned, and it was at Dambadeniya that the king reigned. The poem of course gives fanciful details to explain place-names, but there seems to be no valid reason for doubting that the usurpation of Vathimi

4. താഴെക്കൊണ്ട് is not necessarily the younger sister's son.

5. For Kīrtisīri's age, see *Memoir of Governor van Gollencesse*.



actually occurred. The one difficulty is the location of the death of this prince at Kurunegala. But Parákrama's brother, according to the longer *Pūjāvaliya*, lived at this place, and it or rather Vénaruva (Vāpi-nagara) close by is mentioned in *Mahāvamsa*, LVIII, 43, in the time of Vijaya Báhu I. The *Kurunégala Vistaraya*, it is true, calls the father of Paṇḍita Parákrama Báhu of Dambadeniya and of Vathimi by the name of Vanni Bhuvanaika Báhu. But this work is late and of no authority; its list of kings agrees with no reliable chronicle, and the legend seems to have been inserted with little reference to historical fact. It is of interest that at this time, according to the Tirivendipuram inscription of the 16th year of Rájarája III. (A.D. 1231/2) a Parákrama Báhu king of Ílam and three of his officers lost their lives while fighting on the side of Kopperuñjinga, who had captured the Chola king, against the Hoysala king Narasiṃha II.<sup>6</sup>

Parákrama Báhu II's coronation was followed by three wars. The contemporary authorities give them as follows:—

*Attanugala Vaṃsa*. The king defeated (1) and (2) the Chola-Keralas, who lived at Pulatthi and had their own king (සරාඪක); and (3) Chandrabhánu.

*Katikávata*. The (1) Draviḍa, (2) Kerala, (3) Yávaka, and other wars were waged.

*Pūjāvaliya*. The king reduced the Siṃhala Maha Vannin, and began the second (දෙවෙනුව, දෙවැනිව) Draviḍa war. At that time the two Tamil kings Mágha and Jaya Báhu had been in power 40 years; they had built forts at various places and had a Tamil and Malala host of 40,000 men. In this war Polonnaruwa was recovered. In his twelfth year Chandrabhánu the Jávaka was repulsed. The wars are summed up as "the Malala war, the Draviḍa war, the Jávaka war and others."

*Mahāvamsa*. The king brought into subjection the princes of the Vanni of Síhala. He then attacked the Tamils. "At this time a host of 40,000 strong men of the Tamils and Keralas under the two Tamil kings Mágha and Jaya Báhu had dwelt for a long time in the land," and had built fortresses. Polonnaruwa was recovered and in the king's eleventh year Chandrabhánu was defeated.

The expression "second" in the *Pūjāvaliya* probably is used with reference to the first Draviḍa war in the time of Vijaya Báhu III.

6. Madras Annual Report on Epigraphy (A.R.E.), no. 142 of 1902.



Mágha is said in the *Mahávaṇsa* to have brought with him to Ceylon a host of Keralas, to whom he gave the lands of the Sinhalese. These Keralas must be the Malalas of the *Pūjāvaliya*. The question is, who was Jaya Báhu? Was he Mágha's sub-king and successor, or was he an independent but allied prince? The definite mention of the two Malala and Draviḍa wars points to his independence; possibly he was a Chola, though the use of the word in the *Attanugalu Vaṇsa* as meaning anything more than "Tamil" should not be pressed.

The expulsion of the foreigners from Polonnaruwa took place before the eleventh year of the reign (A.D. 1245/6). They had been in power 40 years, perhaps a round number. The longer *Pūjāvaliya* relates that after the old king's abdication in 1267/8 Vijaya Báhu IV. began to restore Polonnaruwa, which had been recovered 26 years before, and further that the old *Daḷadā-gé* had been empty for 64 years, when the Tooth Relic was brought back some months later. The reconquest of the capital, therefore, took place about 1242, and the Relic had been removed therefrom about 1204, forty years from which time brings us to 1244. The period of 64 years includes the 40 of Tamil rule, and the balance obviously is the 26 years which had elapsed since the recovery. It is tempting to read සුවිසි in lieu of සවිසි, but as one manuscript out of three consulted has සන්විසි, I am inclined to retain the number 26 and to emend සුමට into සමට. This, however, is not strictly necessary, if 40 is a round number. In any case Tamil rule must have been considered as beginning on the death of Sáhasa Malla about 1202, and as including the government of the various generals, "who were causing obstruction with the object of gaining personal power for themselves and so were not desiring to have kings that would be powerful enough both for granting rewards and for inflicting punishments, and that would protect the people and the religion" (*Ep. Zeyl.* II, 36, B. lines 3-8). This period is called the *arájitaya* or *Demala arájitaya*, not as rendered by B. Gunasekara "the time when there were no Tamil princes", with scant regard for history, but "the Tamil anarchy," because there were no kings worthy of the name and Mágha was not a native sovereign, and because the Tamil mercenaries and later the Keralas dominated the country. At the very beginning of the "anarchy" we hear of "Kandavura" or Polonnaruwa being taken in a Tamil disturbance under Kalyāṇavatī (c. 1202-1208; *Ep. Zeyl.* II, 33).



It is convenient in this place to consider the origin of the independent kingdom of Jaffna. Its later mediaeval rulers styled themselves Árya Chakravarti and claimed to be of the Gaṅga vanṣa and to be descended from two Brahmans appointed by Rāma to rule over Ramesvaram; their flag was a seated bull and their capital Siṅkai-nakarai (Siṅha-nagara). They were of mixed descent. De Queiroz (*Conquista*, I, 7) relates that one of the Brahmans of Ramesvaram, who were known as Arus (Áryas), married the daughter of the Jaffna king, and that his offspring succeeded to the throne. The *Vaipava Málai*, an eighteenth century medley compiled from older material, makes the first king a prince of the Chola dynasty; he was Siṅha Árya or Vijaya Kúlaṅkai, "maimed hand," was brought over from Madura with a Páṇḍyan army, and settled at Nallúr. But the earlier *Kailāya Málai* makes no mention of his Chola descent and gives as his father Seliyasékarai of Madura, apparently of the Gaṅga-kula.<sup>7</sup> Whether the first ruler was a Chola or not, it is certain that his successors in the later middle ages claimed Gaṅga and Brahman blood; the seated bull was the cognizance of the Gaṅgas of Kalinga and Siṅhapura their royal city; shortly before our period a Kalinga dynasty had sat on the Sinhalese throne, and in the thirteenth century a Kalinga sovereign Mágha held Polonnaruwa with at least two fortresses, Kuḍa Veḷigama and Húrátoṭa, in the Jaffna peninsula, unless indeed these were in the hands of his ally Jaya Báhu.

We know from an inscription at Nayinativu that Parákrama Báhu I. was in possession of the extreme north. But Parákrama Báhu II. clearly never recovered it and his northern frontier was entrusted to Vanniyars, in whose charge was Anuradhapura. So it is highly probable that Mágha or Jaya Báhu or both never lost the peninsula, and that the independent Jaffna kingdom came into being with their expulsion from the rest of Ceylon. The Gaṅga dynasty of Jaffna is accounted for by Mágha himself; the Chola Kúlaṅkai or Vijaya, if Chola he was, may be Jaya Báhu.

In the eleventh year of the reign (A.D. 1245/6) according to the *Mahávaṇṣa* or the twelfth according to the *Pūjavalīya*, occurred the Jávaka war. The invaders under Chandrabhánu undoubtedly were Javanese: they used blow-pipes (*nachchambu*) and poisoned arrows, and pretended to be Buddhists. The *Attanagalu*

7. Seka Rásasekara Málai (Jaffna, Kali year 5004); Dakshina Kailāsa Purāṇam; *Raghuvamśa*, etc.



*Vaṇsa* says that Chandrabhānu was from Tambaliṅga, the name given in the *Pūjāvaliya* to the country Tamba, whence came the priest Dhammakitti (*Mhv.* LXXXIV. 12). The *Saddharmaratnākara* in the narrative of the Bo tree calls the port of Tāmralipti, 7 days, sail down the Ganges from Gaya, by the name of Tāmaliṅgam-tōṭa; the *Daḷadā Sirita* also translates the Tāmralipti of the *Dāṭhādhatu-vaṇsa* by Tamalingomu. This identification is hardly probable in the case of Chandrabhānu, who seems to have been a Malay raja, a sea-robber or viking, frequenting the coasts of Southern India and Ceylon. Perhaps he may be the "Sāvaka," whose crown and crowned head Jaṭavarman Vīra Pāṇḍya boasts that he took in an inscription of his 10th year (A.D.) 1264/5<sup>s</sup>. In this connection may be noted Chavakachcheri in the Jaffna peninsula and Jāvakakoṭṭe, on the mainland, where according to the *Kokila Sandésaya* Sapumal Kumārayā defeated the Canarese.

The late *Dambadeni Asna* confuses Parākrama Báhu's wars. According to this work (1) a Tamil king from Kalinga, claiming the throne by inheritance, landed at Salāvattōṭa, advanced on Dambadeniya, and was killed. (2) In the second year after this the Tamalingamu king, hearing of this event, descended with Tamils on Tammeṇnāwa; Parākrama Báhu made offerings to the Tooth Relic and the Tamil king was killed. (3) Jāvankarē rāja invaded with a Tamil host: Parākrama Báhu killed 12 kings in as many battles and gave land to their armies.

The expression in the *Pūjāvaliya* "and in various other wars," following on the enumeration of those already mentioned, appears to conceal a serious invasion by the Pāṇḍyans. Jaṭavarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I. (A.D. 1251-1280) in an inscription of his 9th year (April, 1259) styles himself "a second Rāma in plundering the Island of Ceylon". In his Sidambaram inscription, undated but apparently of 1257, he states that he fought Peruñjīnga of Sendamangalam after receiving tribute of elephants and gems from the king of Ṭam; these elephants were employed by him in his Koṅgu war. Jaṭavarman Vīra Pāṇḍya II. (1254-1275) in record of his 10th year (1264/5) is described as "pleased to take the Chōla country, Ceylon and the crown and the crowned head of the Sāvaka"; in one of his 11th year (1265/6) he boasts that he "killed one of the two kings of Ceylon, captured his army, chariots, treasures, throne, crown,



necklaces, bracelets, parasols, chauris, and other royal possessions, planted the Pándya flag with the double fish at Kónamalai, and the high peaks of the Trikútagiri mountain, received elephants as tribute from the other king of Ceylon, and subdued the Kerala."<sup>9</sup> The slain monarch must have been the king of Jaffna and the other Parákrama Báhu. If all these records refer to one campaign, as seems probable, its date must fall between 1254 and 1257. On either side of the main entrance of Fort Frederick, Trincomalee, may be seen the double Pándyan fish on carved stones taken from the old Kónésar temple.

Of Parákrama Báhu's 30th year is the Galapata Vihare inscription. The Demaḷa Adhikári Keselána bim Mahendra *alias* Kahambal-kula Mindal-návan cannot be Devapratirája as contended in *Ceylon Notes and Queries*, July, 1914, as this minister according to the *Aṭṭanagalu Vaṇsa* was of the Dunukewatta family.

The Parákrama Báhu Piriveṇa (Mhv. LXXXV, 57) is referred to in the Naranbedda inscription in Kegalla District.<sup>10</sup>

From the abdication of Parákrama Báhu II. in his 34th year, history is continued not only by the *Mahāvansa*, but also by the longer version of the *Pújāvaliya* already mentioned. This is strictly parallel with chapters LXXXVIII and LXXXIX of the *Mahāvansa*, and occasionally gives important information lacking in the Pali chronicle. Both seem to be from the same school. A critical edition of the last chapter of the *Pújāvaliya* in its longer form is very desirable; at least three manuscripts exist in the Ratnapura District alone. I note below points of interest.

The prince Tribhuvanamalla, not Tilokamalla as in the *Mahāvansa*, was given the army of the Dakuṇu-pasa or "Southern Country"<sup>11</sup> with command from Dambadeniya to the sea coast, Mhv. LXXXVIII, 20-22). Bhuvanaika Báhu was set over Yápvugala, as the Tamils very often landed at Kuḍa Veligama (*ib.* 23-26) on the north.

The account of the fortification of Vátagiri (Wákirigala, *ib.* 43, 44) and of the deposit of the royal treasures is prefaced by the statement that Vijaya Báhu IV. had heard that in former time Mahalu Vijaya Báhu, being defeated in the Tamil war, had gone

9. *Ind. Ant.* XXI, p. 343; A.R.E., no. 421 of 1907; Sen-Tamil, IV.

10. Report on the Kegalla District, Sessional Paper, XIX, 1892, p. 77.

11. J.R.A.S., C.B., XXIX, p. 62.



to the same hill and placed his treasures there, the reference being to *Mahāvamsa* LVIII, 32; Vijaya Báhu IV. now set the Máya-dunu army in charge of the fortress. The Mahanetpámula Sthavira, for whom he built a monastery on the top of the rock, was Buddha-putra the writer of the *Pújávaliya*; he was of the Ganaveṣikula on the one side and of the Maha Pāṇḍi-vansa on the other, and so presumably a relative of the king. His brother, Mahanetpámula Sumaṅgala, judging from the *Nikāya Saṅgraha*, was a contemporary of Saṅgharakkhita and Vagisvara, both of whom lived under Vijaya Báhu III. and it is likely that he was dead when the Mayurapáda Piriveṇa was founded at Vátagiri.

After fortifying Kurunegala (*Mhv.* LXXXVIII, 60),<sup>12</sup> where his uncle Bhuvanaika Báhu had lived, Vijaya Báhu "built Badalagoda-nuvara, placed the people as a guard for that rock (*scil.* Kurunegala), and sent information thereof to the king his father." This is the present Batalagoda and the Badalatthali of the *Mahāvamsa* LXV, 5. In addition to the *Mahāvamsa* story of Chandrabhānu's second invasion, which was more than a mere raid as he overran a considerable tract of country, the *Pújávaliya* states that he brought a Sinhalese army when appearing before Yapahu. "The holy places such as Thúpárama and others" (*Mhv.* LXXXVIII, 80) are given in detail as "Tubúrup, the Śrī Bódhi, the Lovámahapáya, Ruvanveli-maḷu, and other places;" Senánátha Pariveṇa is rendered by Senevirat Piriveṇa. The Maha Vannin in Pihiti-rajaya were made guardians of Anuradhapura.

After *Mahāvamsa* LXXXVIII, 109, the *Pújávaliya* relates that Parákrama Báhu sent 4000 soldiers, inhabitants of the country east of Dambadeniya, to protect his son Vijaya Báhu at Polonnaruwa, and all those from Navayodun-raṭa to guard his nephew. The two princes began work "in the twenty sixth year of the king who entered Polonnaruwa." As this is of importance for purposes of chronology it is advisable to give the texts, which differ among themselves: the sentence runs in one manuscript:—

1. එකල විජයබා විරබා රජ දෙදෙන රජපොලොන්නා රජකට සිටිවන හවුරුදුගෙහි පටන් පොලොන්නරුවෙහි නොයෙක් කම්මාන කරවන්නාහු

12. Of Kurunegala, the *Pújávaliya* has: එකුවර ජනගහන කරවා පවුරු වාසල් ආදියෙන් සෙමකොට, and of Vátagiri: එහල් මුදුනෙහි මහා මාළිගාවක් කරවා පවනය සිසාරා පවුරු පදනම් වාසල් දෙරවු ආදියෙන් සුරක්ෂිතකොට.

*Vasala*, therefore, in the thirteenth century, meant "gate-house" and not "palace," as contended by some modern pundits.



In the others the wording of the crucial part is :—

2. රජදෙදෙන තම පොලොන්නරු රජකට සවිසිවන හවිරුදු පටන් පොලොන්නරුවෙහි
3. රජදෙදෙන තමන් පොලොන්නරු රජකට සත්විසිවන හවිරුදු පටන් පොලොන්නරුවෙහි

With these should be compared the Ambagamuwa inscription : අවනිස්වන්ත මතු හවිරුදු පටන්කොට (*Ep. Zeyl.* II, 4, line 50). I understand the meaning to be that the commencement of repairs took place in the 26th year from the recovery of the capital. In the part of the *Pújávāliya* corresponding with *Mahāvamsa*, LXXXVIII, 116-120, the Lañkātilaka is mentioned specifically : at this building, miscalled "Jetavanarama," there actually exists an inscription of Vijaya Báhu IV. giving its true name and recording its restoration<sup>13</sup>.

Parákrama Báhu, when handing over the government to his son, had bidden him to take "to Kandavuru the Tooth Relic, which had been brought to Máya-rāṭa in the kingless time," and had announced his intention of being crowned there (*Puj. = Mhv.* LXXXVII, 63-72). Accordingly his second coronation was celebrated in "Kandavuru-pura," and the Tooth Relic brought from Dambadeniya to "Kandavuru" and placed in "the old Daḷadā-ge," which had been vacant for 64 years. The Daḷadā Pújāvaliya says that Vijaya Báhu I. built "the old Daḷadā-ge in Kandavura," but the one mentioned here presumably is that of Niṣṣaṅka Malla.

The name "Kandavuru" seems to mean Polonnaruwa and this is made certain by the Sinhalese *Attanagula Vamsa* (XI, 8) which, as pointed out by Mr. D. B. Jayatilaka, has : පොලොන්නරුව යන මෙ නමින් ප්‍රසිද්ධ කඳවුරු නුවර. We can now understand the statement of Kalyāṇavati's Bopitiya inscription (*Ep. Zeyl.* II, 33) that "Kandavura" had been broken into during the Tamil disturbance (දෙමළ විසවුලින් කැකුරු විණි.) In this connection we may recall that the open country, in which Duṭṭu Gemuṇu pitched his camp before Vijitanagara, was called Khandhāvāra-pitṭhi (Kandavuru-piṭṭiya); if the town then besieged was on the site of the branch city Vijita (*Mhv.* LXXXVIII, 91) as contended by Parker and Storey, the name "Kandavuru," applied to Polonnaruwa close by, is explained. But Monier Williams' Dictionary gives the meanings of *Skhandhā-*

13. Arch. Survey, 1910-11, p. 137.



*vāra* as (1) an army or a division of it attached to the person of the king; (2) a royal capital, a royal residence; and (3) a camp. The second interpretation must apply here. It may be observed that Kalyāṇavati's general Āyasmanta was of the Khandāvāra family<sup>14</sup>.

There is no part in the *Pūjāvaliya* corresponding with *Mahāvamsa*, LXXXIX, 70; instead, we read:—

“The king his father hearing this speech, with joy arising therefrom, said, ‘Just as Buddha could have laid claim to the virtues of (his son) Rāhula Thera, so I take to myself the services rendered by my son,’ and participating therein sent divers precious gifts. Thus, having with Vijaya Bāhu's ordination in this thirty fifth year carried out nine ordination festivals, he again continued at the same Jambudroni-pura seeing the prosperity enjoyed more and more by his sons, and again heaping up merit more and more enjoyed his royal state.”

The usual colophon beginning with එකල උභය කල and appearing on page 701 of the printed edition then follows. The poor manuscript followed in this is defective in the account of the author's descent.

(To be Concluded.)

---

14. Sri Rāhula was of the Maurya or Kandavuru family *Vrita Ratnākara Pañchika; Kāvyaśekhara*, I, 23.)



## Notes & Queries.

---

### SINHALESE CURRIES.

---

By the late MR. J. P. LEWIS, C.M.G

---

THE following were the curries at a breakfast at Arambegama Walawwa, belonging to the Nugawela family, on 13th January 1910. I wonder whether they exhaust the list known to Sinhalese cookery :—

1. Mun-ēla	Green peas.
2. Kollu	Brown peas.
3. Wamboṭu	Brinjal.
4. Pol-mal	Coconut-flowers.
5. Labu-mada	Water-pumpkin.
6. Polos	Young jak.
7. Kos-ēmbul	Mature jak.
8. Miris-ēmbul	Capsicum.
9. Patol	Snake gourd.
10. Muwa-mas	Dried venison.
11. Badulla-kola	Leaves of the <i>badulla</i> tree.
12. Amba-ēmbul	Mangoes.
13. Lūnu-kola	Onion leaves.
14. Kolluhodi	Soup of brown peas.
15. Bōnchi	Beans.
16. Tiyaará	Cucumber (the native kind.)
17. Kēkiri	Cucumber (dwarf.)
19. Mēkaral	Beans (long)
19. Angunu-kola	Leaves of <i>angunu</i> creeper (bitter)
20. Bilin	The fruit of that name.
21. Alu-kesel	Ash-plantain.
22. Kohowila	



23. Bim-mal	Mushrooms.
24. Tampalá	
25. Takkáli	Tomatoes.
26. Karawala	Dried Fish.
27. Niwitikola	Spinage.
28. Idalpalá	Leaves of a wild shrub.
29. Hiritala-embul	Wild-yams.
30. Gówa-kola	Cabbage.
31. Raṭala	A kind of small yam, also called <i>innala</i> .
32. Katurumurunga-mal	Leaves of the tree so called.
33. Kaṭuwala-ala	Yams of a kind of jungle creeper.
34. Kaṭupuhul.	A concoction of ash pumpkin.
35. Polkiri-hodi	Coconut milk soup.

## COW AND BUFFALO MILK.

By Muhandiram W. DANIEL FERNANDO WAIDYASEKARA.

THE following *slokas* (with translations) from our ancient Medicinal Books should interest readers of the *Ceylon Antiquary* who habitually or occasionally drink cow or buffalo milk :

### Cow-milk.

1. *Gavyan Pavitrancha rasayanancha pathyancha hridayan bala-pushtidan syat*  
*Ayuh pradan rakta vikara pitta tridosha hridaroga vishapahan syat.*

Cow-milk has a purifying effect ; it is savoury, wholesome, agreeable, vigour-giving, and nutritious ; it prolongs life ; removes derangement of blood produced by bile, also the three humours, heart-complaints and poison.

2. *Nasastan lavanayir-uktan kshirancha melnava punan*  
*Karoti kushthan twagdoshan tasmanayiva hitan matam.*

Cow-milk that is saline and sour brings on eruptions and cutaneous diseases. It is therefore unwholesome.



**Cow-curd.**

3. *Amlan swadurasan grahi gurushnan vatarogajit*  
*Medah sukravala sleshma rakta-pittagni sopakrit.*

Cow-curd is sour and agreeable to the taste; it binds the bowels; it is heavy and heaty; it destroys windy complaints; and it produces fat, semen, phlegm, bile, appetite, and morbidness.

4. *Snigdhan vipake vadhuran dipanan bala-vardhanam*  
*Vata pahan pavitrancha dadhigavyan gunapradam.*

It is also cooling; it contributes to digestion; it gives a glossy appearance (to the skin), and vigour; it destroys wind; and it has a purifying effect.

**Cow-ghee.**

5. *Vipaka Madhuran vrishyan vatapitta kapha paham*  
*Chakshushyan-bala krinmedhayan gavyan sarpi gunottamam.*

Cow-ghee has excellent qualities; it contributes to digestion, promotes sexual vigour, destroys wind, bile, and phlegm; and it is a power to the eye.

**Buffalo-milk.**

6. *Snigdhan maruchchhita karanchatandra nidrakaran vrishya-*  
*taman sramaghanam.*  
*Balapradan pushtikaran kaphasya sanjivanan-mahi sam-*  
*yuchyate payah.*

Buffalo-milk is cooling; it produces wind, indolence, drowsiness, excellent sexual vigour; it destroys fatigue; it gives strength; and it is, in its relation to phlegm, called the life-restorer.

**Buffalo-curd.**

7. *Ghanan mahisa muddiishtan madhuran raktadosha krit*  
*Kapha sophā haran sasthan pitta kritvata kopanam.*

Buffalo-curd is excellent. It is thick and delicious; it affects the blood; it destroys phlegm, and morbidness; and inflames wind.

**CAPT. THOMAS ALDERSEY JONES.**

By JOHN M. SENAVERATNA, F.R.H.S.

CAN any reader let me know who is now the possessor of the Silver Cup which Messrs. M. & S. Lyon, Silversmiths, of 113, High Holborn, W.C. 1, had for sale in November, 1920, and of which the following is a description:



Antique silver cup and cover chased with branches of berried foliage and partly fluted, on square pedestal stand, date 1819, 20½ inches high, weight 141 ozs. 3 dwt. Inscribed—

TO THE WIDDOW OF CAPT. T. A. JONES  
WHOSE LIFE WAS EXHAUSTED  
IN THE LABORIOUS EXERTIONS  
OF A CAMPAIGNE  
AMONG THE FORESTS OF CEYLON  
HIS BROTHER OFFICERS OF H.M. XIX. REGIMENT  
WHO KNEW HIS VIRTUES & DEPLORE HIS LOSS  
PRESENT THIS MEMORIAL OF THEIR  
AFFECTION FOR A RESPECTED BELOVED  
LAMENTED FRIEND.  
A.D. MDCCCXVIII.

\* \* \*

This was Capt. Thomas Aldersey Jones, who died at Batticaloa on April 18th, 1818. He was the 3rd son of John Lloyd Jones, Esq., of Maesmawt in the County of Montgomery. He married on February 4th, 1813, Susan, 2nd daughter of Wil. Thornes, Rector of Cardeston and Vicar of Alberbury in the County of Salop. He had three children.

There are three memorials to him in Ceylon, two at Batticaloa, where he died, and one at St. Peter's Church, Colombo, which says that "when in the midst of the Kandyan rebellion he was attacked by his last illness at Katabowa in Wellasse, he refused to quit his post or remove to the sea-side until he had exhausted the last effort of his strength in the cause of his country."

---

## THE KANDY ROAD.

By J. C. VAN SANDEN.

---

THOSE who have read the article on "The First Mail Coach in Asia," which appeared in the *Ceylon Antiquary* some time ago, may find some interest in this note on the historic Kandy Road. It is difficult to say whether it is to the far-seeing and progressive policy of Sir Edward Barnes or the indomitable energy and engineering skill of that great pioneer, Major Skinner, falls the greater share of credit for the construction of the most important thoroughfare in the Island.



The late Mr. A. M. Ferguson of the *Colombo Observer*, in his *British Administration of Ceylon*, states that in those days it was considered a privilege to be selected for any particular undertaking by Sir Edward and well did Skinner rise up to expectations. It would be detracting from the merit of Skinner's achievement if it was not stated that the Major had to contend with almost insuperable difficulties. There were first and foremost the ravages of the *anopheles* mosquito to guard against and, such a thing as an organised labour force was conspicuous by its absence. Leaving alone skilled labour, it is not difficult to imagine the trouble there must have been to recruit workmen from amongst the Kandyans who entertained superstitions that, when a certain rock was pierced, Sinhalese independence would be at an end.

Any notice of the Kandy Road, be it of the most casual nature, would be incomplete without mention of General Fraser and Captain Dawson of the R.E. under whose directions the work was carried out. The latter's connection with this work is commemorated by the monument at Kadugannawa near the point where the main road and the railway track meet.

The first sod was cut in 1820 and by the following year the trace and other preliminaries were complete. Of course, the road could not be gravelled or metalled all in that short period. Yet it was opened for traffic, and this indicates the urgency there must have been for this line of communication with the Kandyan Capital. It must have been when the road was in this incomplete state that Sir Hardinge Giffard had occasion to make use of it when performing a journey to the Hills to hold sessions there. "My Lord" must have been a bad traveller. He describes the agonies of the journey as follows :—

"Marshes and quagmires, puddles, pools and swamps,  
Dark matted jungles and long plushy plains,  
Exhaling foetid airs and mortal damps,  
By Kandyan perfidy miscalled a Road,  
Through which the luckless traveller must wade,  
Uncheered by sight of man or man's abode,....."

To the late Mr. J. P. Lewis is due the credit of having saved these lines from oblivion.



## NOTICE TO CONTRIBUTORS

**C**ONTRIBUTORS of Articles to **The Ceylon Antiquary and Literary Register** will greatly oblige the Editor by leaving the *upper half of the first sheet of manuscript* blank, for the convenience of the Editor in entering instructions to the Press regarding titling, style of printing, etc.

2. The task of the Editor will be greatly lightened and the cost of composition and correction lessened if the following suggestions are observed :—

(i) In preparing copy, a margin of at least three inches should be left on one side. The revision of crowded manuscript is excessively laborious. Further, the folios should be numbered consecutively from 1 to the end.

(ii) Please write plainly, especially proper names and foreign words. If Roman or Italic characters with diacritical points are used, those points should be distinct and rightly placed. Words to be printed in Italics should be *once* underscored. Type-written copy always needs to be carefully revised, with especial attention to mechanical faults, punctuation, and paragraphing.

(iii) Punctuate the copy precisely as you wish it to appear in print. Double marks of quotation (" ") should be used for actual quotations; single marks (‘ ’) for included quotations, definitions, and the like.

(iv) Give the title of books cited in full where it first occurs. In subsequent citations, the work may be indicated by brief reference, e.g., **Tennent** *l. loc cit.* p. Entire uniformity should be observed throughout the article.

Footnotes should be kept within moderate limits. References to footnotes should be made by brief series of natural numbers (from 1 onwards), not by stars, daggers, etc.

Additions and alterations in type, after an article is printed in pages, are in many cases technically difficult and proportionately costly, the bill for corrections sometimes amounting to as much as the first cost of composition. A careful preparation of the manuscript or "copy," in the manner above indicated, will save every one much unnecessary trouble.

*Notes and Queries* will always be gladly received for insertion in **The Ceylon Antiquary and Literary Register**.

Remittance, correspondence relative to subscriptions, and notices of change of address should be sent to

**THE MANAGER,**

**"THE CEYLON ANTIQUARY  
& LITERARY REGISTER."**

BOX 159,  
COLOMBO.

Contributions of Articles, Notes and Queries, etc., should be sent to

**THE EDITOR,**

**"THE CEYLON ANTIQUARY  
& LITERARY REGISTER."**

BOX 159,  
COLOMBO.



---

## SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

Four Rupees each copy  
or  
Fifteen Rupees for the year

Obtainable from the Publishers  
**THE TIMES OF CEYLON**  
Colombo, Ceylon, and  
Blackfriars House,  
New Bridge Street, E. C. 4.

and from

**LUZAC & Co.,**  
46, Great Russell Street,  
LONDON, W.C.

**PROBSTHAIN & Co.,**  
41, Great Russell Street,  
LONDON, W.C.

**KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH,**  
**TRÜBNER & Co., Ltd.,**  
25, Museum Street,  
LONDON, W.C.

**ERNEST LEROUX, Esq.,**  
28, Rue Bonaparte,  
PARIS.

**HIGGINBOTHAMS, Ltd.,**  
MADRAS & BANGALORE.

**THACKER, SPINK & Co.,**  
CALCUTTA & SIMLA.

---

*Prospectus and full Particulars  
obtainable from the Publishers  
Post Free.*

---















