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Preface

In this book the political history of the Kingdom of Jaffna since its beginnings to the mid-fifteenth century has been reconstructed with the aid of archaeological and literary sources. This Kingdom was referred to variously as Yalpppana, Yalpppanatam and Yalpppanapattimagam in local and Indian Tamil literature and inscriptions of the contemporary and later periods. It was known as Yapithewa or Demangapatnam to medieval Sinhalese literary tradition. The Portuguese administrators and chroniclers refer to it as Jaffnapatam and in the period of Dutch rule it was known as Jaffnapatnam.

The origins and development of the Kingdom of Jaffna and the relations which its rulers, the Arya cakravartis, had with contemporary South Indian and Sinhalese kings have been examined in nine (IV - XII) Chapters of this book. The origins and development of the Vanni principalities some of which were included within the Kingdom of Jaffna have also been examined in considerable detail. The historical traditions recorded in the local Tamil chronicles have been examined here in a historical setting and interpretively analyzed.

The first three chapters dealing with the history of the Tamils in the island from Proto-historic times to the thirteenth century have been included here with a view to provide a background that would enable the reader to have a better understanding of the principal theme of this book. Interesting and valuable information pertaining to the Megalithic culture in Sri Lanka has been obtained since the first chapter has been printed and now it is estimated by archaeologists who conducted recent excavations that Megalithic urn-burials could be unearthed in thousands in the island's western littoral. Archaeological research in the future may therefore show that the extent of Dravidian penetration into the island during the Proto-historic and early historic periods was much greater than has been recognized in this book. In the second and third chapters the scope of our enquiry has been considerably enlarged by the progress made in Tamil epigraphic studies in the recent past.

The major part of this book (Chapters IV - XII) is based on a study originally conceived as a Ph.D. dissertation for the school of Oriental and African studies, University of London. That study was undertaken under the supervision of Professor J.G. de Casparis, Reader in South and South East Asian History in the University of London. I am indebted to him for his learned and stimulating guidance which enabled me to complete that study. His wide experience, unrivalled knowledge of the pre-colonial history of Sri Lanka, and criticisms and comments helped me immensely.

I am beholden to Dr. John R. Marr of the Department of South Asia, S.O.A., S., who was kind enough to read the drafts of several chapters of the original study and make valuable suggestions. His help was a great asset in interpreting obscure passages and expressions in Tamil literature and medieval inscriptions.

I remain indebted to Professor K.W. Goonewardene who helped me to obtain probationary study leave for post-graduate training in London and to Drs. T. Kandiah and V. Kanapathypillai who read the drafts of some of the chapters of this book and made some useful comments and criticisms. I am obliged to Mr. James T. Rutniam and Vidwan F. C. Nadarajah who lent me some valuable texts from their libraries for the preparation of this study. I would like to express my thanks to the staff of the libraries of the S.O.A., S., the British Museum and the University of Ceylon, Peradeniya. I owe a deep debt of gratitude to Arul Rajendran who took a personal interest in this work, made all arrangements for its publication and patiently read the proofs of each chapter several times. If not for his labours this book would never have come out of the Press.

The history of the Kingdom of Jaffna from 1467 to the Portuguese conquest in the seventeenth century will be dealt with in the sequel in part II of this book.

S. Padmananathan,
Peradeniya Campus
University of Sri Lanka
Peradeniya
Sri Lanka.
Abbreviations
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ASSI  Archaeological Survey of Southern India
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Note on Transliteration and Diacritical marks

In the transliteration of words and expressions in Oriental languages the standard practice followed by historians and epigraphists is adopted here except in rare cases where it is not possible to do so. The distinction between ṣ and ś has not, however, been maintained in the transliteration; both letters are represented by n.

In the case of Tamil letters the long vowels, ā, ū, े, ो, and ulary are transliterated respectively as a, au, e, and o. The following also may be noted: k stands for ṭ; c for ṣ; ɾ for ṣ; t for ṣ; d for ṭ; l for ṣ; ṭ for ṭ; ṭ for ṭ; and ṭ for ṭ; n for ṭ; and ṭ for ṭ; n for ṭ; n for ṭ; and n for ṭ;

The Tamil passages quoted in the text have been, with a few exceptions, translated or transliterated.
## Publisher's Note

This little volume forms Part I of the revised and enlarged version of Dr. S. Pathmanathan’s doctoral thesis written in 1969. His original thesis had remained in manuscript for want of a publisher.

Having come to know of this in 1974, I made an appeal through the Press for public donations or returnable contributions towards its publication. A former Senator and Attorney-at-law of Mallakam Mr. S. Nadarajah and Dr. S. Rajaratnam of Prasanthi Dispensary, Thalayali, Kokuvil, responded with donations of Rs. 100 and Rs. 50 respectively. There was no further response until Mr. K. Subramaniam of No. 23, Galle Road, Bambalapitiya, Colombo, and of Tellippallai, gave me the courage to launch on the venture with a contribution of Rs. 2000. I was further encouraged by a donation of Rs. 1,500 from a Tamil Association in London. The balance money required for the purpose was shared by my three sisters. I express my gratitude to all of them.

I thank Dr. Pathmanathan for permission to publish his thesis; the Ceylon Newspapers Limited for printing it; Mr. S. Doraisamy for the cover design; and Messrs. Arasan Printers for printing the jacket and the plate.

The follow-up on Part II will to a great extent depend on the public response to the present volume.

Arul M. Rajendran.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Vikrama Panḍya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>Manava</td>
<td>Manava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>Manavai</td>
<td>Manavai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>ary the main political events</td>
<td>are the main political events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>literary sources</td>
<td>literary sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Girā sandesa</td>
<td>Girā sandesa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in the sources that were available to Valentin</td>
<td>in the sources that were available to Valentin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>computing</td>
<td>comprising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queyron</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
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<td>Thirty-eight year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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18. Matale.
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30. Padaviya.
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INTRODUCTION

The Tamil speaking people of Sri Lanka who constitute about thirty percent of the island's population could broadly be divided into three principal groups: (1) 'The Ceylon Tamils' (2) The Tamils in the central region of the island and (3) the Muslims. The Tamil population in the central parts of the island emerged as a result of the opening up of coffee, tea and rubber plantations by the British colonial government in the nineteenth century. Most of the 'Indian Tamils' have been and are still employed as estate workers and have provided 'cheap labour' in the plantation sector of the economy. They have perhaps remained isolated from the mainstream of political and social life in the country owing to certain constraints imposed on them.

The rise of Muslim settlements in several parts of Sri Lanka is linked up with the history of the island's trade, internal and external. By the tenth century the Muslim Arabs had acquired a foothold in Malabar from where they extended their activities all over the Coromandel. From the late thirteenth century they dominated the trade of the Indo-Ceylon straits. Soon they spread to the ports of Sri Lanka in increasing numbers and gradually penetrated into the interior of the island. By the mid-

1. According to the recent census report the Tamil speaking population consists of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceylon Tamils</td>
<td>1,415,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Tamils</td>
<td>1,192,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceylon Moors</td>
<td>824,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Moors</td>
<td>29,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malays</td>
<td>41,615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(mostly bilingual)

3,500,257

fourteenth century there were many Muslim settlements around the ports on the western and southwestern coasts of the island. The Portuguese who came to the island in the early sixteenth century found the Muslims in control of most of its trade.

In modern times the Muslims are found in most of the towns in Sri Lanka and a majority of them are concentrated along the western and eastern coasts. They are of diverse origins like the Sinhalese and Tamils. Their numbers include Malays and even some who are probably the descendants of traders who had come from the Arab lands of West Asia and North Africa. A very large number of them are, however, the descendants of traders from Malabar and the Coromandel and are therefore Tamil-speaking. Yet, the Muslims claim a separate identity—an identity based on religion. They have developed a social organization and attitudes that are in some ways distinctive to them.

The 'Ceylon Tamils' whose history forms the subject of this work have influenced the pattern of social and cultural evolution in Sri Lanka at different stages and in varying degrees. They have been concentrated from medieval times in the areas that correspond to the Northern and Eastern provinces and in the western littoral from the north up to Chilaw. A section of the Tamils in Jaffna began to spread out into Colombo and other towns in the western and central parts of the island as a result of being employed in government service and the mercantile sector after the administrative unification of the whole island by the British during the nineteenth century.

The Tamils have lived in Sri Lanka from pre-Christian times and Sinhalese-Tamil relations is a favourite theme in certain sections of the Mahavamsa and the Culavamsa which record Sinhalese traditional history. The two communities are differentiated by the languages they speak and from medieval times also by religion. Sinhalese which is mainly Indo-Aryan in vocabulary evolved in Sri Lanka and is not spoken anywhere outside the island. Although it is derived from Prakrit, which was introduced into the island from India in pre-Christian times it is not an Indian language. Tamil which belongs to the Dravidian group of languages concentrated mainly in the southern states of India had developed in South India before the Christian era. It is spoken by several millions there and is one of the major Indian languages.

During the early centuries of the Christian era Buddhism which had spread almost over the entire island promoted a sort of cultural homogeneity. The Tamils and other Dravidians who followed Buddhism and had come under the influence of the cultural tradition transmitted by Prakrit seem to have been absorbed within the framework of this cultural homogeneity. But the Tamils who came to the island in increasing numbers from the period of Pallava-Pandya supremacy in South India which coincided with the Hindu revivalism there tended to remain Hindu. They were not easily absorbed into the Buddhist Sinhalese population as before. From the seventh century onwards, the Tamils were an important element in the cultural, political and military affairs of the country.

Since the period of Cola rule in the eleventh century they developed as a separate community with an identity of their own. The remains of several Hindu temples constructed mainly in the Cola style of architecture, the substantial number of bronzes and other icons unearthed within the premises of ruined temples and the evidence from Tamil inscriptions set up at several localities which were of political, strategic and commercial importance show that the Tamils were a prosperous and influential element in society during the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The contents of the Tamil inscriptions set up during this period
and the art forms found in the architectural and iconographic remains reveal that their cultural and social institutions were almost entirely a replica of those in South India. During the Polonnaruwa period (1070–1215) the Sinhalese and Tamils lived together as the subjects of a monarchy which always claimed and at times had sovereignty over the whole island. Some rulers of this period were of Tamil descent in the male line. The Sinhalese court had matrimonial links with the Pandyas, one of the two main Tamil dynasties in India. Many Tamils held high ranks at the court and in the army and the administration.4

After the conquest of a large part of the country by Magha of Kalinga in A.D. 1215 the kingdom of Polonnaruwa disintegrated. All vestiges of political unity in the island disappeared. The events of the thirteenth century, especially those that followed Magha’s invasion, had far-reaching effects. The most notable among them was the development of two kingdoms—Jaffna and Dambadeniya, and a number of autonomous or independent chiefdoms collectively known as the Vanni. Of the two kingdoms one was Tamil and the other was Sinhalese while most of the chiefdoms were under the authority of Tamil feudal chiefs called vanniyar.5 The kingdom of Jaffna had as its nucleus Uttaradesa,6 the northern division of the old principality of Rajarata, and corresponded to the Tamil districts in the northern part of the island.

Another development that followed the fall of Polonnaruwa was the eventual abandonment of the irrigation works of the north-central plain in the dry zone. The once fertile and prosperous north-central plain which supported a prosperous society reverted to jungle and became an effective barrier between the Sinhalese and Tamil kingdoms which for the most part developed in isolation.

The origins of the Tamil kingdom in the northernmost parts of Sri Lanka may therefore be traced from the time of Magha who occupied Polonnaruwa mainly with the support of Dravidian armies and ruled Rajarata as a separate kingdom for a period of forty years. After his demise around 1255 the Javakas under the leadership of Candrabhanu secured power over most of the territories that were previously under Magha, mainly with the support of armies raised from the Tamil kingdoms in South India. Candrabhanu soon came under the influence of the rising Pandyas power in the Tamil country. He was reduced to the position of a vassal. Not many years later when Candrabhanu refused to send tribute the Pandyas invaded his kingdom, defeated him in battle and the king was killed.7 Towards the end of the thirteenth century Arya cakravarti, a chieftain from the Pandyas kingdom acquired authority over the kingdom in the northern part of the island.8 His descendants continued to rule over it until the Portuguese conquered it in the early seventeenth century.

The Arya cakravartris reorganized the administration and under them the Tamil kingdom became stronger and more prosperous. It aspired for and even attained for a brief period some sort of supremacy over the central highlands and the south western lowlands. Under the Arya cakravartris Jaffna had close political, cultural and commercial links with the kingdoms of South India. Pandyas and Vijayanagara influences over Jaffna were strongly felt in successive stages. The rulers of Vijayanagara claimed and at times even obtained tribute from the rulers of

---

4. See, Chapter III
6. Uttaradesa was the northern division of Rajarata which was one of the three major units into which the entire island was divided for administrative purposes under the Sinhalese monarchy.
The Kingdom of Jaffna

Jaffna since the late fourteenth century. After the decline of Vijayanagara Jaffna came under the influence of Tanjore and Madurai which were two of the successor states of that empire.

In the fifteenth century Sinhalese political power revived after a long period of decline, under Parakramabahu VI of Kotte. He aspired to become the ruler of the whole island. When his armies overran Jaffna, the Tamil ruler Kanakacuriya Cinkaiyariyan fled to India. Thereafter, Jaffna was administered for a period of seventeen years by Sapumal, the adopted son and general of Parakramabahu who had conducted the campaigns that led to its conquest. When Sapumal left for Kotte to secure the throne of that kingdom on the death of Parakramabahu, the king of Jaffna returned from exile and re-established his power in Jaffna with the help of some of the chieftains in the Tamil country.

The successors of Kanakacuriya Cinkaiyariyan like their contemporary Sinhalese rulers, had to confront the Portuguese whose power assumed menacing proportions and ultimately threatened the existence of their kingdom. Cankili I who realized the gravity of the threat posed by the Portuguese power at times supported the Sinhalese rulers in their wars against the Portuguese. With support from Vijayanagara feudatories in South India he successfully resisted Portuguese pressures and managed to keep them at bay until the very end of his reign. A formidable invasion of Jaffna organized and led by the Portuguese Viceroy in Goa, Don Constantino de Braganca in 1560, ended in failure. The only Portuguese gain was the capture of the island of Mannar which became a foothold from where they could organize expeditions against Jaffna whenever they found it convenient and desirable. The Portuguese captain of Mannar soon began to play the role of a king-maker in Jaffna.

After the death of Cankili the threat of Portuguese power became greater and his successors did not have the power and ability to resist them. The decline of royal power and the dissensions among the nobility were advantageous to the Portuguese who lost no time in exploiting the situation to secure their ends. Initially their policy was, as in the Sinhalese kingdoms, one of supporting plant rulers who would meet their demands in respect of Christianity and commerce. In course of time such a policy was not found to be a feasible one. The Portuguese demands were so exacting and irksome even to a ruler who was their virtual protege. The concessions granted to the Portuguese by successive rulers were resented by the inhabitants the bulk of whom were Hindus and made the rulers unpopular. Besides, Portuguese activities in Jaffna amounted to a challenge to the power of the Nayak of Tanjore who claimed overlordship over Jaffna. When in the 1560's the captain of Mannar found himself obliged to play the role of king-maker in Jaffna it was not long before the new ruler found himself obliged to oppose the Portuguese to protect his own interests and to maintain the loyalty of the Hindu subjects. Periyappillai Chegaraiya Cekaram who was installed by the Portuguese in 1570 later attacked Mannar with aid of forces from Tanjore. Another king Puviraja Pandaram Pararajaciyan attacked Mannar with the support from the Kunjalis, the admirals of the Zamorin of Calicut. The attack proved to be unsuccessful and the Portuguese retaliated by invading Jaffna. The king was defeated and killed together with his son and the commander-in-chief of his forces. The Portuguese then installed as king Ettimannaciyan, the son of the previous king. The new ruler was bound, by a treaty concluded in 1591, to acknowledge the king of Portugal as his suzerain and pay a substantial portion of his
revenues as tribute. The new ruler, like some of his predecessors, found that the Portuguese interests conflicted with those of his kingdom and could satisfy neither the Portuguese nor his people who disliked the Portuguese especially on account of their religious activities. As the Portuguese found the ruler vacillating in his support to them they planned for his deposition. Affairs in Jaffna ultimately developed into a confrontation between the Portuguese and the Nayak of Tanjore. In 1620 the last ruler of Jaffna, Cankili II, was captured and the kingdom was occupied by the Portuguese. The latter were able to suppress local opposition and establish their power in Jaffna by 1621 only after decisively beating the Nayak’s forces on land and sea.

The conquest of Jaffna by the Portuguese under Constantine de Sa enabled them to round off their control of the maritime areas of the island. The kingdom of Kandy in the centre of the island became more isolated and was more exposed than ever to Portuguese attack. After their conquest of Jaffna the Portuguese attained a position of supremacy in the Indo-Ceylon straits and could easily interrupt communications and commerce between Kandy and the kingdoms of South India. Besides the Portuguese acquired control over the pearl fisheries in the Gulf of Mannar and the lucrative trade between Jaffna and South India.

The Portuguese conquest severed the political and cultural contacts between the Tamils of Sri Lanka and South India. Hinduism suffered a sharp decline in Jaffna and almost all Hindu institutions were destroyed by the new rulers. Jaffna became a fertile field for proselytization which was vigorously carried out by Portuguese missionary organizations with the support of the colonial government.

The Portuguese adopted the traditional system of administration and the old territorial divisions; They also retained the traditional ranks in the administration. Under the Dutch Jaffnapatnam, which was one of the three divisions of the Dutch possessions in Sri Lanka, included almost all the territories that were under the kings of Jaffna.

After the fall of Jaffna, centres of Tamil political power lingered on in the Vanni. The principalities of the Vanni which were spread over a large part of the dry zone, had emerged as seen earlier, by the thirteenth century. The principalities in the territory stretching from the Gulf of Mannar to Trincomalee were subject to the control of the kings of Jaffna. The Vanniyaar of Trincomalee were also under the influence of Jaffna until the sixteenth century. Thereafter, when the eastern littoral assumed a new importance as a result of European activities in the region the kings of Kandy brought the Vanniyaar of Trincomalee and Batticaloa under their effective control. Until then many of the Tamil Vanniyaars in the eastern littoral enjoyed a great measure of independence and the principalities under their rule had remained isolated from the politics of the rest of the island. The Vanniyaar of Puttalam, who, like most of the chieftains of Batticaloa, were Mukkuvars of Malabar extraction, owed allegiance to the king of Kotte since the reign of Parakramabahu VI. The principalities on the west and east coasts, however, succumbed to the Portuguese and the Dutch in successive stages during the seventeenth century.

The situation in the Vanni lands of Jaffnapatnam was altogether different. The seven Vanni principalities of 'Jaffnapatnam' were administered by feudal chieftains who held the rank of Vanniyaar. They were mostly the descendants of warriors who conquered the Vanni lands under the early kings of Jaffna. They received their investiture from the rulers of Jaffna to whom they paid annual tribute. The administration of their principalities was under their charge. All the Vanniyaar in the kingdom had to attend the ceremony of paresse held bi-annually in Jaffna.
After their conquest of Jaffna the Portuguese and later the Dutch claimed tribute and allegiance from the chiefs of the Vanni. They were reluctant to mobilise sufficient military resources for the conquest of the Vanni lands because of their involvement in other areas which from their point of view were of greater importance. From their centres of feudal power in the remote and jungle-covered lands the Vanniyars developed and sustained a spirit of local independence against the two successive European colonial powers, the Portuguese and the Dutch. Tradition and legend perpetuate the memory of the feats of Kalläyavanniyan, Nallamappäyan and Pañäravanniyan who led, at different times, the movements of resistance. Whenever the colonial government of Jaffnapatnam endeavoured to force them into submission the Vanniyars sank their differences and took concerted measures to safeguard their common interests. In such instances, the leadership fell on the chiefmin of Panankamam which was the largest and the most important of the principalities in the Vanni. The Dutch who had dealings with these chiefmin for a period of nearly one and a half centuries have left substantial accounts of the conditions in the Vanni. The Dutch government finally decided to crush the power of the Vanniyars and their principalities were brought under the direct rule of the Dutch authorities in Jaffna around 1780.

In the kingdom of Jaffna and the principalities of the Vanni the Ceylon Tamils have developed a social structure and cultural traditions which were in many ways distinctive. The Čeçaväjamai, the collection of customary laws, codified and applied by the Dutch in the early eighteenth century, embodies the traditions and values which were crystallized under the Tamil kings of Jaffna. The most notable feature of Tamil society in the kingdom of Jaffna was the fusion of the matriarchal and patriarchal forms of social organization. In the principalities of the Mukkuvar of Puttalam and Batticaloa, the matriarchal system continued to be predominant until recent times.

Jaffna became a stronghold of the orthodox form of Saivite Hinduism. This was largely due to the predominance of the agricultural classes which had imbibed the orthodox traditions of Hinduism to a larger extent than any other social group, with the exception of the Brahmans. Numerous temples were constructed and supported in various parts of Jaffna and in the different principalities of the Vanni. Tirukketisvaram at Mäntai and Konësvaram at Trincomalee were perhaps the most outstanding, the rest being of modest proportions. In the eastern littoral the traditions of the Rämiyana and the Mahäbhärata have exerted the dominant cultural influences. The Pätti cult based on the ancient Tamil work, Čiłapattikäram was very popular among the Tamils of the east coast. The Tamils of Batticaloa have developed and preserved a variety of folk literature which is of high literary merit and has many distinctive features.

Despite a long period of colonial rule covering nearly four and a half centuries the social structure and the cultural heritage developed by the Tamils in the kingdom of Jaffna and the principalities of the Vanni have survived although they have undergone transformation in varying degrees due to the impact of extraneous influences and adjustments.
I

The Tamils in the Anuradhapura Kingdom

The history of the Tamils in ancient Sri Lanka could be reconstructed only in bare outline. The available archaeological evidence being scanty and limited the Mahavamsa and the Culavamsa are the principal sources of information. Political history and Buddhism are the two major themes of these chronicles. They record Sinhalese traditional history and in works of that nature one cannot expect detailed information on Tamil history. Yet, in their accounts of dynastic history, the Mahavamsa and the Culavamsa refer to Tamils who were of importance in politics and society. Such references in the chronicles provide the basic chronological framework for any study of the Tamils in Ancient Ceylon. The scope of a study of this nature will remain narrow and limited until the major prehistoric and protohistoric sites in the island are systematically excavated and the artefacts found there are analysed scientifically. Until and unless such work is done the beginnings of civilization in Sri Lanka and the date of the earliest Dravidian settlements in the island will remain controversial matters.

Sri Lanka, situated in the centre of the Indian Ocean and in close proximity to the Indian subcontinent was under strong Indian influences from prehistoric times. As South India and Sri Lanka formed one trading unit and because Sri Lanka was often brought within the sphere of South Indian political influence Tamil Nadu and Kerala were of special significance in the spread of Indian culture to Sri Lanka.

The ancestors of a vast majority of Ceylonese are of Indian origin and most of them seem to have come to the island from the southern parts of India. Race movements of the prehistoric age and the political changes and upheavals of the Christian era in India had their impact on Sri Lanka. They led to periodic migrations of Indians of different racial strains, in considerable numbers to the island. Besides, the impressions of seamen and travellers' tales sustained a belief among Indians that Lanka was a marvellous land of promise and plenty. Her wealth in pearls, gems, spices, and other natural products became legendary. Sri Lanka attracted to her shores all sorts of people—adventurers in quest of land and wealth, warriors, traders, seamen and divers mainly from the Malabar and Coromandel coasts.

Periodic migrations from India resulted in the growth of settlements in different localities in the island. Prehistoric archaeological remains suggest that the neolithic stage of civilization spread to the island from South India. The two major communities of prehistoric Sri Lanka, the Nāgas and the Veddas, seem to have entered the island from South India. The affinities the Nāgas had with the Tamils and other groups of Dravidians are not precisely known but the Veddas are considered as the lineal descendants in culture as well as in physique of the early Dravidian jungle tribes of India.

In the course of the four centuries prior to the Christian era Sri Lanka was brought within the mainstream of Indian culture. Several Brahmins, Aivikas, Jains and Buddhists

1. It is the belief among prehistorians that man did not evolve in Ceylon but on the other hand that he arrived in the island from the main continent of India. No skeletal remains of prehistoric man have come to light. See N. D. Wijesekera, The People of Ceylon, 2nd edition (Colombo 1963), p. 20.

2. Tellmann asserts: “In conclusion we may state our opinion of the relationship of the Veddas to the jungle tribes of India and to the civilized races of Ceylon. We regard them as part of the same race as the so-called jungle tribes of Southern India.” C. C. Tellmann and Brenda Tellmann, The Veddas (Oosterhout, Netherlands) pp. 416, 422.
came to the island and their activities led to the diffusion of ideas and traditions that were developed in the Magadhan empire in India. The rise of Buddhism as the dominant religion in the island laid the foundation of the synthetic proto-Sinhalese culture. The spread of Buddhism among the various communities in different levels of development led to their integration. With the adoption of Prakrit, the language of Buddhism, they tended to become Indo-Aryan in speech. The Indian cultural and religious heritage transmitted through Buddhism and Prakrit were thoroughly assimilated and became the basis of Sinhalese identity.

The pace of political and cultural developments among the Sinhalese was accelerated by Buddhism. The Magadhan Prakrit which was the language of early Buddhist literature exerted a profound influence on society and it led to the development of the Sinhalese language. All early stone inscriptions in the island were in Prakrit and were indel in Brahmi characters of the Asokan type. Monarchy as developed by the Sinhalese was basically a replica of the Indian model. Under Mauryan influence, Tissa, the Sinhalese contemporary of Asoka, adopted the practice of royal consecration and the title Devanampiya. The Sinhalese monarchy in the Anuradhapura kingdom which existed since the fourth century B.C. and lasted until the Cola conquest towards the close of the tenth century, was supported by an ideology of state power developed and sustained by the Sangha and the court. The unity of the nation and religion and the interdependence between the Sangha and the Court were two ideas behind this conception of state power. Agriculture dependent on artificial irrigation works became the economic foundation of the Sinhalese state. Buddhist institutions were supported and developed with the surplus revenues of the rulers. Religious edifices of monumental proportions were constructed in Anuradhapura and other towns. Art and architecture flourished and developed under Buddhist inspiration and with state support. Anuradhapura, the capital, became the principal centre of religious and cultural activity and it retained its pre-eminence until the rise of Polonnaruwa.

Another important development in the transmission of Indian culture to Sri Lanka, a development that had little in common with the Indo-Aryan tradition, was the spread of the megalithic culture into the island. The introduction of the megalithic culture generally associated with the Dravidians synchronised with early stages in the development of Proto-Sinhalese culture.

Several funerary urns containing human skeletal remains, with artefacts in bronze and iron in and around them have been unearthed in and around Ponnapparippu. At Ponnapparippu and other sites in the western littoral the urn-burials do not seem to have had any lithic appendage. The urns discovered at the protohistoric sites in Sri Lanka are remarkably similar to those found at Adichchannallur and other related sites in Tinnevelly in South India where the urn-burial culture was in fact part of a larger megalithic culture. The urn-burials in the Tinnevelly district and elsewhere in South India are generally found at rocky

---

3. Several pre-Christian Brahman inscriptions testify that there were several Brahmanas living in different parts of the country. The Mahavamsa also has several references to Brahmanas of whom had influence at the court. Pāṇḍukābhyāya is said to have given residences for Jainas, Ajivikas, and Brahmanas. Mv. 10: 101 - 102 S. Gunasingham, Koṇēsvaram, (Pallandiyak, 1973) pp. 17-22.

4. The traditional accounts of the origins of the Sinhalese as given in the Pali chronicles are legendary and cannot be considered as history. They are, in several respects, similar to the legends that purport to explain the origins of the 'Indianized' dynasties that held sway over those parts of the South East Asia that came under the influence of Indian culture in the first millennium of the Christian era. Most of such legends trace the ancestry of local ruler from either a Purāṇic sage or an epic hero. No clear evidence of a large scale migration of Indo-Aryan to the island has hitherto emerged. Some trading vessels operating from the Eastern and Western coasts of North India could have touched at some ports in the island and through the contacts established thereby North Indian influences seem to have penetrated into the local society. A thorough assimilation of the Indian cultural tradition by the local population need not imply and did not require a full scale Indo-Aryan migration.
surfaces in the neighbourhood of a settlement, almost invariably on its southern side. The urns are accompanied by pottery with a black and red polished surface and contain skeletal remains and metallic artefacts. Iron, bronze and gold were the metals that were mostly in use and among them iron predominates. Iron implements included agricultural implements and such weapons like sword, dagger and spear used in hunting and warfare. The megalithic people were therefore an iron using community, partially dependent on agriculture for their subsistence. It could be inferred that the migration of divers and others from the Tamraparani basin in the Pandya kingdom resulting in their settlements near the pearl banks on the west coast of Sri Lanka had led to the spread of Megalithic culture in the island. Megalithic culture was not restricted to the western littoral but had a wider distribution in the island. Monuments and artefacts that could be described as megalithic are reported to have been discovered at Anuradhapura, Habarana, Padiyagampola, Okanda near Kataragama, and Katiraveli in the Batticaloa district. The Megalithic people may have introduced into the island iron and paddy cultivation by means of irrigation.

The two ancient names of Ceylon, Tamraparani and Lankan, also testify to the close cultural contacts between her and the Tamil kingdoms in India during the proto-historic period. The river Porunai that flowed across the Tinnevelly region was otherwise called Tamraparani. Kapatapuram, the ancient capital of the Pandyas stood on the mouth of this river. Significantly, the same name was applied to the seaport town on the west coast of Sri Lanka. Tradition claims that Tamraparani was the capital of a kingdom before Upatissagama and Anuradhapura were established. In course of time, however, the name Tamraparani was applied to the whole island. It is noteworthy that the river Tamraparani which entered the sea at Cape Comorin and the town of Tamraparani on the opposite Ceylonese coast were in close proximity and significantly both were in the vicinity of the pearl fishery. This would indicate close cultural connections and parallel developments in both regions. The urn burials found in hundreds of thousands in the Tinnevelly area and in small numbers on the western coast of the island seem to provide evidence of such close links between the Pandya kingdom and Sri Lanka in ancient times. Lanka was also the name of a town in a principality in Toptainatu in south India.

The Tamil population in ancient Sri Lanka was derived largely from four groups of Dravidian settlers, namely warriors, merchants, artisans and seamen who came to the island from pre-Christian times. The Mahavamsa claims that a thousand families of craftsmen from the Pandya kingdom came over to Sri Lanka during the time of Vijaya, the legendary ancestor of the Sinhalese. But little reliance could be placed on this claim because the account of Vijaya as given in the chronicle is a legend. The earliest Tamil conquests of Ceylon seem to have been undertaken by merchant princes. In the two or three centuries prior to the Christian era there were wealthy and influen-

8. Vijaya, the legendary ancestor of the Sinhalese is said to have landed at Tamraparani. In another context it is claimed that he founded the town of Tamraparani and ruled from there. Ms. (trans.) 6:47; 7:41.
9. The Ciparagarampadi refers to Toowaa, Hippikai, Kitiappakai and Neemani para Hippikai. Hippikai referred to in ancient Tamil works has been identified as a region in the North Arcot district. Ciparagarampadi, II. 119-120; V. Kanagasabai, Tamils Eighteen Hundred Years Ago (Madras) pp. 27, 29.
10. Ms 7:51.
The Tamil householders' terrace inscription from Anuradhapura which records the construction of a Buddhist monument mentions the names of six Tamils of whom was the son of a ship captain. Two short inscriptions from Periyapulyanikulam in the Vavuniya district mention a Tamil trader called Viśākha. The Tamils Sena and Guttahaka, who were the sons of a horse trader, overpowered Suratissa, a brother of Devanampiyatissa and ruled the northern part of Lanka from Anuradhapura for a period of twenty-two years. 

In the second century B.C., Elāra, a nobleman from the Cōla country, subdued the Sinhalese ruler Asela and administered a large part of the island from Anuradhapura for a period of forty-four years. Early historical traditions of the Sinhalese represent him as a great and just ruler. He is said to have ruled righteously and with even justice towards friends and foes alike. Elāra was held in high esteem even by his foes on account of the ideals of justice which he cherished. Several anecdotes have been invented to illust-


12. According to the epigraph the Terrace of the Tamil householders was caused to be made by the Tamil Samann (residing) at Viñhaka. On the rock terrace near the inscribed boulder, are engraved the names of six Tamils, Kuhira, Tiso, Kubira, Nujita, Nago, Masaja and Karana the Navika. All names are in Prakrit and the name of each one is written above the section of his terrace. Above the highest part of the terrace is written the name of the one referred to as a ship captain. From the adoption of Prakrit names by these Tamils it may be inferred that at least a section of the Tamil living in Sri Lanka inhabited the 'Indo-Aryan' cultural tradition under the influence of Buddhism since pre-Christian times. S. Paranavitana, 'Tamil Householders' Terrace Anuradhapura', JCRAS, XXXIV (1940), pp. 54-58.


14. Mr. 21: 10

15. ibid. 21: 13-14

16. ibid. 21: 18-33

17. Pulathuttia, Bāhiya, Pannamāraka, Pīlayamāraka and Dāthika are said to have remained in the island. The other two returned to India. Two among those who stayed in Sri Lanka had names ending in māraka, perhaps from maśa, a common Pāli word. Mr. 33: 39-42, 56-61.
of the Sinhalese rulers while others came with the South Indian conquerors. Recruitment of mercenaries from the neighbouring Tamil kingdoms in India became necessary on account of internal politics and the inadequacy of trained warriors at certain periods in Sri Lanka where the bulk of the population consisted of a fairly prosperous peasantry engaged in the pursuit of agriculture. In Sri Lanka there were no laws regarding succession to the throne; as a result succession was not always regular and peaceful. Disputed succession often developed into full scale wars, especially in the seventh and eighth centuries. Aspirants to royal power and deposed princes had to raise armies from India in order to wage war against their local enemies.

Political conditions and geographical environment favoured the development of a military tradition in South India. In ancient times the Tamil country was politically divided into three kingdoms, namely, those of the Cōlas, the Pāṇḍyas and the Cēras, and a number of independent principalities. Dynastic conflicts and the attempts at territorial expansion often led to wars which had adverse effects on society. Constant vigilance and effective measures for local defence were required on the part of the people to safeguard life and property. The response to such needs was the development of a military tradition which was sustained until the medieval age in the Tamil country. The recruits to the armies of the principal ruling families were drawn mainly from the simple and hardy folk of the hilly regions and the infertile tracts. In course of time such recruits tended to become professional military groups as in the case of the Majavar and the Maravar of the society depicted in early Tamil literature. Sinhalese rulers could raise armies from such communities in South India whenever required without much difficulty.

In the early Anurādhapura period Illānāga (A.D. 33-43) and Abhayānāga (231-240) brought Tamil mercenaries from South India in order to secure the throne. In the fifth century several Pāṇḍya princes occupied Anurādhapura and ruled over a large part of Ceylon for a period of twenty-seven years. In the late Anurādhapura period many Sinhalese rulers brought Dravidian mercenaries from South India. Rival parties in the succession disputes and the civil wars that commenced in the seventh century and lasted for over a hundred years with interruptions, often raised mercenary forces from the Tamil country. The mercenaries who came to the island in the seventh century were almost exclusively Tamil but by the tenth century they included a substantial number of Canarese and Keralas.

Sirināga, a general of Silāmeghavānu (619-628) organized a rebellion from the northern province with the support of a Tamil army, but the attempt was crushed by the king’s forces. The deposed ruler Aggabodhi III (628-639) went to South India and returned with a force of Tamils whose support he avenged the defeat he had suffered earlier at the hands of Jēṭhātissa and regained his throne. Nevertheless, he was dislodged from power once again in a rebellion organized by Dāṭhēsiva. The latter secured power with the help of a Tamil army and assumed the name Dāṭhopatissa (639-650) on his accession.

After the death of Aggabodhi in Rōhanya his younger brother, Kassapa, deposed Dāṭhopatissa. The deposed ruler

19. In relation to the conquest of North Ceylon by the Pāṇḍya princes the Mv. says: ‘The Tamil king Pāṇḍu had slain Mudigama in battle and now having come over from the opposite coast held sway in Lanka. All the kings of noble families bade themselves to Rōḥanya, on this side of the stream the Tamil ruled. Cr. 38 : 11-12, 20-34.
20. Cr. 44 : 70-71.
21. Cr. 44 : 105-117
22. Cr. 44 : 125-126
23. Cr. 44 : 128
24. Cr. 44 : 145
brought a Tamil army from India with a view to re-establishing his power but his attempt ended in disaster. Some years later his nephew Hatthadāthā brought another Tamil army from India and seized Dappula I and administered the kingdom for a period of eight years (650-658). In the late seventh century, the prince Mānavamma (684-718) brought a Tamil army supplied by the Pallava Narasimhavarman and conquered the island. Thereafter, the Dravidian mercenaries who settled in Rajarata and their descendants continued to be a factor in the politics of the Anurādhapura kingdom. In the tenth century their strength was augmented by fresh arrivals from South India. In the reign of Śenā V (972-982) his general Śenā brought a large number of Tamil soldiers. The bulk of the mercenaries brought by this general stayed behind in the island and in the reign of Mahinda V (982-993) they were found in large numbers at Anurādhapura.

The Tamil mercenaries who were thus brought from time to time in considerable numbers played a decisive role in the succession disputes during the seventh century. Aggabodhi III, Dāthāsiva, Hatthadātha (615-667) and Mānavamma were able, as we have seen, to secure royal power with their support. Some times they fought in opposite camps. Most of them had no inclination to return to their homeland and settled down in the island and resisted attempts to have them sent away. When the prince Māna attempted to expel them he defied his authority and occupied Anurādhapura. The prince was able to retrieve his position only after concluding a truce with them. Peace and stability at the capital depended to some extent on their loyalty and co-operation. The rulers could not risk their hostility and therefore had to placate them.

26. Cr. 44: 152-153
28. Cr. 44: 155-156
27. Cr. 47: 33-54
28. Cr. 55: 2
29. Cr. 44: 105; 125-128: 45:18-22
30. Cr. 45: 11-15

When Hatthadātha came from India with a Tamil army to wage war against Māna, all Tamil on the route from Matoa to Anurādhapura are said to have joined him. Māna who was unable to face this combination fell from power.

During the late seventh century one of their leaders, Pothukkuttha, became so wealthy and powerful as to play the role of a king-maker. In the reign of Aggabodhi IV he held high office and on the king's death he imprisoned Dathāsiva, the yuvārajya, and administered the kingdom by setting up two puppet kings, Datta and Hatthadātha in succession until Mānavamma conquered the country with the support of a Pallava army. Mahinda V was another ruler who lost his throne on account of the Dravidian soldiers in the army. He was an incompetent monarch who neglected his duties and wasted away his resources. He lost authority over his subjects and was unable to remunerate the soldiers in his army. When the Kerala soldiers threatened to revolt Mahinda fled to Rōhāya and consequently lost control over a major part of his kingdom. After his flight the Cauromes, Kerala and Sinhalese army leaders are said to have administered all the territories except Rōhāya.

The employment of Tamil mercenaries from the seventh century onwards and the activities of South Indian merchant guilds led to the growth of Tamil settlements in Rajarata. Trade was another factor that led to the growth of Tamil settlements in Sri Lanka at different times. The lucrative trade between Sri Lanka and the Tamil kingdoms of South India, in pearls, precious stones, spices, elephants and cloth was largely in the hands of merchants operating from Maha-bhar and the Coromandel. From the ninth century onwards
the South Indian traders became more inclined towards organizing themselves in guilds. Soon such guilds became a vital force in society and in the sea-borne trade of the region.

The Vaṅgrāma (Vaṅgrāma), the most important among such mercantile groups in the Tamil country during the ninth and tenth centuries, had spread its activities over several areas in South India. Merchants who belonged to this group were to be found in the major towns like Uraiyaṅ Kotumpāḷur, Makkōtiappāḷinam and Talakkād. Inscriptions show that their overseas activities had led to their settlements in Thāland and Sri Lanka. In the middle of the tenth century the market town of Hopitigamu near Mahiyangana had a settlement of the Vaṅgrāma. The Vaṅgrāma was integrated into the local community and it had a say in local affairs.

There were Tamil traders in Anuradhapura during the ninth and tenth centuries. A Tamil inscription set up, in the reign of a ruler called Senāvarman, by the mercantile body called Nāṅku nāṭar records the gifts made by Tamil traders to a Buddhist institution named Makkōtiappāḷi. The inscription is said to have been set up by the Tamils of the Nāṅku nāṭu. The latter were an itinerant mercantile body of South Indian origin who came into prominence since the ninth century. They were some times included within the composite and more famous mercantile body called Tisai ayirattu ānāruṟṟur. The Tamils of the Nāṅku nāṭu seem to have appointed a select group of persons who together with the employees of the Viḥāra were entrusted with the task of administering the endowments made by the merchants, presumably for supplying certain requisites for the inmates of the Viḥāra. Some of the merchants, if not all, who belonged to the Nāṅku nāṭu seem to have been Buddhists. The name of the institution—Makkōtiappāḷi is interesting and it suggests Kērala connections. Makkōti was the epithet of a Čera King. Besides, there were some localities called Makkōti in Kērala. It may be inferred that the Tamils of the Nāṅku nāṭu who had set up the Makkōtiappāḷi in Anuradhapura had come from the Mālabar coast. Traders of the Četa community were also to be found in Anuradhapura prior to the Cēla conquest. Two such traders Cēkkīlān āṇkū and Cēkkīlān cēṇū are known to have donated some money to a Hindu shrine in Anuradhapura. The presence of traders belonging to the Vaṅgrāma and Nāṅku nāṭu in the island towns like Anuradhapura and Hopitigamu shows that some of the South Indian merchant guilds had gained a foothold in the island and secured for them a share of its internal trade. Their activities seem to have resulted in some of them settling down in different localities in Sri Lanka.

In connection with the invasion of the island by the Pandya king Śrī Maha Śrī Vallabha, the Cēlayanava refers to several Tamils living in different parts of Kērala. The testimony of this chronicle is corroborated by the evidence from Sinhalese inscriptions. Inscriptions issued from the ninth century onwards provide clear evidence of Tamil settlements at different localities in the island. Such expressions as Demel kēṭhalla, Demel-gum-būm and Demel vaṭṭadēnum indicate that there were several lands and villages, held or inhabited by Tamils. The first of these expressions is explained as an allotment in a village set apart for the Tamils. Such lands were to be found in the northern and

35. IV. 54. 12-16
36. Paramananda explains the term Demel kēṭhalla as an allotment in a village, set apart for the Tamils. The expression Demel vaṭṭadēnum seems to refer to the lands that were owned by Tamils. The RājānuḷũḷṆa inscription of Mahāvīra IV (255-307) records some immunities granted to a certain class of officials from Kēṭtigama and Demel Kēṭtigama. The latter seems to have been the part of the Village Kēṭtigama which was inhabited by Tamils. The Demel kēṭhalla referred to in the Colombo Museum Pillar inscription is said to have been situated at Gobagoni, a revenue division (village) of Veliṭtī in the Northern province. D. M. de Z. Wielenga-singhe, Anuradhapura slab inscription of Mahāvīra IV, 52, I. p. 177; 8 Paramananda, Colombo Museum Pillar Inscription of Kāเสีย(750,104),(995,993)

eastern provinces (dēsas) of Rajarata. An inscription of Kassapa IV (898-914) refers to a Demej kābāḷa situated in Gannagani, a village in the Valviti division of the Northern province. The inscription of Udaya III mentions 'Tamil lands' in the Parisakuliya district of the Eastern province. The Rājāmapiyāya inscription of Mahinda IV (956-972) mentions Demej-kēnuigam—the Tamil part of the village of Kigam— in the Eastern province. Moreover, the Anurādhapura slab inscription of the same ruler refers to Tamil lands and villages in the four directions.

The levy of an impost known as Demej-kūḷi, which was a kind of poll-tax, also gives some indication of the Tamil settlements in the late Anurādhapura period. Such an impost was presumably collected from all Tamils living in the kingdom. The inscriptions of Sena II (853-887) mention this impost in connection with the villages of Poṣonavalla and Galinduru gamaṇḍala. Demej kūḷi is mentioned also in two epigraphs of Kassapa IV; one of them is from Sigiriya.

A functionary who had the designation Damiḻādhikārā is mentioned in inscriptions issued after the ninth century. He seems to have been an official who had authority over the Tamils in royal service. This functionary is mentioned in epigraphic records mostly in connection with edicts involving Tamil allotments.

---

37. EZ III, p. 216 
38. EZ IV, p. 236. 
39. EZ III, p. 236. 
40. EZ IV, p. 236. 
41. EZ I, p. 117. 
42. The Kāvinnuḷiyāva and Humāḷa inscriptions refer to Demej Kūḷi in these villages. This impost is also mentioned in the Vihaṟgaḷa Pāḷḷa Inscription of Kassapa IV, EZ I, pp. 197, 198; EZ IV, p. 152. 
43. EZ IV, p. 216; ASCAR 1911/II, p. 108. 

---

Most of the Tamils living in the island during the late Anurādhapura period were concentrated in towns like Māntai and Anurādhapura while the rest were scattered in the market towns and military outposts in Rajarata and elsewhere. A considerable number of them must have been traders. Inscriptions reveal that the Manigrama and Nankunṭṭai—two mercantile groups of south Indian origin—had extended their activities to Ceylon.

Religious institutions, Buddhist and Hindu, were set up by Tamils in different parts of the country. Evidence suggests that some of them patronized and even adopted Buddhism. The religious convictions of the earliest Tamil rulers, Sena, Guttahaka and Ela are not precisely known. But the tradition that they ruled righteously as found in the early stages of historical writing suggests that the monks of the orthodox Mahāvihāra had sufficient reason to be gratified with those rulers. It may be assumed that they were liberal in their religious outlook and even supported Buddhism in order to consolidate their position in the country.

Some of the Tamil rulers of the fifth century are definitely known to have patronized Buddhism. An inscription of Pārinda from Aragama in the Kurumāgala district records the donations made by him to a Buddhist monastery. The consort of his brother, Kuttīha Pārinda, made some donations to another monastery. Kuttīha Pārinda even assumed the title Buddhāsana. Moreover, an epigraph from Kataraṅgama attributed to the Tamil king Dāṭhika, the son of Tiritara, records a grant of land made for defraying the expenses connected with the ritual at the Maṅgala-mahācetiya at Kataraṅgama.
The Tamil merchants who have left behind records of their activities in pre-Christian times supported Buddhist institutions and even followed Buddhism. The six Tamils mentioned in the Brāhmi inscription from Anurādhapura, as seen earlier, had set up a Buddhist monument, at the behest of a Tamil monk, Visākha, the Tamil trader mentioned in another epigraph, supported Buddhism. In the seventh century the two Tamils, Pothakumhha and Mahākanda, who held positions of high rank in the reign of Aggabodhi IV promoted Buddhism. The former erected the monastery called Mātambiya, constructed several caityas and made several grants to Buddhist foundations. Mahākanda is said to have built three monasteries, one of which was named after him. Later, the mercantile body called Nāgakumāṭīr settled at Anurādhapura, set up a Buddhist monastery called Makkottai-palpjī in the reign of a certain Śenāvarman and made endowments for its maintenance.

The evidence—in the form of literary notices and archaeological remains—on the development of Saivism and Hindu temples in the island is limited. Nevertheless, evidence suggests that several Hindu temples, mainly Saivite, were set up at the ports and other important localities where the Tamils were settled. Tirukketīsvaram and kōṇēsvaram, the two principal Hindu shrines of ancient Sri Lanka, had their origins in the early centuries of the Christian era and perhaps were originally set up and subsequently maintained by Tamil traders operating in the Indo-Ceylon Straits. In the time of Mahāsēna there were Hindu temples at Trincomalee, Erakāvila and in the village of the Brahmin Kālanda. Mahāsēna had all of them destroyed and got Buddhist monasteries erected at their sites.

50. SI IV. No. 1405.
51. Mv. 35: 40—41.

Around the middle of the first millennium of the Christian era the two principal Hindu shrines of Sri Lanka had developed to such proportion as to attract the attention of the Hindus in the Tamil country and elsewhere in India. The Vāyupurāna, a saivite work of the Gupta period mentions the saivite temple at the peak of Triguna on the east coast of the island.12 Tirunāncanmantar, the celebrated Saiva hymnist of South India had sung of the glories of both Kōṇēsvaram and Tirukketīsvaram in two decades during the seventh century.33 Cuntaramūrtinīyamam also produced a hymn in honour of the latter.44 In the eighth century Mahinda II (777 - 797) is said to have restored several decayed temples and to have set up costly images of deities in them.55

Archaeological remains show that there were several Hindu shrines at Anurādhapura, mostly confined to the northern part of the town.56 The Hindu ruins in the premises of that ancient capital include temples dedicated to Siva, Kāli and Gānēśa and Brahmins' quarters and other minor buildings. The temples, mostly of brick, were of modest proportions and built in the Pallava style of architecture. They consisted of the inner sanctum (garbhagriha), a vestibule (antarāla) and a hall (ardhamāṇḍapa) in front of them.57 Two Tamil inscriptions found amidst the ruins of Hindu temples, and which could be assigned to the ninth century testify that some Tamils living at Anurādhapura were organised on a

53. Thirunandanmayam Cauśamihal Aṇuśeṣa
55. Mv. 48:143.
57. ASCAR for 1993, p. 5.
corporate basis. One of these dated in the fifth year of Cīraṇākapātī mārīyan records a grant of 30 īlakkācu by members of the kumārakaṇam, presumably to one of the temples.58 The money, obtained on loan from a Tamil trader called Čekkiṣan cankan, was granted for making daily offerings and for burning a perpetual lamp. The second inscription of the seventh year of the same ruler also records a similar grant by the same grant for a similar purpose, and presumably made to the same shrine.59

In the late Anurādhapura period which corresponded to the period of Pallava ascendancy in South India Tamil cultural influences were increasingly felt in Sri Lanka. The cordiality in the relations between the Pallavas and the Sinhalese court and the activities of mercantile bodies and religious groups of South Indian affiliations led to the spread of ideas and techniques characteristic of the Pallava tradition. Some Brahmins or the adherents of the Mahāyāna seem to have introduced the Pallava-Grantha into the island where a few inscriptions were engraved in the Grantha characters which were originally used in the Pallava kingdom for writing Sanskrit texts.60

The Nālanda Gejige, the earliest monument of Sri Lanka, which was entirely of stone construction was modelled on Pallava architectural forms.61 The figure of a Man and Horse, lately identified as a representation of Aiyānār, and the bas-relief representing Siva and Pārvati at Isurumuniya bear so close a resemblance to the figures at Māmallapuram as to suggest that they were the work of craftsman trained

58. SII IV: 1403, 1404.

59. SII. IV: 1404.

60. On the Tiriyāy inscription Paranavitana comments as follows: ‘The script of this record is one of its main features of interest. It resembles Pallava-Grantha of about the seventh century, and in this script has been written a few inscriptions of this period found in Ceylon.’ EZ. IV pp. 152–153.

61. UCHE. t. 1. p. 401.

62. ibid, p. 403.
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The Cōjas in Sri Lānka

993 — 1070

The Anurādhapura kingdom had lost much of its power and influence towards the end of the tenth century. The incompetence of its rulers, especially Sena V (972 - 982) and Mahinda V (982-1019), and the growing instability at the capital undermined royal authority. Mahinda V, the last ruler, lost his throne as a result of a military revolt and his flight to Rōhāna was a prelude to anarchy. The decline of Anurādhapura coincided with the rise of Cōla power in South India. During the early years of his reign the Cōla king, Rājarāja I (985 - 1016), conquered the kingdoms of the Pāṇḍyas, Cēras, Gangas and Nūlāmbas and brought them under his direct rule. After these initial conquests of Rājarāja Cōla power became supreme in South India. After the Pāṇḍya dynasty which at times was supported by the Sinhalese rulers was overthrown by the Cōla armies Sri Lanka became more exposed than ever to Cōla attack.

When the Cōla armies invaded Rājarātara there was no organized government and therefore its conquest was achieved with relative ease around 993. Rājarātara, the northern portion of the island, soon became an integral part of the Cōla empire, its government being placed under the charge of officials sent out from the Tamil country. In the central and southern parts of the island Mahinda

1. For the details about the events leading to Mahinda’s evacuation of Anurādhapura see CV, 55.

continued to rule until 1017 when he was captured and taken to the Cōla country by the expeditionary force sent by the new Cōla monarch, Rajendra I (1016 - 1044). After this event Rajendra’s official records claimed that he conquered the whole of Tamil. The capture of Mahinda demoralized the forces of resistance against the Cōlas and resulted in the expansion of Cōla power within the island. Mayarata and an additional stretch of the eastern littoral came under Cōla control and remained under them until the middle of the eleventh century. Besides, the Cōlas secured a position of unchallenged supremacy for a period of nearly five decades over the North Central plain which was then the most prosperous and populous part of the island.

In Rōhāna a succession of local rulers of diverse origins established themselves and sustained local independence amidst internal dissensions and a series of raids by the Cōla armies. Vījayaβahu I, a resourceful and imaginative ruler, who came to power in Rōhāna in 1055 brought the whole principality under his rule and mobilized his resources for a prolonged war against the Cōlas. He set up a number of military outposts along the frontiers of Rōhāna from where he sent expeditionary forces to attack the Cōla strongholds in Rājarātara and elsewhere. Soon intense fighting developed between both parties and Cōla military power showed signs of decline. Yet the outcome of the struggle in the island was largely decided by events in the Cōla kingdom. During the brief period of confusion that followed the death of Adhirajendra the Cōla government temporarily lost grip over the affairs of the outlying provinces including Tamil and it was not in a position to send reinforcements. This was to the immense advantage of Vījayaβahu I who intensified his military operations and brought the island under his authority after defeating the beleaguered Cōla armies.

In the period of Cōla ascendancy in South India and especially during the eight decades of Cōla rule in the island

3. The Cōjas, pp. 248-252; CV, 56.
Tamil influences on the politics, society and culture of Sri Lanka were felt in greater measure than ever before. For the first time a major portion of the island became an integral part of a Tamil empire. The earlier Tamil conquerors ruled from Anuradhapura and their rule did not result in the island ever becoming a dependency of any foreign power. In Rōhaṇa, two Tamil rulers Vikrama Pāṇḍya and Parākrama Pāṇḍya, exercised authority for some time during this period. They seem to have mingled with the Sinhalese royalty which, subsequently, in the twelfth century had in its ranks princes who were of Pāṇḍya descent.

When a major part of the island was under Cōla rule many Tamil officials, soldiers, traders, artisans and Brahmans came to the island in considerable numbers and settled in various localities in the northern and eastern parts of the country. Such settlements continued to flourish even after the end of Cōla rule and they played an active role in the social and cultural life of the country. The few dozens of Cōla inscriptions so far discovered in the island provide some evidence on Cōla administration and the social and cultural life of the Tamil settlements that arose in the island during the period of Cōla rule.

Cōla Administration
Territorial Divisions

Sri Lanka was administered as an integral part of the Cōla empire and the Cōla territories in the island formed one of the nine provinces of that empire. In Cōla records

4. CV. 56: 11-10
5. Mitra, the sister of Vijayabahāra I, was married to a Pāṇḍya prince and the offspring of that union were the three princes, Māṇābhāraṇa I. Ketasī Mūgha and Sīra Vallaṁba, who divided among themselves the principalities of Dakhkiṇadesa and Rōhaṇa. The famous Parākramabahāraṇa I (1153-1186) was the son of Māṇābhāraṇa.
6. In the heyday of its power the Cōla empire was divided into nine provinces called Maṇgalam. The other eight provinces were Jayakōṇi cōjāmaṇṭalam (Taṇṭai nāṭu), Gaṅga, Māṇgalam, Kāṃjāmajjāpāḷi, Māṇgalam (Ganga), Nīkālikōjāmaṇṭalam (Nīlamāṇḍapī) Vengāndamal, Malaimaṇṭalam (Cera kingdom) and Adhirājāmaṇṭalam (kōnug). See T. V. Mahalingam, South Indian politics (Madras, 1933), pp. 303-304.

8. Ibid.
9. SI, Vol. II: No. 92
11. F. Gannington, Trincomalee Inscriptions Sarjan-No. I.
There is no means of determining whether the Cōlas renamed the units called rata in the Sinhalese system as vālānāţu or whether such units were entirely new divisions superimposed on the Sinhalese system. In South India under the Cōlas, each vālānāţu was subdivided into smaller units called nāţu. There is some evidence to suggest that there were units called nāţu in the island. An inscription of Adhirājendra from the Siva Devale No. 2 at Polonnaruwa mentions the nāţār. The reference to the nāţār, which expression may denote either the inhabitants of a unit called nāţu or an assembly of the nāţu, however, presupposes that there was a nāţu in the region around polonnaruwa. A contemporary South Indian inscription mentions kōjitārnāţu in Ilam. On the basis of these isolated references it may be inferred that the units called vālānāţu in Sri Lanka were subdivided into several nāţus as in the Tamil country.

In South India the local assemblies flourished in their most developed form under the Cōlas. The assemblies of the Brahmin villages were called Sabhai, while those of the non-Brahmin villages were generally known as ǚr. The executive committees of such primary assemblies were known variously as Perunkurī māhāsabhā, Perunkurīppurumakkā and Álunākanām. There were also assemblies of other units such as Nāţu and Nakaram. Evidence relating to such assemblies is found only in one Cōla inscription hitherto discovered in the island. A recently discovered inscription from Kantaţāy shows that a Caturvedimānākalam— a Brahmin settlement—named after Rājarāja was established at Kantaţāy. From the reference to Perunkurīppurumakkā in this inscription it is clear that the Brahmin settlement at Kantaţāy, like its counterparts in contemporary South India, had an assembly for the regulation of its affairs.

12. The Cōlas, p. 405
13. SII. Vol. IV. No. 1388
14. ARE, 1912/18, 454 of 1917
15. Tho Cōlas, pp. 494—495
16. Trincomallee inscriptions, Società No. 1
Another Brahmin settlement, Jayaṅkoṇa- calāmeka-caturvedimāṅkalam, is mentioned in a twelfth century inscription from Mahākārindagama. This settlement like the one at Kantaḷāy may have been constituted during the period of Cōla rule. The first element of its name, Jayaṅkoṇa, which was an epithet of Rājarāja, may have been part of its original name—Jayaṅkoṇa Cōla Caturvedimāṅkalam. The name of this settlement, like that of Rājarāja caturvedimāṅkalam at Kantaḷāy may have been changed into Jayaṅkoṇa calāmeke caturvedi maṅkalam after the restoration of the Sinhalese dynasty.

The isolated reference to the Nāṭṭār in a Cōla inscription from Polonnaruwa may suggest that assemblies, of the territorial units called nāḷu were not altogether unknown in the island. However, government by primary assemblies does not seem to have become a regular feature of the local government under the Cōlas in the island. The system of local government as it prevailed in the Tamil society in India could not have been grafted on to the society in the island, where traditionally rural organization was chiefly through the medium of village headmen. Even among the Tamil settlements, in the island corporate organizations flourished only among groups which were either socially homogenous or functionally affiliated and such instances seem to have been rare.

Cōla Laṅkesvara tevar and the official hierarchy

The administration of the Cōla's possessions in Sri Lanka was for a time under the direction of a prince sent from Cōla court. Two recently discovered inscriptions from Kantalāy and Mānaṅkeni, two villages in the Trincomalee district, refer to a Cōla prince called Laṅkesvara tevar. In one of the epigraphs he is referred to also as Sri Cōla and Sri Caṅkavvarmā. As both inscriptions are dated in his regnal years, Sri Cōla Laṅkesvaratevar must have been a consecrated ruler. Sri Caṅkavvarmā and Laṅkesvaratevar appear to have been titles which had some political significance. Sri Caṅkavvarmā seems to be an abbreviation of Sri Caṅkabhodhivarman which was one of the two alternate consecration names assumed by the Sinhalese kings on their accession to the throne. The term Laṅkesvara meaning the Lord of Lanka occurs frequently in Sinhalese inscriptions as a royal epithet. The assumption of these epithets by the Cōla prince suggests that he was consecrated as a ruler of the island.

The position of Sri Cōla Laṅkesvaratevar is analogous to that of the Sri Cōla pāṇḍya princes in the Pāṇḍya kingdom. Rājendra Cōla who had to govern and defend an overgrown empire introduced a major innovation in the Cōla administration by delegating royal authority to his sons and other princes of the court who were sent to administer some of the conquered kingdoms. This system, perhaps partly designed to appease the sentiments of the peoples of the conquered countries, was continued in some measure by his successors until the accession of Kuloṭunga I (1070—1122) and it brought new strength to the Cōla administration which was called upon to face difficult problems, domestic and foreign. Rājendra deputed one of his sons to rule over the Pāṇḍya kingdom as his representative and had him consecrate at Madurai. All the successive Cōla princes who ruled from Madurai until 1070 were styled Sri Cōla pāṇḍya. Besides, they assumed one of the alternate throne names of the Pāṇḍya kings, namely Jājāvarman and Māravarman. The prassattis of Rājādhiraja and Rājendra II claim that they consecrated several Cōla princes as rulers of many subject kingdoms including that of the Pāṇḍyas. Such Cōla princes held authority over their respective kingdoms as deputies of the Cōla emperor and were assisted by imperial officers in the task of government.

18. Trincomalee inscriptions, Series No. 1
19. The Cōlas, p. 465
20. Trincomalee inscriptions Series No. 1, p. 8
21. ibid
The consecration of a Cōja prince as the ruler of Iļam was an extension of a practice which Rājendra introduced in South India. After the capture of Mahinda the Cōjas claimed to have conquered the whole island and from their standpoint the Sinhalese monarchy was abolished. The whole island was to be under their rule as an integral part of their empire. But, the Cōja emperor in Tanjore could not have audience with the subjects in the island and by any means his rule could not have been regarded as legitimate by the people living in it. Monarchy was the only form of government familiar to the Sinhalese and to make government effective and meaningful to a people traditionally accustomed to pay homage and render service to a legitimate ruler the Cōjas appear to have attempted to provide continuity to the institution of monarchy by substituting the Sinhalese monarchy with the Cōja monarchy. The consecration of a Cōja prince as the ruler of Iļam was a decisive step in that direction. In order to secure legitimacy the Cōjas adopted some traditions of the Sinhalese court. The Cōja prince on his consecration assumed the titles Lankesvara and Sri Cāṅkavarmar and presumably undertook to uphold the ideals implied by such titles.

In South India the Cōjas had brought into existence a highly organized and thoroughly efficient bureaucracy for the administration of their dominions. The aristocracy of landholders formed the core of the bureaucracy. Remuneration for service was mostly in the form of land assignments given as life tenure. The Cōja administration in Sri Lanka was, for the most part, a replica of that in the Tamil country. The administration was manned by a hierarchy of officials most of whom were periodically sent out from South India. The descendants of such officials who settled in the island were also presumably recruited for royal service. Most of the dignitaries serving in the island held the rank of Uṭaiyān and had their original

tiefs in the Tamil country while others held ranks such as Nāṭālāyān, kilavan, peraraivān, paṇimakan and cīruntanam. The Cōja officials must have come into contact with the local chieftains to some extent at a certain stage but the nature and extent of such relationships is not revealed in the sources brought to light hitherto. The Cōja inscriptions do not refer to any person who could be identified as one who held any rank in the indigenous system of administration.

In Sri Lanka, as elsewhere in South Asia, agriculture was the mainstay of the economy and the tax on the produce of the soil was the principal source of revenue for the government. As land was the basis of political and social organisation in the Sinhalese kingdom and the Tamil kingdoms in South India the patterns of economic organization in all these kingdoms shared some characteristics in common. Nevertheless, there were essential differences which would partly explain the variations in the modes of government and social organization. In Sri Lanka the dependence on agriculture, especially on paddy cultivation, was far greater than in the Tamil country where economic activities were much more diversified. The other notable difference between Sri Lanka and South India was on the degree of dependence on artificial irrigation works and the dimensions of such works. In Sri Lanka huge reservoirs could be constructed by raising dams across rivers and canals in the north central plain chiefly because of the uneven character of the terrain. Most of such reservoirs could generally be depended for water supply almost throughout the year except in years of prolonged drought.

The essential characteristics of a hydraulic society were to be found in the north central plain on the eve of the Cōja conquest. As the grain tax and the water dues were their major sources of revenue the indigenous kings showed great interest in the development of irrigation works. The major irrigation works were of such a magnitude that their repair and maintenance were beyond the competence of village organizations. They required the resources at the king’s dis-
posal and became one of the major concerns of the government. An agrarian society which was dependent on a network of reservoirs and canals some of which extended over large stretches of land tended to promote the growth of royal power and precluded the development of village organizations as centres of power and initiative as in South India.

The Cōla administrators in the island perhaps could not easily grasp the intricacies involved in the operation of a hydraulic system on account of two reasons. One is that the officials of the Cōla government had no tradition of managing irrigation works of stupendous proportions as the ones found in the island; the maintenance of the medium sized irrigation works in the Tamil country was largely in the hands of the local assemblies. The other is the character of the Cōla administration which was unlike that of the first two European colonial powers, the Portuguese and the Dutch, who employed traditional ranks on a large scale. Cōla administration, dominated largely by an alien officialdom, could not have adequately mobilized the traditional resources for the maintenance and operation of the reservoir systems without the support of local officials. Irrigation works in the island undoubtedly continued to function under Cōla rule but we have no means to determine the measure of their capacity and the degree of economic prosperity generated by such works.

One of the most remarkable achievements of Rājarāja I was the systematic survey of the lands in his dominions for purposes of revenue settlement. In the island the lands in Rajarata were surveyed for the assessment and collection of revenue. Arable lands are known to have been classified at least into two categories, wet land (air nilam) and dry land (pun cey). The lands in the first category were obviously the ones that were irrigated by means of artificial irrigation works.

Land survey and revenue assessment by the Cōlas led to the introduction of methods prevalent in the Tamil country where the system and the units of measurement differed from those in the island. In Sri Lanka, under the Sinhalese monarchy, the measurement of land was according to sowing capacity as in the Canarese and Telugu regions in India. In the Tamil country linear measurements were used by the Cōlas. Ulakālantān kōl and Tiruvilāntān kōl are two of the measuring rods that were used by the Cōla officials in the island.23

In the Cōla kingdom the nilam or vēli was the unit of measure of land. It was subdivided into mā, kull, kāni and muntirikai. The system of measurement by vēli was introduced into all subject kingdoms including Īlam. The liquid and dry measures of capacity as found in South India were also introduced into the island.24 The atavatālān otherwise called Rājakēsari was the standard marakkāl that was used in Sri Lanka.25 The Cōla system of land-measurement by vēli and its subdivisions and linear measurements could not strike firm roots in the island. The simpler and less accurate method of measuring land according to sowing capacity which had prevailed over the centuries was revived after the restoration of Sinhalese rule. However, the Cōla system lingered on in considerable measure among the Tamil settlements in the island. The liquid and dry measures of capacity as introduced by the Cōlas were not abandoned soon. They seem to have been adapted into the indigenous system to some extent.

Taxes were collected mostly in kind as under the Sinhalese monarchy. Two kinds of taxes were levied on land: one was a quit rent (kāni kētān) payable in money and the other was nel mutal, a share of the produce. Besides, taxes were levied in kind from trees such as (luppai) which had some utility value.26 Customs dues, tolls and professional taxes were some of the

24. ibid.
26. SII, Vol. II: No 92
other sources of revenue. An inscription from Mātṭām provides the information that an akkam was levied from people passing through the ferries and pathways leading to Arunomjiteva vajānā. Taxes were levied on the weavers, living at Mātṭām at the rate of an akkam for a month on each loom. Tolls were collected from the traders at market places. A levy of a vaṭṭam on every kācu was collected from the buyer and seller of each commodity.  

Social and cultural life

The period of Cōla rule was an important phase in the growth of Tamil settlements in the island. These became an important factor in the economic, social and cultural life in the country during the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Our knowledge of them is derived mainly from the donative inscriptions set up in the premises of Hindu temples and the Rājarājapurumāḷ and the architectural and iconographic remains from religious sites.

The Nikāya Sangrahāya, a Sinhalese chronicle written in the fourteenth century states that there were Tamils in large numbers in the towns, market places and villages in the kingdom. This could be an exaggeration. Yet, it gives a vague idea about the nature and extent of Tamil settlements in the island when it was under the Cōlas. Administrative centres, military outposts and market towns were the localities where Tamils seem to have settled in considerable numbers during the period of Cōla rule. The provenance and contents of inscriptions and other archaeological remains may give some indication about the location of such settlements. Archaeological remains datable to the Cōla period have been found mostly at Māntai, Polonnaruwa, Paṇḍava, Madirigiriya, Kantalāy, Trincomalee, Jaffna and Attanagalla. Significantly all these localities, except the last two, were in the central belt of the northern dry-zone and some of them were in the neighbourhood of tanks. It would appear that the Cōlas concentrated mostly in areas which had an abundant supply of grain and water.

27. SII, Vol. IV: No. 1412

Officials, merchants and soldiers appear to have been the dominant groups in the Tamil settlements that arose in the island during this period. There were also Brahmins and probably artisans and others whose services were needed to meet the religious, social and economic requirements of the dominant classes. As mentioned earlier, a major part of the island which was constituted as a province of the Cōla empire was administered by officials mostly sent out from South India. Officials of high rank seem to have been posted at important administrative centres like Polonnaruwa, Mātṭām and Paṇḍava. Sri mōkanārūwāya, Tiruppuvanatevan, Tiyaṅkāntāmāṇi mutvāntavelān of Tittai, Sri mākarināyāl, paṭṭanātivān of Sri Nallur, Mankalappāṭī velān and Cōla pāḷavarvāya are some of the officials who seem to have been posted at Polonnaruwa. Tālākkurāyan—the kilavan (chief) of Cūkūrā naḷḷur in Cōlamāṇṭalam and Čīrakulṭṭur utaiyān āvāna, a paṇāmākan in the service of Rājendra, were two of the officials who exercised administrative functions in the town of Mātṭām. The inscriptions from Paṇḍava mention a number of dignitaries who had the rank of utaiyān. They had come to the island from Marunķūr, Pāḷippākkam, Tiyrucittāmālaṇ and other places in the Tamil country. One of the inscriptions from Rājarājapurumāḷ records the donations made by Atītān of putukkuṭi who had the rank of Pērārāyaṇī.

The evidence from inscriptions on Cōla military establishments in the island is very meagre. There is no means of determining the strength of the Cōla armies in the island in terms of numbers. The Cūḷavamsa and the Cōla prasātis give vague and exaggerated accounts of the strength of the Cōla army in the island. Army units were stationed at military outposts in

31. ET, pt. I, p. 34
33. The claim made in the Cūḷavamsa that the Cōla ruler sent an army of 95,000 men to subjugate Rājaṅā, is undoubtedly an exaggeration. See CV 55 : 24 - 25.
Rajarata, Dakhiniadesa and Róhana. Besides, contingents were sent out from India to reinforce the armies in the island whenever necessity arose. The leaders of the Cōla armies were mostly chosen from the landowning and Brahmin classes. Cōla inscriptions in the island mention the names of only two generals, Jayaṅkoṭa Cōla māvēnta vējān and Jayamurināṭṭiyān. The former led an invasion of Róhana which resulted in the capture of Mahinda V while the latter is known from an epigraph from Sankilkamadara. Citrrukutatt uṭṭiyān tevan who was at Māṭṭālam also had some military connections. He is referred to as a member of the group of Peruntam which was a military unit in the service of the Cōlas. Inscriptions show that troops, belonging to groups of the Veḷaṅkārār and Perumpatāi aṭukkar were serving in the island. A fragmentary inscription from Gal Oya, a village near Polonnaruwa, which could be assigned to the period of Cōla rule on palaeographic considerations mentions a Veḷaṅkāra called Athikaraṇa cārāṇa. An inscription of Rajendra II from Madiririgiriya records a donation to a temple.

34. The Cōlas had military outposts at Muhunara, Badaliathalān, Vāpāmara, Buddhagāma, Tilagulla, Mahāgalla and Māpi-jagalla in Dakhingerprint. In Rōhana they had a military stronghold at Cōḷama (Cōḷāmam). See CV, 59: 44 - 44

35. The general Jayamurināṭṭiyān is mentioned in the inscription from Sankili Kandarama. He may be identical with Ṭeniyān Bājaraja who otherwise called Vīraṅkendra Jayamurināṭṭiyān, a general and foundatory of Rajendra II, mentioned in an inscription from Karuvaṭ. See The Cōlas, p. 246; SII, IV: 1411

36. The terms cītjan tamam and perum tamam occur mostly in connection with military affairs. The Polonnaruva slab inscription of the Veḷaṅkārāra refers to groups called Cītjanam, Peruntaṇam and Vīlaṅkalatanam. Cītjan tamattu Veḷaṅkārapaṇādak, Cītjan tamattu vuyakā kṣīvala and Cītjan tamam perum tamam māṭājan are some of the expressions of military significance which occur in Cōla inscriptions.

37. This inscription records some endowments made by Athikaraṇa cārāṇa, a Veḷaṅkāra of the Māpiyukki. The word Māpiyukki is apparently an abbreviation of the expression Māpiyukkaka māṭcaenai, 'the great Army of the three armies', which was an important unit in the Cōla army. SII, Vol. IV: 1398.

38. Some princes and feudatories seem to have the word Aṭukkar suffixed to their names or epithets. Vīra Cōla aṭukkar was one of them. As he is referred to as a Nammakkal (our offspring) by a Cōla king, in an inscription, Vīra Cōla aṭukkar may have been a Cōla prince. A Cōla king, according to this inscription, made a gift of tax-free land to a certain Vīrāṅkāvīya aṭukkar who celebrated Vīra Cōla aṭukkar in a poem called Vīrāṅkāvīyavānum. Aṭukkar seem to have been a class of warriors, like the Veḷaṅkārāra, who were included in the composite army unit which was variously referred to as Perumpatāi, Māṭtāntra and Māṭtāmenai. The Cōlas, p. 604, ET, pt. I, p. 27

39. ET, pt. I, p. 34

40. Ceylon Journal of Science (O) II, p. 191

by a member of the unit called perumpatāi Aṇukkar. There were some soldiers at Padaviya in the reign of Rajarāja. Some of the donations to the temple of Iraṃ kūlamāṇikka īsvara at Padaviya were made by soldiers as suggested by their epithets paṭṭālakka and kanāṇ. An inscription from Diyaivina in the central province, which could be assigned to this period, records the name of a soldier Virabhavanān Dāhalābha māllaṇ. It would appear that the Cōla armies for the most part remained in the island after the liberation of the country under Vijayabāhu I and subsequently served in the armies of the Sinhalese kings. The Veḷaṅkāra and Apanṭaṭi troops which served in the armies of Vijayabāhu I and his successors must have been the remnants of the Cōla armies which once served in the island.

South Indian itinerary mercantile communities like the Ayyāvoie Ticaṭiyārattu aṃṇuṟṟavar, which had reached a very high stage of development in South India during the Cōla period gained a foothold in the island. The Ayyāvoie was a composite body which included several sub-groups such as nāṇadesi, Vāḷaṇcīyar, Vīrāṅkotti, Nāgaratār, Āṭṭiś and Āṭṭiṭputras. They are often described as belonging to the eighteen samayas and thirty-two Veḷaṅpurumams. The mother Goddess Paramesvari seems to have been their favourite deity. As they are described as the children of the goddess of the earth it may be inferred that the mercantile classes represented in the Ayyāvoie developed from the peasant communities of South India. They engaged
in retail and wholesale trade. Elephants, horses, cotton and silk fabrics, metals and metallic ware, foodstuffs and spices and gems and pearls were among the items of their merchandise. They employed soldiers belonging to various regiments for the protection of their personnel, caravan and merchandise. The Ticciyirattu aānurruvar who were one of the most enterprising and prosperous mercantile communities in South India seem to have actively participated in the sea-borne trade of the countries of South and South East Asia. They have left behind records of their activities in Sri Lanka, Burma, Siam, Sumatra and China.

During the Cōla period they were one of the three dominant groups in Tamil society, the others being Brahmans and Veḷḷāḷar. Towns and villages where mercantile interests predominated were at times constituted as Virapaṭṭamas or nakaram and they enjoyed certain privileges accorded to them by royal charter. The mercantile classes, among whom literacy was high, patronized cultural and literary activities. They constructed temples and monasteries and endowed them with various forms of wealth. A part of their surplus wealth was used for the provision of public amenities and the maintenance of charitable institutions.

The commercial links between South India and Sri Lanka, which usually formed one trading unit, became stronger after the Cōla conquest. The South Indian mercantile communities seem to have intensified their commercial activities in the island when it was under Cōla rule. They presumably acquired a virtual monopoly over the external trade and a large share of the internal trade. Inscriptions mentioning the activities of the Ticci ayirattu aānurruvar, which could be assigned to the period of Cōla rule, have been found in Padaviya, Polonnaruwa and Attaragalla. The evidence from these inscriptions, although meagre, gives some idea about the nature of their activities in the island. The inscription of the reign of Rajarāja from Padaviya records the gifts made by members of the official, mercantile and military classes to the temple of Iravikulam-aṉikka isvaram. One of the donors seems to have been a Nāṇādesi merchant. Two other short inscriptions at Padaviya show that two of the foundation stones of Siva devale No. 1 at Padaviya were laid by two merchants. One is referred to as Taniyappan, the merchant from Padaviya, while the other was a Cēti of the Nāṇādesa group.

A two-line inscription of the Ticci ayirattu aānurruvar from polonnaruwa, as mentioned earlier, shows that the Ayyavole were settled in a separate quarter at Polonnaruwa. The presence of the members of this mercantile body in the Puttalām area is indicated by an epigraph of the reign of Rajendra Cōla. It records the setting up of an inn (ambalam) named after the aānurruvar. Small groups of Tamil traders whose range of activity was confined to particular localities appear to have settled in the island during this period. An inscription of Rajendra Cōla from Māṭoṭṭam mentions the Cāṅkarapāṭān, Valakkāy vāṇiyan and Veṭṭilāi vāṇiyan. These groups of traders were dealers in oil, bananas and betel leaves respectively. Unlike the Ticci ayirattu aānurruvar, they were small groups of traders who dealt with one or two items of merchandise. They were presumably settled in the neighbourhood of the temple of Tiruvirāṁisvaram by the Cōla authorities for supplying certain commodities required for daily use in the temple.

As Māṭoṭṭam, the chief emporia of the island, continued to enjoy some measure of prosperity as in earlier times a prosperous mercantile class must have resided there. A Cōla inscription mentions incidentally of a wealthy local merchant named Kunça Tāmān who owned a house, a mansion and a
If his wealth and influence was typical of the affluent merchants it may be assumed that some of the local merchants resident at Māṭṭhām were so wealthy as to afford the luxury of owning mansions. The South Indian mercantile communities which had intensified their commercial activities in the island under the Cōlas were not entirely dependent on the fortunes of the Cōla power. They survived even after the fall of Cōla power and flourished in the island for a period of another century and a half.

A large number of Brahmins immigrated to Sri Lanka during the Cōla period. As custodians of the sacred literature and the orthodox traditions of Hinduism the Brahmins were an honoured and influential community in South India. Their influence in Tamil society during the Cōla period was perhaps greater than ever. This was partly due to the progressive development of the Hindu temple as the principal custodian of culture and learning in the land. In temple affairs the Brahmins exercised great authority and influence. Besides, Hindu rituals and ceremonies at the mansions of the court and the humble dwellings of the commoners were performed by them. In local government under the Cōlas the organization of the Brahmin dominated Caturvedimaṅkalam was the most developed.

The presence of a substantial number of Brahmins in Sri Lanka when it was under Cōla rule was a result of the growth of Tamil settlements. These settlements were followed by the introduction of the religious and cultural traditions that had developed in South India under the Cōlas. Quite a number of Brahmins were brought into the island to officiate as priests in the temples set up by the Cōlas at various localities in the island. The organization of the religious services in the temples that arose in the island was modelled on that of the Temples in the Tamil country. The terminology applied to denote groups of Brahmin functionaries came to be thus introduced.

An inscription of Adhirājendra from Poļonnaruwa, which records some details about the organization of the temple of Vānavaṁ maṭēviśvaram, mentions a bhaṭṭa, a kramavītta, a Sivabrāhmaṇa, Patipātumallapatturpaṇācāryyar and Panmaḥēsvaram kaṅkāni as some of the Brahmin functionaries attached to the temple. The first three categories referred to in the epigraph belonged to different groups of Brahmins well versed in religious matters and temple rituals. They conducted the rituals and ceremonies connected with worship offered to the consecrated images of deities. The expression Patipātumallapatturpaṇācāryyar which occurs frequently in the South Indian Cōla inscriptions probably denotes a group of five Brahmins of high rank who performed certain duties in the innermost sanctum sanctora of the shrines. The designation Panmaḥēsvaram kaṅkāni may be interpreted as one which denoted a group of Brahmins who supervised the work of Panmaḥēsvaram — Brahmin priests attached to Saivite temples, who were presumably to be found in all Cōla Saivite temples in the island. The Nilāveji inscription for instance mentions the Panmaḥēsvaram in connection with a landgrant made to the temple of Kōṅeśvaram. The panmaḥēsvaram at times served as trustees of the temples and in that capacity undertook responsibility for the endowments made to temples.

The Brahmin settlement at Kantaḷāy was sufficiently large as to be constituted as a Caturvedimangalā. As seen earlier, like its counterparts in the Tamil country it had an assembly of its own for the regulation of its affairs. It may be inferred that the Brahmin settlement which flourished at Padaviya during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries had its origins under the Cōlas. Brahmins of the Kauṇḍinyan gotra seem to have lived in Padaviya during this period. A short inscription on a bronze bell recovered from Padaviya mentions that the bell was donated (to a shrine) by a person who belonged to the Kauṇḍinyan gotra. The members of this gotra were also perhaps to be found among the Tamilis settled at Vinnantai in kottanṭu, a territorial division in the island. Two South Indian inscriptions record the benefactions made by residents of Vinnantai in Kottanṭu to
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the temple of kuttâlam in Tinnevelly in India. The interest shown by the residents of Vinnantai in Sri Lanka to a temple in kuttâlam may perhaps suggest that they were immigrants from Tinnevelly. Vînântay and koṭjīr nâtu in īlam cannot be identified at present. In South India, however, there was a locality called Vînântay. A certain kaṇṇiyan of Vînântay is mentioned in Ĉaṅkam literature. The name Vînântay was presumably applied to a village in koṭjīr nātu after the settlement of immigrants from Vînântay in South India. Since Ĉaṅkam literature associates the Kaṇṇiyan gotrâ with Vînântay and because members of that gotrâ were to be found in Padavavya during this period one may be tempted to suggest that Brahmins of the Kaṇṇiyan gotrâ were involved in the growth of a Tamil settlement at Vînântay in Koṭjūr nātu in īlam.

The substantial architectural and iconographic remains of the Cōḷâ period presuppose the employment of architects, sculptors and other artisans taken from the Tamil country. As the Hindu temples and the images of deities of the Hindu pantheon had to be made according to the rules prescribed by technical works of Śīpa sastra, it may be assumed that such work was undertaken by artisans familiar with such work and with a long tradition of building temples and casting icons in stone and metal. As the Cōḷâ monuments and icons in the island are unmistakably in the Cōḷâ school of art it may be inferred that they were produced by artisans sent from the Cōḷa dominions in India where the temple building activities of the Cōḷa rulers had led to the development of sophisticated techniques in the fields of architecture and sculpture. That such techniques were also introduced into Sri Lanka is evident from the high artistic and distinctively Cōḷa character of Siva devale No. 2 in Polonnaruwa and the bronzes and other icons recovered from the remains of Siva devale No. 5 in that town.

The remains of a substantial number of Cōḷa temples and icons would suggest that the Cōḷa settlements in the island had sufficiently adequate economic resources to construct and support temples. But in the absence of adequate information, it is difficult to ascertain what they were and how they were mobilized. The mercantile class which was wealthy was largely independent of the government and acquired its wealth through its own efforts. It could channel part of its surplus wealth to institutions meant for public use. Among the others, only the official and military classes could have sufficient resources part of which could be directed for cultural and religious activities. The Brahmins, artisans and others, irrespective of their numbers and influence, were economically dependents of the three dominant classes, namely merchants, officials and the soldiers.

The construction of many medium sized temples and their endowments suggest that the Cōḷa settlements had sufficient economic resources at their disposal. Evidence from inscriptions suggests that the endowments to the temples were made by the government as well as by individuals. The landgrants given to the temples of Rājarājēswaram at Mantai and Maccākevaram (Kōṇēvaram) at Trincomalee were made by the government. Private donations to religious institutions were mostly in the form of lamps, bells, cattle and money. Such grants, which were at times impressive, suggest that persons serving in the official and military establishments and agricultural resources and sources of monetary income. Private donations of land by Cōḷa officials, although rare, may suggest that they held landgrants assigned to them by the government.

Religious conditions: Hinduism and Buddhism

The Cōḷas being ardent Saivites were great patrons of Hinduism in South India. The period of their rule which covered nearly four centuries was the 'Silver age of South Indian Hinduism'.
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Hinduism during the Cōḷa period was the rise of the temple as a great centre of religious, social and cultural activity. The successive Cōḷa rulers constructed a large number of monumental temples in all parts of the Tamil country.\(^56\) The temple movement spread even to the subject kingdoms where many Saivite and Vaishnavite temples were set up and in their organization they were modelled on those in the Cōḷa country.

Inscriptions and other archaeological materials show that many temples were constructed in those parts of the island where Tamils had settled in considerable numbers during the period of Cōḷa rule. The names of some of these have been preserved for posterity in the texts of inscriptions. Of the two temples that are known to have been built at Māṭiṭṭam one was named Rājarājesvaram while the other was called Tiruvirāmīsvaram.\(^57\) In the town of Padaviya which was one of the important Cōḷa strongholds the remains of a few Saivite temples and inscriptions have been found. The partially damaged long inscription of Rājarāja I from Padaviya mentions the temple called Iraivilāmākkēvaram.\(^58\)

Four short inscriptions which could be assigned to the period of Cōḷa rule on palaeographic considerations show that Siva Devale No. 1 was a Cōḷa monument.\(^59\) An inscription from Madirigiriya reveals that there was a Saivite temple called Paṇḍita Cōḷa-Īsvaram at Nittaviṅṉataparam which was patronized by the Cōḷas in the reign of Rajendra II.\(^60\)

In Polonnaruwa, which was the principal seat of Cōḷa administration, the remains of no less than sixteen Hindu temples have hitherto been brought to light. Some of them were constructed during the period of Cōḷa rule. Identification of Cōḷa temples has been possible only in cases of architectural remains where Cōḷa inscriptions have been found. For instance Siva devales No.2 and No.5 have been easily identified as Cōḷa monuments because Cōḷa inscriptions have been found amidst their remains. Siva Devale No.2 was called Vānacakalāvēvaram after the queen mother of Rājendra I.\(^61\) No inscriptions which record the names of the other Cōḷa temples which were in Polonnaruwa have survived.

An inscription dated in the 28th regnal year of Rājendra I from Atakada mentions the temple called Uttama Cōḷēsvaram, which was named presumably after the predecessor of Rājarāja I.\(^62\) It is possible that the temples Vijayarāja-Īsvaram at Kantaḷḷaj and Vīkkiramačalāmekā Īsvaram at Mākal were originally Cōḷa temples which were renamed during the period of the Sinhalese rulers.\(^63\) Apart from constructing new temples in their strongholds the Cōḷas seem to have also supported the older temples of renown.

Two recently discovered inscriptions from Māṇāṅkaṉi and Nilāveḷi in the Trincomalee district show that the temple of Kōḷēsvaram was patronized by the Cōḷas. The inscription of the Cōḷa prince called Ilaṅkēvāratēvar from Māṇāṅkaṉi mentions Māccakēvaram which was another name for Kōḷēsvaram.\(^64\) It may be assumed that the missing portions of this fragmentary inscription contained the details of some grant made by the Cōḷa prince to this temple.
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The fragmentary epigraph from "Nilaveli", which could be assigned to the Cōla period on palaeographic and other considerations records a grant of 250 veji of irrigable and non-irrigable land in the localities called UkkiyikāmA, Kirikāgā and KirikāmA to the Saivite temple of Makkakesvaram on the promontory of Tirukōṇamalai.65

The Köṇēcar Kalvetu, a work which purports to give an account of the temple of Köṇēsvaram seems to perpetuate the memory of some Cōla activities in Trincomalee.66 The account of Kulakkōttan is a major theme in the Köṇēcar Kalvetu. Kulakkōttan is associated with the origins of some Tamil settlements in Trincomalee and the reorganization of its services. The traditions centering on Kulakkōttan came to be overlaid with legends and events of later date in the course of their transmission from generation to generation.

Kulakkōttan appears to have been a ruler who exercised authority over Trincomalee and the localities surrounding it. His grant of a very large extent of paddy fields, his construction of a major irrigation work and the reclamation of lands carried out under his orders, as claimed in the tradition, imply that he exercised power and authority over that region. The Kulakkōttan traditions assume a new importance in the light of the recent epigraphic discoveries in the Trincomalee district which provide a historical basis for their interpretation. There are some considerations which strongly suggest that the Köṇēcar Kalvetu contains a substratum of traditions relating to the period of Cōla rule. Firstly, the Cōla inscriptions from the Trincomalee district show that a Cōla prince who exercised authority over the areas included in the Trincomalee district had taken an interest in the affairs of Makkēsvaram whereas the chronicle claims that Kulakkōttan who rebuilt Köṇēsvaram and re-organized its institutions was of Cōla descent and was ruling over Trincomalee and the surrounding localities. Secondly, the landgrants made by the Cōlas seem to be similar in magnitude to the one claimed to have been granted by Kulakkōttan. The inscription from Nilaveli records a grant of 2,700 amanem of sowing capacity. Thirdly, tradition claims that Kulakkōttan brought several families from various social groups in the Cōla country and established settlements around the temple of Köṇēsvaram.67 Such a tradition is consistent with the pattern of Tamil settlements that arose in the other regions of the island during the period of Cōla rule.

The temples set up by the Cōlas as could be judged from their architectural remains were of modest proportions. They consisted of the garbhagriha, antarāla, anahamandapa, mandapa and some times the Mahāmandapa as in Siva devale No.5 in Polonnaruwa. They were generally of modest proportions, unlike the principal Cōla shrines in South India, and were mostly of brick construction. The only known exception is the Siva devale No.2 in Polonnaruwa which was constructed with dressed slabs of granite boulders. The latter which is an elegant temple in the best tradition of Cōla art is the only Cōla monument in the island which has survived the ravages of man and nature.

There are strong grounds to suppose that the Siva devale No.5 was designed to be a sepulchral monument. Eight pots containing human bones were exhume among with the walls both inside and outside of the Mahāmaṇḍapa.68 In South India some of the early Cōla temples, Vijayalaya Cēsvaram, Adityēsvaram and Arinjikai-sēsvaram were constructed as sepulchral monuments.69 Human skeletal remains have been found underneath the garbhagriha of such monuments which were generally referred to as paṭippai in inscriptions. The Siva devale No.5 at Polonnaruwa, presumably, was a similar monument— a paṭippai.

A large variety of icons, in stone and metal, have been recovered from the remains of Hindu temples, notably Siva-
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devales No. 1 and No. 5 in Polonnaruwa. The first of these is believed to be a post Cōja structure. But among the ruins of the other shrine, which was constructed during the period of Cōja rule, eight items of statuary in stone and nineteen bronzes, have been found. They include the figures of Nātarāja, Ganesa, Viṣṇu, Dakṣināmūrti, kāli, Saptā mātris—the seven divine mothers, and the seven Saktis. These icons give some idea of contemporary Saivite conceptions of the Hindu pantheon.

A notable feature of Saivism during the Cōja period in South India was the great honour and position accorded to the Saivite saints in temple worship and literary tradition. The revival and the rapid growth of Saivism to a position of ascendancy in the Tamil country was largely due to the work of these saints. The Saivite saints, most of whom were of the Pallava period, wandered from place to place, mingled with the people freely and sang hundreds of melodious verses in praise of the many forms of Śiva enshrined in numerous temples throughout the entire land. Their movement had a wide emotional appeal and the monotheistic Bhakti cult preached by the Tamil Saints was claimed to be based on the teachings of the four Vedas. Most of the hymns of the Saivite Saints are said to have been collected and classified by Nampiyāṉṭar Nampi in the reign of Rājarāja I. His collection with later additions came to be known as the Tirumurai—the sacred canon of the Tamil Saivites. The hymns of Nānacampantar, Appar, Ċuntarar and Māṅikkavācakar, whom tradition reckons as the four principal exponents of Saivism in the Tamil country, constitute the bulk of this collection.

In the Cōja period the collection of hymns called Tirumurai were placed on an equal footing with the four Vedas and thus it became the sacred literature of the Saivites in the Tamil country. Arrangements were made, especially by the members of the Cōja family, for the regular recital of hymns selected from this collection in all leading temples. The inscriptions of Rājendra I show that there was a separate body of royal officials to organize this work in the temples. The recital of hymns from the Tirumurai became a regular feature of religious activity in all temples irrespective of their dimensions and the strength of their resources. In such circumstances, the authors of the hymns—the Nāyānmār, loomed large in the minds of the pious and credulous devotees. They came to be regarded as superhuman beings and were conceded almost divine status. The bronze images of the most important Saivite Saints were installed in the temples and were offered worship. The bronze images of some of the leading Saivite Saints discovered in the premises of the Cōja temples in Sri Lanka reveal that the worship of Saivite saints was also introduced in the Cōla settlements in Sri Lanka.

Archaeological remains at Nātanār Kovil reveal that the ancient shrine at Velgam Vehera was patronized by Tamilics during the period of Cōja rule. No less than fifteen Tamil inscriptions of the Cōla period have hitherto been recovered from this site. Some of these inscriptions show that velgam Vehera, situated in Abhayāśraya Valanāṭu otherwise called Rājendracārika Valanāṭu and Parakēcari Valanāṭu, had another name, Rājarājaperumpalli. In conformity with the general practice of naming Hindu temples constructed by members of either the royal family or the official hierarchy after the names or epithets of kings, their queens and princes, the Buddhist institution at Velgam Vehera was named after Rājarāja. The excavations undertaken in recent times at this site show that this establishment was rebuilt during the period of Cōja rule. The extensive architectural remains show that the structure had as its principal components a monastery and a pratiṃāghara—an image house.

The architectural remains are of special interest because this monument, in its style and composition, differed funda-
mentally from all other Buddhist edifices in the island. Architecturally the Rājarājaperumpallī was a Cōla monument. Almost all the benefactors whose gifts are recorded in inscriptions recovered from this site appear to have been Tamils. Some of them held high positions in the administration as suggested by their epithets while the rest were commoners. An analysis of the items donated to this institution also seems to confirm the view that the Rājarājaperumpallī was supported by persons in different levels of economic and social status and influence.

The gifts that were made to this Buddhist institution consisted of cows, buffaloes, money and lamps. Such gifts, made for the purpose of burning lamps in the shrine, were intended to secure merit for the donors. Cattle were given over to the institution so that lamps could be burnt perpetually from the ghee produced out of the milk obtained from those animals and their progeny. The institution which was the recipient of such gifts presumably had the facilities for rearing cattle and for the investment of money received in the form of donations. In this respect the Rājarājaperumpallī seems to have shared the characteristics of the other Buddhist monasteries in Sri Lanka.

The fact that Velgam Vehera was renamed after the Cōla Monarch, Rājarāja, may suggest that it received Cōla support and recognition. Another consideration in support of the view that the Rājarājaperumpallī had enjoyed government support is the inclusion of the prasasti of Rajendra Cōla I in some inscriptions found in its remains. The prasasti or historical introduction was usually prefixed to the texts of official documents issued by the kings or the court officials. The inclusion of the prasasti in the texts of some of these inscriptions shows that the institution was supported by officials serving in the Cōla administration. A further consideration which suggests official involvement in the transactions relating to this pallī is the support it received from persons who could be regarded as officials of the Cōla

74. ET, pt 1, pp. 41, 42, 45, 48.

Tamil Settlements in the Polonnaruwa Kingdom

The Tamil settlements which had sprung up in several parts of the island in the preceding centuries continued to flourish during the Polonnaruwa period. Close contacts between the kingdoms of South India and Sri Lanka, especially in the fields of commerce and culture, led to further migrations of Dravidians resulting in the growth of some new settlements in the island. Under Vijayabahu I and his successors the Tamil settlements were smoothly integrated into the political and social systems of the country. Several Tamils held positions of power and influence in the administration and the army. The designation Damiladhikara was borne by several dignitaries during this period and this may suggest that the number of Tamils in royal service was much larger than in earlier times.¹

A remarkable feature of this period was the degree of harmony that was maintained between the two major communities; Sinhalese-Tamil relations were, perhaps, more harmonious than ever. Even the historical writings of this period are relatively free of racial bias and this is all the more remarkable as the restoration of Sinhalese sovereignty was achieved after decades of warfare against the Cōḷas who had occupied a major part of the island.

The main achievements of the Polonnaruwa period were confined to the reigns of three rulers namely, Vijayabahu I (1055-1110), Parakramabahu I (1153-1186) and Nissankamalla

¹ CV. 69 : 6; 75 : 19—20; 76 : 30.

(1887-1196). The reign of Vijayabahu was essentially one of reconstruction. He revived the traditional system of administration and restored a number of irrigation works and religious monuments which were found to have been in a state of disrepair. The Buddhist monastic orders were reconstituted and revived and the stage was set for the resurgence of Buddhist intellectual and artistic activity. ² Close connections were established with Burma and some of the Indian kingdoms including Kalinga. Vijayabahu married Trilokasundari, a Kalinga princess, and also Lilāvati—who was of Rajput lineage.³ His sister Mitta was married to a Pāṇḍya prince who seems to have had a Cōḷa princess as his second consort.⁴

Since the reign of Vijayabahu the power struggle that developed between his son, Vikramabahu (1112-1132), and his cousins led to the division of the kingdom. When Jayabahu, a brother of the previous ruler, was consecrated as king in Polonnaruwa, the rank of Yuvarāja was conferred on Mānābharaṇa and not on Vikramabahu who according to custom had the strongest claim to it.⁵ Vikramabahu who was governing Rāhata soon proceeded to Polonnaruwa, dislodged his rival cousins and their protege, the monarch Jayabahu, from power and brought Rajarata under his control. Mānābharaṇa I and his two brothers, Siri Megha and Siri Val-

2. As there was not a sufficient number of ordained monks in the island Vijayabahu had several theras brought from Burma and under their direction many individuals were ordained and admitted to the order. Besides, Vijayabahu is said to have supported all the three sects liberally, see UCHI I (ii) pp. 563—564.

3. Lilāvati who became the Mahaēi of Vijayabahu was a daughter of Jagatīgati who had come from Ayodhya and ruled over Rāhata for a short period, when the Cēsār held sway over the rest of the island. CV. 59; 23—25, 29—30.

4. The evidence from a Tamil inscription from Budumuttēva suggests that Cuntamallīyaṉēr, a daughter of Kuloṭunga Cējotēvar, was a consort of the Pāṇḍya Prince who was the father of Mānābharaṇa I. See S. Paramasivam 'Two Tamil Pillar Inscriptions from Budumuttéva,' EZ III, pp. 302—312.
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labha acquired power over the rest of the island. The principality of Dakhkhina Desa corresponding to the Western and North Western provinces and a part of Sabaragamuva came under the rule of Māṇābharana whereas Rāhata corresponding to Uva and the Southern and Eastern provinces was divided between his two younger brothers. Sri Megha took the South-Western portion of it while the other half of the principality was assigned to Sri Vallabha. The succession war waged by Māṇābharana and his associates against Vikramabahu proved to be inconclusive and the latter remained in firm control of Rajarata which at that time was the most productive and populous part of the island. The methods of guerilla warfare adopted by the combatants of either side caused considerable damage to agriculture, irrigation and society. Besides, they produced a sense of insecurity among the ruling classes, privileged orders and the people living in the frontier districts.

The wars waged by Parakramabahu I, the son of Māṇa-bharana, led to the re-unification of the whole island. He was the greatest monarch of medieval Sri Lanka and in traditional history his reign is chronicled in epic proportions. Parakramabahu excelled as an organizer, administrator and builder. Numerous irrigation works were restored during his reign while several new ones including the giant Parakrama-samudra were constructed. The irrigation works of Parakramabahu had led to unprecedented agricultural prosperity. The surplus revenues enabled the ruler to undertake the construction of numerous buildings, provide public amenities and maintain a large and composite army. In art he initiated a phase of development characterized by the construction of monuments of gigantic proportions. Parakramabahu made his power felt outside the island; he sent a naval expedition against a ruler of Burma, Alaungsithu otherwise called Bhuvanaditta, and actively intervened in the war of Pāṇḍya succession in South India. The work of Parakrama was continued by his nephew, Nissankamalla, a prince who had come from Kalinga in India and who was the last great ruler of Polonnaruwa.

During the Polonnaruwa period the Sinhalese court had close contacts with several kingdoms in India and South East Asia and as a result of such contacts the ruling classes became receptive to foreign influences. The ideas, traditions and institutions of foreign peoples were adopted and assimilated. In this period monarchy was supported by an ideology of state power which emphasized the heroic and superhuman qualities of the king. The traditional theocratic conception which stressed the unity of the monarchy, the Buddhist Sangha and the Sinhalese nation was considerably modified by ideas of kinship that were fashionable in certain contemporary societies. The court of Polonnaruwa seems to have been imbued with and animated by ideas which emphasized that the monarch was superhuman and potentially divine. Such a conception of state had the effect of enhancing royal power and authority in a society that had lost its homogeneity owing to the penetration of Hindu influences at all levels of society and in successive stages.

Archaeological evidence reveals that society in Sri Lanka was heterogeneous during the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Architectural and iconographic remains and inscriptions show that the population in important towns like Polonnaruwa, Padaviya, Kāntājāy, Pāṇḍu-vas-nuwarā and in several other localities in Rajarata, in the northern part of Dakhkhina Desa and in the eastern littoral was a mixed one—Sinhalese and Tamil. The art and architecture of this period such as they appear to have been from extant remains, represent two cultures—Buddhist and Hindu—which flourished together and in general harmony. The engraving of Tamil inscriptions recording the transactions of the Sinhalese rulers with their Tamil subjects would also suggest that the Tamils were an important and influential section of society.

As we enter the Polonnaruwa period Archaeology and literature shed much welcome light on the social and cultural life of the Tamils living in the island. Yet our knowledge of the Tamil settlements in the Polonnaruwa kingdom remains vague and incomplete owing to the limitations of the source.

6. The Ceylonavamsa devotes twenty eight chapters to the reign of Parakramabahu.
materials. We have no means of determining the proportion of the Tamils and other Dravidians in the population of the island as the sources pertaining to the pre-colonial history of Sri Lanka are totally deficient in statistical information. Besides, the evidence from extant sources relates to merchants, warriors, Brahmins and artisans who were among the most important and influential groups in society. The mercantile communities presumably formed the most important section of the Tamil settlers in the island.

Mercantile Communities

The settlement of Tamil merchants in large numbers in the island was a result of the active commercial intercourse between Sri Lanka and the Tamil kingdoms of South India. From ancient times Sri Lanka had had trade relations with several other countries but the life-line of her economy was her trade with South India. She was dependent on South India for her import of textiles and metals while some of her most valuable products such as pearls, gems, ivory and spices were taken to the South Indian ports, from where they were re-exported to many parts of the world. The Indo-Ceylon trade was largely in the hands of traders operating from Malabar and the Coromandel during this period of growing commerce among the littoral countries of the Indian Ocean. Since the tenth century the South Indian mercantile communities which were organised on a corporate basis had gained a foothold in Sri Lanka. As they had reached their highest stage of development, during the time when the Cōla and Cāluksya empires were at the peak of their power and prosperity, these mercantile communities had intensified their activities in the island and in several other countries outside India.

Their growing strength and influence in Sri Lanka during the eleventh and twelfth centuries were due partly to the pace of economic development and the relatively higher degree of material prosperity that were sustained in the island at that time and partly to the support and encouragement they received from the local rulers. Vijayaśīha I and Parākrama-bīhu I are said to have taken steps to promote trade with foreign countries with a view to augmenting their resources, and the latter even issued an edict guaranteeing protection to the Paradises, a group of foreign merchants, who brought elephants and horses to the port of Uratturai (Kayts) for the King.

A remarkable feature of the mercantile communities of South India is their role in political and administrative organization. They were essentially autonomous communities, enjoying specific privileges and immunities and in this respect their townships were in some respects similar to the free cities of medieval Europe. They were in most cases constituted as separate administrative units governed by the mercantile classes. In such units the mercantile communities had their own arrangements for providing public security, settling disputes and collecting revenue. Such a system was consistent with the Indian political tradition, which generally favoured devolution of power and authority. Another important feature of these communities is the corporate basis of their organization and activities as in the case of the contemporary territorial assemblies in local government. In all important matters pertaining to the whole community resolutions were adopted after summoning representative gatherings of the members.

The Dravidian mercantile communities which are referred to in inscriptions in various localities of the island are the Tīcal Ayyirav Aruṇaruvar, the Nānadesi, the Vira Valaićiayar, the Virakkoi, the Čēti, the Čētiçutras, the Paradises and the Nakarattār. Most of these communities seem to have been found at several places in the island and are referred to in several inscriptions. The Ayyivole, otherwise called the

7. See Chapter II.
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10. Appadorai, Economic Conditions of South India (Madras) p 401-402
Ticai Āyiravar AṉṆṟṟuvar, occupied a leading position among the Dravidian mercantile groups settled in the island and their activities were more widespread than those of any other mercantile group. Epigraphic records set up by the Ayyāvole have been brought to light in several localities in the littoral and the central parts of the island. Their settlements or trading establishments were to be found at Polonnaruwa, Anurādhapura, Padaviya, Vāhalkada Viharehinna, Detiyamulla, Galtenpiliya, Anuulandavā, Ilakkāṭṭu Eba, Atagaralla and Kalutara.  

The Ayyāvole merchants in Sri Lanka, like their counterparts in South India, had the privilege of prefixing their epigraphic records with a Prasasti giving a brief account of their origins, affiliations and activities. Like the military community of Velaiakkār the Ayyāvole were a composite group consisting of a number of communities some of whom were mercantile while the rest belonged to a variety of other professional groups. The Prasastis of their inscriptions found in the island mention the mercantile communities of the Vira Vaḷaṉciyir, the Virakkōti, the Čeṭittis and the Čeṭtiputras as their associates. The Ticai Āyiravar AṉṆṟṟuvar probably enjoyed a supreme position among the Dravidian mercantile communities and the fact that they alone among the mercantile classes were conceded the right of using a Prasasti suggests that they held a pre-eminent position in society. They were, certainly, the leaders of a confederate body the formation of which represented the highest stage in the development of corporate activity in South Indian commerce.

The Vira Vaḷaṉciyir, corresponding to the Vira Basigas of the Canarese inscriptions, came next to the AṉṆṟṟuvar in order of importance in social affairs. Their intimate connections with military communities is borne out by the slab inscription of the Veḷaiakkāras from Polonnaruwa. They were summoned to the meeting of the ‘Great Army’ dominated by
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11. SH IV: 1003.
four Tamil inscriptions at Vahalkada, Padaviya, Galtenpitiya, and Matalkeni. Generally referred to as patinenumpum Virakkotiya, the Virakkoti of the eighteen lands, they took a prominent part in the activities of the Ahiruvar. Some inscriptions of the Ahiruvar mention the work done by the Virakkoti on their behalf. The not uncommon currency of the personal name Weerakody among the Sinhalese provides some indication of the extent of their influence on Medieval society. The Virakkoti seem to have been assimilated into the Sinhalese population in the course of time.

The Cettiis and the Cettiiputras are two other trading communities mentioned in some of the inscriptions in the island. The Cettiis, who seem to have been a caste of traders (as they are in modern times), are often described as patineumpuni muttie cettiis. Cetti was also a generic term which denoted a trader. There are instances where some of Nainatdesi and Ahiruvar have been referred to as Cetti. The Nagarattar, a leading mercantile community in the Tamil Country in modern times, had a wide distribution even in medieval South India and were mainly concerned with internal trade. They do not, however, seem to have settled in large numbers in the market towns of the Polonnaruwa kingdom although in course of time, especially after the decline of the corporate commercial organizations, the Cettiis of the Nagarattar community acquired for themselves a considerable share of the Indo-Ceylon trade. The Paradesi referred to in the Nainatdu inscription of Parakramabahu seem to have been confined to the ports and were presumably engaged for the most part in the island’s foreign trade. They are mentioned in the South Indian inscriptions as one of the many communities associated with the Ahiruvar.

16. See CTI pt. I. p. 54. CTI. pt II. pp. 8, 29. The inscription from Meegaskul has not yet been published.
18. CTI. pt. II. pp. 29, 34.

Tamil Settlements in the Polonnaruwa Kingdom

In the composite group dominated by the Ayyavole the warriors were, in Sri Lanka as elsewhere, an important element. A very large number of armed retainers seem to have been maintained by the Ayyavole merchants; their inscriptions in the island mention the military communities of Konavalar, Ilankinavalar, Anakkakara, Erivara, Munavirar as well as the valamkaii perumpatay which were in their service. Besides, the references to the Valanciyar Cenapati and the Valankaiyapadi in the inscriptions show that the Ayyavole settled at Vahalkada, Padaviya, Viharechina and other places had large numbers of armed retainers under the charge of commanders. Such retainers protected their caravans, merchandise and other belongings on their journeys and helped to maintain authority over territorial units that had come under their charge. The artisans formed yet another important element in some of the settlements established by the Ayyavole and other mercantile communities. The artisans made jewels, metallic artefacts and other items of merchandise.

In Sri Lanka, during the eleventh and twelfth centuries the Ayyavole and other Dravidian mercantile communities were found in substantial numbers and in sufficient strength to constitute townships which were autonomous like those of their counterparts in South India. The settlement of the Tici Ayirattu Aanirggvar at Vahalkada, which is referred to as Kanianeri in their inscription, was constituted as a Nainatdui Virapattinam. Another settlement which developed into such a mercantile town was Ayyampoli pattinam at Padaviya. Similar towns appear to have flourished in the neighbourhood of Panduvasnuwara, the premier town of Dakhinhadesa, and at Viharechina in the Matale district. The reference to a patineumpum pattinappatay, a pathway leading to the towns of the merchants from the eighteen countries, in an inscription at Detiyamulla suggests that there was a mercantile town dominated by either the Aanirggvar or the A
The inscription of the Anurudravar at Viharehinna mentions a Virapatitanam and in fact refers to the establishment of a great town which appears to have acquired some form of political authority.

The units called Virapattinam, which were mainly settlements of merchants, mercenaries and other professional groups affiliated with mercantile interests, had markets in them and were to some extent centres of production where artisans manufactured certain items of merchandise. They were the principal strongholds of the Ayyavole and other mercantile bodies from where traders went out in all directions with their pack-bulls distributing and collecting items of merchandise.

The tavalam, another centre of commercial activity often mentioned in the inscriptions of the Ayyavole, was a place where traders met periodically for the distribution and collection of merchandise. The inscriptions of the Anurudravar at Vahalkada, Viharehinna and other sites, refer to prosperous Cettis and Cettiputras who engaged in commercial transactions at the tavalams. The Tamil and other Dravidian mercantile communities in the island seem to have set up tavalams at several places in the island during this period and in course of time the word tavalam crept into Sinhalese usage.

The fact that the Ayyavole and their associates had settlements at several localities in the interior parts of the island and the evidence from their inscriptions about their commercial activities show that they had secured for themselves a considerable share of the island's internal and external trade. Pepper and other spices seem to have been among the main items of their merchandise. As seen earlier, some of them also brought elephants and horses for Patikramabhu. Presumably they supplied luxury articles and other rare commodities to the court and bought from the rulers commodities which were royal monopolies. Their leading role in the island's commerce and the privileges and rights conferred on them presuppose close and harmonious relations between them and the state.

Military Communities

The Tamil settlements in the island during this period included those of the military communities, which were to be found in greater strength than in earlier times. The Velaikkârâr and the Akampaits, the most important among these communities were, presumably, the descendents of warriors who had settled in the island when it was under Câla rule.

In South India the Velaikkârâr, who were a permanent and dependable body of troops, were usually under special oaths to serve and defend their masters under any circumstances and even at the risk of their own lives. They were distinguished by their high sense of loyalty and their fighting quality and were widely used as bodyguards by kings, princes, feudatories and chieftains. Besides, the Velaikkârâr were an effective fighting force in the Câla armies and in course of time they spread over many parts of the Câla empire. The inscriptions of Rajarâja I and his successors make mention of a number of Velaikkârâ regiment named after the epithets or titles of Câla kings and princes.

The Velaikkârâ were a composite group which included persons of many communities, some of whom held positions of high rank in society. Some Velaikkârâ were feudatory princes: the Vanniyar chiefs of Malayamantu and the Bânas were Velaikkârâ. The Bâna princess who became the chief queen of the Câla king Rajarâja III (1216 - 1253) is said to have been a Velaikkâri.

22. ibid., p. 16.
23. A Virapatitanam is mentioned in the inscription found at Viharehinna. See CTI, p. 1, pp. 50 - 51.
In Sri Lanka the Velaiikkārār were an important group in the armies of the Sirhalese kings during the Polonnaruwa period. The Cūlavamsa refers to them in connection with the reigns of Vijayabahu I, Gajabahu II and Parakramabahu I. In the reign of Vijayabahu the Velaiikkārār rebelled against the king when he assembled a force at Mōntāi to launch an expedition against the Cōlas. The rebellion turned out to be formidable and the projected invasion against the Cōlas had to be abandoned. The rebels, for a time secured control over Polonnaruwa and forced the king to flee to Dakhkānadesa. The royal palace was burnt down and Mitta, the king's sister, and her children fell into rebel hands. The king, however, returned to Polonnaruwa after some time and subdued the rebels with the aid of troops supplied by his brother, Virabahu, who was administering the principalities of Dakhkānadesa. The magnitude of the success in the initial phase of their rebellion suggests that the Velaiikkārā army in Polonnaruwa was a large and powerful one.

Later, when Gajabahu II, a grandson of Vijayabahu held sway over Rajarata, his uncles, Kit Sirī Megha and Kit Sirī Vallabha who controlled the rest of the island, managed to bring the Velaiikkārā army at Polonnaruwa under their influence. On their instigation the Velaiikkārār revolted against Gajabahu just at the time when he was attacked by his uncles. Gajabahu, however, quelled the rebellion, repelled the attacks of his rival kinsmen and successfully defended his position in Rajarata. The Velaiikkārār are again mentioned in the account of Parakramabahu I recorded in the Cūlavamśa. During his reign a Velaiikkārā army is said to have been posted at Kōṭiyāram.

Inscriptions in Sri Lanka show that the Velaiikkārār were used in the island, as they were in South India, also for the protection and maintenance of religious institutions. An Epi-
included persons or groups belonging to the Valaṅkai and the Itaṅkai, the two broad divisions of medieval Tamil society. Another interesting feature was the corporate basis of their organization and activities. When the request regarding the protection and maintenance of the Tooth Relic temple was made to them a meeting of the Mahātāntram, 'the Great army', was summoned and resolutions pertaining to that request were made jointly in the assembly of the Vēlaikkārar which included all units of their army.

The Vēlaikkārar settled in Polonnaruwa had some close connections with mercantile communities. Two of the mercantile communities, the Valaṅcīyar and the Nagarattār, were also invited to the meeting of the Mahātāntram. In their inscription the Vēlaikkārar refer to the Valaṅcīyar and the Nagarattār respectively as their mūtātaikaḷ and as nīkalōju kūṭi varum uṭkattuturulīṭtīr. However, the precise nature of the relationship between the Vēlaikkārar and the mercantile communities is not clear, for while the term nīkalōju kūṭi varum uṭkattuturulīṭtīr translates 'those including the nagarattār who accompany us', the term mūtātaikaḷ has several meanings; it may denote ancestors, elders, leaders or benefactors.32

The relationship between the Vēlaikkārar and the Valaṅcīyar could be explained in three different ways on the basis

32. Commenting on this Paranavitana observes: 'As the Valaṅjiyars are said to have been the leaders (mūtātaīkai) of the Vēlaikkārar groups, it might be conjectured that the latter migrated to Ceylon with the Valaṅjyars whom they served'. Nilakanta Sastri disagrees with this view and remarks: 'The translation of mūtātaīkai into 'leaders' is not quite accurate; the word literally means 'grandfathers', and what is meant cannot be physical descent when it is one corporation claiming this relation to another, but must imply some kind of spiritual or constitutional relation.' D. M. de S. Wickremasinghe has translated the word mūtātaīkai as elders. See Paranavitana, 'The Polonnaruwa Inscription of Vijayabahu I', El, XVIII, p. 335: K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, Vijayabahu, The Liberator of Ceylon, JRAS (78) N.S., IV, 1954, p. 70; EZ, II, p. 252.

of our interpretation of the expression Mūtātaikaḷ. Firstly, if the expression is to be understood in its literal sense as ancestors one has to assume that the implied relationship was one of kinship. As R. C. Majumdar suggests one may find in the Vēlaikkārar an example of a Kshatriya Sreni the members of which pursued commercial and military activities.33 However one should not jump to hasty conclusions on this point since no clear evidence for the existence of such a Sreni in medieval South India has hitherto come to light.

Secondly, the interpretation of the word Mūtātaikaḷ as "leaders" or "elders" would suggest an explanation that may be valid when one considers the pattern of relationships among the various communities in medieval Tamil society. As mentioned earlier, from Medieval times Tamil society was divided broadly into two blocs, the right hand bloc and the left hand bloc. Some of the communities which belonged to either of the two blocs had the members of certain mercantile communities as their leaders. The Valaṅcīyar and the Nānādesis were among the leaders of the Valaṅkai, while the Nagarattār were among the leaders of the Itaṅkai.34 As the Vēlaikkārar army in Polonnaruwa included groups which belonged to both the Valaṅkai and the Itaṅkai it may be assumed that the Valaṅcīyar and the Nagarattār were invited to the meeting of the Mahātāntram in their capacity as leaders respectively of the Valaṅkai and Itaṅkai divisions of society.

Thirdly, if the expression Mūtātaikaḷ was used in the inscription in a sense different from the ones mentioned earlier we may be compelled to adopt the view that the Vēlaikkārar were mercenaries of the mercantile communities and accompanied the latter on their journeys to protect their caravans and merchandise. Such a view may seem to be supported by the reference to the Nagarattār 'as those who accompany the Mahātāntram.' In medieval Sri Lanka there

32. R. C. Majumdar, Corporate Life in Ancient India, p. 31.
33. The Imperial Gazetteer of India, XVIII, pp. 198—199.
had been several mercantile communities which maintained groups of warriors but there has hitherto been no clear evidence of the Vēḻaṅkāṟar ever being used as mercenaries by mercantile communities. Moreover, the tone and contents of the inscription of the Vēḻaṅkāṟar suggest that they were an autonomous group which entered into agreements with others through their leaders. If they had been mercenaries of the mercantile communities it is unlikely that the ministers of state and the Mahāthēṭa Mugalāṉ would have made an agreement regarding the Tooth Relic temple directly with the Mahāthāntram.

The Akampatiṣṭi unlike the Vēḻaṅkāṟar were a homogenous community of warriors who in course of time developed into an endogamous caste. In recent times they have been concentrated mainly in the districts of Madurai, Pudukottai and Arcot in Tamil Nadu. Akampatiṣṭi seems to be a compound of the Sanskrit word anu meaning day and the Tamil word pati meaning wage and it may, therefore, be inferred that originally the Akampatiṣṭi were a military community receiving daily wages. In South India they came into prominence under the Imperial Cojas during the tenth and eleventh centuries.

References to the Akampatiṣṭi in the sources relating to the Polonnaruwa period are incidental and date from the first half of the twelfth century. An inscription of the time of Gajabāhu II from Hingurakdamana records a donation made to a Buddhist shrine by a certain Umpila Ayittam, who belonged to the group of Akampatiṣṭi serving under Gajabāhu I. His successor Parākramabāhu, employed hundreds of Akampatiṣṭi soldiers in his army and they are said to have fought in his foreign campaigns. Nissanka Malla (1187-1196) is also known to have maintained Akampatiṣṭi soldiers. Akampatiṣṭi troops were used in increasing numbers by the Sinhalese kings in the subsequent periods. The kuruṅkula was one of the Tamil communities which supplied mercenaries to the Sinhalese kings. The parasūṭi of Virāṭaṭārāya mentions a certain Kuruṅkulaṭṭārāya among the Śimāṭas of Vīyajabāhu defeated by the Coja armies. As one of their leaders had attained the position of a feudatory under Vīyajabāhu it may be inferred that the community of Kuruṅkula was of some importance in society during his reign. Members of this community were to be found in increasing numbers in the south-western litoral during the post-Polonnaruwa period and they were gradually assimilated into the Sinhalese population.

During the Polonnaruwa period, as in the tenth century, the Tamil warriors employed by Sinhalese kings seem to have been placed under the charge of officials called Damiḻdźhikāra. There were, for instance, two such dignitaries under Parākramabāhu I. Some of the leaders of these Tamil troops rose to the position of generals. Kitiya Apiṭāntram and Malaṅgiyaṭṭa were two such generals. The former is known about from an inscription at Kantaḻāy while the other is said to have led the troops which campaigned in the north-western litoral. Yet, another Tamil general was Mutumāṭi Ṛṣikarai who served under Nissanka Malla.

Remuneration to the Tamil military communities in royal service was generally in the form of land assignments given
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36. The explanation given by modern lexicographers that the expression Akampatiṣṭi is a compound of the Tamil words anu meaning day and pati meaning wage and it may, therefore, be inferred that originally the Akampatiṣṭi were a military community receiving daily wages. In South India they came into prominence under the Imperial Cojas during the tenth and eleventh centuries.
37. CIII, pp. 37-38; II: 1, pp. 141-147.
38. NKS, p. 18.
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40. EII, p. 245.
41. Two of his generals, Rakkha and Aṭṭikala, had the designation Damiḻdźhikāra.
42. SII, IV: 1297.
43. CV, 70: 62.
44. K. G. Krishnam, 'Notes on the Tamil Inscription from Pundakuvanurai', UCR, XX, No. 1 (April, 1962) p. 15.
on service-tenure. The Vejaikkārer, for instance, seem to have held large extents of land and they were able to assign from their holdings one Veli of land to each of those who were placed as guards of the Tooth Relic temple. The military communities which received such remuneration had a stake in land and, in course of time and under changed circumstances they presumably become agricultural communities as was the case with the Mulkwar of the Eastern littoral.

Brahmins

The Brahmans were an important element in the Tamil settlements that flourished in Rajarata and the northern part of Dakhinadasa during this period. They were mainly associated with temples where they were required to perform rituals and propitiate the deities. They also conducted at home domestic ceremonies which had any religious significance. Brahmans influence in society, however, was not restricted to the Hindu communities. During this period Sinhalese society became more receptive to Hindu influences than in earlier times. The court generally showed solicitude for Brahmans, through whom it became acquainted with Hindu literature on politics, administration and warfare. Indian treatises on astronomy, astrology, mathematics and medicine were also presumably interpreted to the Sinhalese literati by Brahmans. Some of the rulers of this period had Hindu rituals and ceremonies regularly performed at court by Brahmans. Vikrama bahu and Gajabahu II are believed to have had Hindu leanings, while Manibharaṇa I, Parakramabahu and Nissankamalla, despite their strong leanings towards Buddhism had patronized Brahmans.

45. A Veli is equivalent to 0.74 acres.
47. CV, 62:33, 45, 52; CV 74: 249.

Tamil Settlements in the Polonnaruwa Kingdom

Inscriptions set up in the eleventh and twelfth centuries provide some information about two notable Brahmin settlements. One was at Kantalaj and the other was the lone mentioned in the Tamil inscription at Hingurakdamana. The Brahmin settlement called Rājarājasthūrvedimāṇkalam at Kantalaj which had had its origins under the Colas, continued to flourish throughout this period with some pressure of support from the Sinhalese monarchy. Under Vijaya-bahu I the original name of this settlement was changed to Vijayarāj sthūrvedimāṇkalam. Some of the Brahmin residents of the locality seem to have been of Telugu extraction. The names of Karāmpaceṣu yajā brahma vitan and his spouse Nāṭikaiccani, which are recorded in the Tamil inscription at Palamottai in the Trincomalee district, suggest some Telugu connections. An inscription of Gajabahu II refers to the Brahmadeya of Kantalaj and suggests that its boundaries were re-defined on the king’s instruction. The same settlement is referred to as Caturvedi Brahmapura in the Kantalaj stone seat inscription of Nissankamalla, who had caused the Saivite institution of Pārvati sattrā to be set up in the same locality. Another Brahmin settlement was Jayaṇakoṭa caḷimēka caturvedimāṇkalam, referred to in the Tamil epigraph at Mahakirindegama, which could be assigned to the early years of Gajabahu II. According to this epigraph the Brahmin settlement had, owing to some reason, lost its rights over some land and this land is said to have been bought from a certain Vallapar and handed back to the Brahmans.

Artisans

The construction and maintenance of many Hindu temples suggest the presence of Tamil artisans familiar with the
techniques of the Dravidian style of architecture. The provenance of many Tamil inscriptions in Rajarata and Dakhinadesa shows that the services of Tamil artisans trained in the art of stone carving were available whenever inscriptions had to be engraved on stone. There is some evidence to show that Tamil artisans were used in the construction of some architectural monuments and works of public utility. Mason's marks with Tamil letters have been found among the architectural remains of Buddhist monuments in Padaviya and Polonnaruwa. One such monument is the famous Lotus Bath of Parakramabahu in Polonnaruwa. Moreover, a Sinhalese inscription mentions a certain Kaṭṭan Pilantai Vallan in connection with the construction of a minor irrigation work. Artisans and others were brought from South India during the reign of Parakramabahu for the construction of architectural monuments as sufficient numbers of craftsmen were not found in the island. The king's general, Lankāpura, had sent to the island a large number of Tamilis captured by Sinhalese armies which had campaigned in South India. The people were mostly used for the renovation and construction of Buddhist monuments. The Ratnāvali Cetiya was one of the important monuments which were renovated by Tamil prisoners captured in the war of Pandyā succession. The Mahaṭhupāḷa, one of the major architectural undertakings of Parakramabahu's reign, came to be known as Damīṭhupa as it was constructed by Tamils.

A Tamil inscription of Mānābharaṇa I at Budumuṭṭāva suggests that there were Tamil castes of blacksmiths and washermen in Dakhinadesa during the twelfth century. The inscription records the settlement by five officials of Mānābharaṇa of an inter-caste dispute that had arisen over certain rights and obligations. The setting up of a Tamil inscription by court officials recording the settlement of a dispute between blacksmiths and washermen in a predominantly Sinhalese region suggests that the blacksmiths and washermen concerned were Tamils. Gajabahu II seems to have employed Tamils to perform certain services at his court. Some of his palanquin bearers were Tamils. The Tamil inscription at Manikāṇay mentions a certain Miṭṭam kaṭṭan, who was the overseer of the palanquin bearers of Gajabahu.

**Social and Religious Conditions**

During the Polonnaruwa period the Tamils were found in greater numbers in the island than in earlier times. Archaeological evidence seems to suggest that their settlements were mainly concentrated in the north-eastern and north-western littorals and in the interior towns such as Polonnaruwa, Padaviya Anuradhapura, Magalla and Sripara. They were an important and influential element in society and exerted considerable influence on the social and cultural institutions of the Sinhalese. Besides, they played a key role in commercial and military affairs.

The social and cultural institutions of the Tamils settled in the island continued to be more or less the same as those found during the period of Cōla rule and did not differ fundamentally from those of contemporary South India. They were vitalised by the streams of Indian cultural influences that flowed from South India as a result of the close contacts that existed between Sri Lanka and that region. The stratification of society into a number of mutually exclusive endogamous castes and the division of society as a whole into two broad categories called valaiṅkai and itanṅkai—the two main characteristics of medieval Tamil society—were to be witnessed in the island during this period. Evidence from inscriptions suggests that the laws regarding the privi-

---

52. *ACSR* for 1954, p. 20
53. *EZ, Ve*
55. S. Paranavitana, ‘Two Tamil Pillar Inscriptions from Budumulatuva’ *EZ, III*. No. 33.
leges, rights and mutual obligations of the various social groups were strictly adhered to. The landgrants and monetary endowments made to religious institutions by some Tamils suggest that they were quite affluent and possessed both movable and immovable property.

As the Tamils came into close contact with the Sinhalese at almost all levels of society Tamil influence on the Sinhalese language during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries was considerable. Many Tamil loan-words relating to administration, weights and measures, handicrafts and musical instruments crept into Sinhalese usage. The transactions which the king and his officials had with the Tamils were mainly in Tamil and the drafting of official documents in that language suggests that there were court officials conversant in Tamil. Indeed, the Panākada copper plates of Vijayabāhu I refer to Tamil clerks serving under him.\(^{57}\)

Among the Tamil inscriptions of this period some were issued by the court while others record the transactions of either private individuals or groups of persons. Inscriptions were indited in Tamil letters with an admixture of Grantha characters. Sanskrit words and expressions were usually written in Grantha characters. The Tamil inscriptions of the Polonnaruwa period represent a distinct stage of palaeographical evolution and some of the letters are in a more advanced state of development than those found in the Cölā inscriptions of the tenth and eleventh centuries. As in the period of Cölā rule each line of the text of inscriptions was usually indited neatly between horizontal straight lines carved out on stone slabs or pillars. These inscriptions contain only a few grammatical errors and their language and orthography conform to contemporary South Indian Tamil inscriptions.

The drafting of records in Sanskrit and Tamil by court officials and others and the engraving of such records by artisans in stone and metal\(^{58}\) with precision and accuracy presuppose a fairly high standard of literacy and education among the officials and the artisan communities. The occurrence of Tamil verses\(^{59}\) and prاست in the texts of inscriptions suggests a familiarity with literary conventions and poetic traditions. It may be assumed that the traditional type of education was imparted to the children of the dominant classes in society. The Brahmins were expected to be familiar with the vedic literature in order to discharge the duties traditionally assigned to them. Some of the artisans had to study the manuals on architecture and iconography. The knowledge of Sanskrit and the familiarity with Grantha scripts which many artisans had during this period show that they had been taught the Sanskrit language in order that they could acquaint themselves with Sanskrit texts, which were recorded mostly in Grantha characters. Elementary arithmetic, Tamil prosody and the levaram were some of the subjects which may have been taught to all those who received some kind of informal elementary education.

In Sri Lanka, as in contemporary South India, most of the Tamils were Saivite Hindus while the rest were Buddhists. The relationship between Hindus and Buddhists in the island has generally been one of harmony and co-existence. In the Sinhalese kingdom the king was expected to be a Buddhist. He had to uphold and maintain Buddhism and Buddhist institutions. Yet, Buddhism was not the state religion in the sense that Christianity was in some of the medieval European states. It was never claimed that the religion of the ruler should be the religion of the people. Even a zealous Buddhist ruler could worship Hindu deities and support Hindu institutions and

---

57. The inscription refers to a register of Tamil clerks.

58. The expressions 'Kailitum capilum veśikulatam' found in the slab inscription of the Vēlsikātār at Polonnaruwa shows that there were two copies of the inscription; one was indited on stone while the other was engraved on copper plates.

59. Tamil verses are found in the inscriptions at Budi-vas-nuwaru and Podawiyana. See BCR XX. No.1. p. 11 and CTI, pt. 2. p. 28.
such action on his part was not regarded as detrimental to Buddhist interests. But the non-conformity on the part of a ruler with the requirement that he should be a Buddhist and support Buddhist institutions was met with strong disapproval from the Sangha and traditional ranks. It could have led to succession disputes and unrest within the kingdom.

Some of the succession disputes which contributed towards the decline and fall of Polonnaruwa seem to have been caused by religious factors. The two successors of Vijayabahu I and Gajabahu II, are believed to have had strong leaning towards Hinduism. Their religious activities are referred to in the Cūλavamsa in unfavourable terms. Vikramabahu is said to have despoiled the monasteries, revoked the landgrants made to them by previous rulers and converted them into residences for the warriors serving under him. The same work claims that Gajabahu had brought heretical nobles from abroad. Moreover, an inscription issued by him records a land-grant made by him to a certain Hinabhi who had made an image of Skanda for the king. In local Hindu tradition Gajabahu is depicted as a great patron of Saivism. It has been suggested with some degree of plausibility that Vikramabahu and Gajabahu were denied the royal consecrations because they were not Buddhists.

Hinduism and Hindu institutions were generally supported by all rulers during this period. Hindu inscription, perhaps, received a greater measure of support from Vikramabahu and Gajabahu II than from others. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries there were many Hindu shrines in Sri Lanka. Trinco-

60. CV 61: 54-61
61. CV 70: 53-55

male, Kantalāy and Padaviya were some of the strongholds of Hinduism. In Polonnaruwa itself the architectural remains of sixteen temples have been discovered. Except in a few cases little has remained of the structure above the ground plan of such shrines and it will not be possible to determine when such monuments were constructed unless inscriptions or other datable objects are found among their remains. Only a systematic archaeological survey of the sites where Hindu architectural remains are found would throw some light on the architectural dimensions and artistic quality of such monuments.

There is some information in inscriptions and literature about a few Hindu temples that existed during this period. An inscription from Pālamōttai refers to the Saivite temple of Ten Kailasam at Kantalāy. In the reign of Vijayabahu this temple was renamed Vijaya raja-varam. A Brahmin widow had made substantial endowments to this shrine. A crown of the weight of six kājāče of gold and a gold chain of three kājāče were donated by her to the shrine. She deposited a gold coin of one kācu for the lighting of a perpetual lamp. Besides, the compound interest on eight kācu deposited by her was to be used for maintaining a flower garden in the temple premises. She also deposited twenty-three kācu for the maintenance of seven āvadāsī who had to perform certain services in the temple. The endowments

64. The architectural remains amidst which the Pālamōttai inscription was found are probably those of Ten kailasam otherwise called Vijaya raja-varam. Among the remains of this temple area fragmentary image of Pārvāti and several stone pillars of an architectural style reminiscent of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The remains of many Hindu shrines datable to this period have been unearthed at Padaviya. See ASCAR, 1904, p.18; ASCAR, 1901, p.10 ASCAR, 1861, p.67.
65. ASCAR, 1902, pp. 7-8; ASCAR, 1904, pp.3-10; ASCAR, 1900 p.17; ASCAR, 1924, pp.16-17.
were placed under the custody of a Vēlaiikkāran who belonged to the military unit called Vikirama ḫāmekatterinta Valaṅkai, a division which was presumably named after Vikramabāhu.

Another important Saivite shrine was the one called Vikkirama ḫāmeka ḫīvaram in the town of Mākal, otherwise called Vikkiramakal mekapuram, in Dakkhinadasa. The shrine, which was in all probability named after Vikramabāhu, had received some donations from the princes called Cuntamali ājvār, who is described as a daughter of Kulottunga and the consort of Virapperumāl.

K('').vēsvaram, the ancient and famous temple at Trincomalee, continued to be one of the leading religious institutions in the country during the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Traditions recorded in the Köṇecar kalēva Jātisana kalēkaparanaam and other works claim that Gajarāhu who was a great devotee of Siva, visited Köṇeswarām at a time when religious services had been interrupted, there as a result of a controversy between the Buddhists and Saivites. The king is said to have summoned the vanipam, the tānattar and the varippattu, inquired about the affairs of the temple and had its institutions and religious services restored. On the king’s initiative Brahmans were brought from a foreign country to be appointed priests at the Temple. Tradition claims that the king made a gift of a thousand pieces of gold coins to the temple and endowed it with substantial revenues from land and other sources.

The traditions about Gajarāhu’s religious activities as found in the Tamil Saivite texts are, to some extent, confirmed by the details about his career and religious outlook as could be gleaned from inscriptions and traditional Sinhalese history.

Although Gajarāhu supported both Hinduism and Buddhism it would appear that his leanings towards the former were stronger. His religious activities were viewed with anxiety by some section of the Buddhist Sangha; the Čulavamsa records that Gajarāhu filled the land with nobles of heretical faith brought from abroad. As seen earlier he had patronized Brahmin settlements and had propitiated Skanda. The king spent the last days of his reign at Karaiyā, which had a Hindu environment and perhaps provided him with a greater measure of security and a sense of relief from the troubles that had beset him in Polonnaruwa.

The architectural remains of many Hindu temples datable to this period are found at Padaviya. Some of these temples were supported and maintained by mercantile communities, who formed an important element in that town. The Ayyavāle of the Ayyampojjiṉaṉ of Padaviya are said, in one of their inscriptions, to have dedicated themselves to the service of (a temple of) Siva.

Another epigraph in the same locality refers to the gift of an image of a deity made to the temple by the merchants of the locality. It also mentions a group called Kiḷi kaṅgam, who were presumably the managers or trustees of a temple of Kiḷi. Yet another Tamil inscription, which could be assigned to the late twelfth century on palaeographical grounds, records a verse composed by a local poet in praise of a temple dedicated to Siva and referred to as Valakai.

Some of the Tamil inscriptions set up during this period record donations made to Buddhist institutions by Tamils, some of whom were Buddhists. An epigraph at Hingurakdamana records the gift of an amaṅgam land to a Buddhist thana by an Akampati soldier called Tampila ayittan, who held

67. S. Paranavitana, ‘Two Tamil Inscriptions from Budumutawa’ EZ II, p. 311.
68. Ibid.
70. C.V, 70, 59–55.
71. CTI, pt II, p.55
73. CTI, pt II, p. 28.
an assignment of lands at the locality called Patōni mācār.\textsuperscript{74} Another Tamil epigraph, at Moragahawela, mentions the donation of a vela of land by a soldier of the Munu ranks (māhasenai) division from his lands at Patālaya.\textsuperscript{75} As the Pāndu-vasa-
nuvaram inscription of Nissankamalla, which records the construction of a monastery at Sripura under the care of the general called Matimārpancara,\textsuperscript{76} is in Tamil it may be assumed that there were Tamil Buddhists in that town. It may be surmised that some of the Velaikkarar in Polonnaruwa were Buddhists as they had undertaken to protect and maintain the Tooth Relic Temple. The inscription which records their activities in relation to this shrine seems to suggest that they undertook this responsibility as an act of religious piety.

\textsuperscript{74} CTJ. pt. 1, p. 34.

IV

The Origins of the Kingdom of Jaffna— I
Magha’s Conquest of Polonnaruwa

The Origins of the Kingdom of Jaffna which comprised the Tamil districts in the northern part of the island may be traced from the events of the early thirteenth century which culminated in the conquest of a major part of the island by Magha of Kalinga in 1215. Magha’s long reign in Rajarata and the eastern littoral was in some ways a period of transition in the island’s history. It brought to an end an era characterized by a relatively high degree of central control, monumental architecture and agriculture by means of extensive artificial irrigation. It led to the permanent dislodgement of Sinhalese political power from Rajarata and its drift to centres in the hill country and the South Western lowlands. The Tamils and other Dravidians who were found in considerable numbers in Rajarata and the north eastern littoral became predominant in the northernmost parts of the island and in most of the eastern littoral.

The Kingdom of Polonnaruwa declined in power soon after the death of Parakramabahu I and an era of peace, prosperity and security ushered in largely by his achievements was terminated by a series of events which occurred after the demise of Nissankamalla (1187–1196). The history of this decline is somewhat confused and complicated and the main events connected with it are briefly referred to in local chronicles. The author of the Hāththavanagala Vihāravamsa, a contemporary of Parakramabahu II, explains the decline of Sinhalese political power in the following manner:
"When (those) lords of Lānākā, who were like unto ornaments to (the island of) Lānākā who were endowed with immensely meritorious and miraculous prowess, who were devoted to the Tripīḷa gem, (have passed away) leaving but their aura of glory, and when the (other) lords of Lānākā who had gone astray from the path of justice, who were deficient in the customary canons of statecraft, who (were) weaklings lacking in fortune (bhāgīya), and also when ministers of a similar nature were living embroiled in mutual antagonism, then as a result of a heinous evil deed committed by the dwellers of Lānākā in the past the enemy forces from different regions who were ignorant of the Dispensation of the Teacher, who have entered the thickets of wrong beliefs, having arrived here from Jambudvīpa converted the whole island of Lānākā into one of confusion and danger."

The author of this passage, perhaps, had a clearer perception than any other Sinhalese chronicler of the causes that led to the decline of Polonnaruwa. In his view, which may be considered as characteristic of the religious outlook of the land, the monarchs of this period were weak, ineffective and devoid of the charismatic qualities of their predecessors. The ministers, who were of a similar nature were divided into mutually hostile factions and their conflicts tended to aggravate instability. Under such circumstances the country was overrun and occupied by Indian adventurers who were hostile to Buddhism. Such an analysis is a remarkable one for a thirteenth century local chronicler. But an examination of the sources relating to the history of this period, while reinforcing the chronicler’s conclusions to some extent, shows that there were also other fundamental causes.

The history of the two decennia that preceded Māgha’s conquest exhibits features which are in many ways peculiar.

---


---

It saw a quick succession of thirteen reigns almost all of which were terminated with violence, resulting in the death or deposition of the rulers. Succession disputes served to divide the court into mutually antagonistic factions. Dissensions at court and the incompetence of rulers encouraged local adventurers to play the role of king makers and gain control of state power. There were a number of foreign invasions directed from the Cōḷa, Pāṇḍya and Kalinga Kingdoms in India. The raids of foreign armies had the effect of accelerating further the process of decline.

Some of the developments which took place after the reign of Pāṇḍrakamābhū I were, in some measure, the result of the policies which he had followed. His irrigation works, building activity and long wars had overstrained the human and material resources of the Kingdom. His extravagance had led to excessive taxation and his two successors, Vijaya-bahu II and Nissankamalla, had to allay popular discontent with relief measures such as the abolition or reduction of taxes, restoration of confiscated property to their respective owners and the release of prisoners and political victims.

Pāṇḍrakamābhū’s intervention in the war of Pāṇḍya succession was a costly adventure which ended in defeat and disaster. The active involvement in Pāṇḍya affairs by him and later by Nissankamalla failed to achieve the objective of securing permanently the Pāṇḍya throne for the princes who sought Ceylonese support. The Cōḷa intervention in Pāṇḍya affairs eventually proved to be decisive and the Cōḷas succeeded in securing the Pāṇḍya kingdom to their subordinate allies. Moreover, the Cōḷas countered Pāṇḍrakamābhū’s activities by organising retaliatory expeditions against the island from time to time. Such invasions tended to aggravate the political instability in the island.

The fact that there were eleven reigns in about twenty years between the demise of Nissankamalla and the invasion:

---

of Magha is itself indicative of the extent of confusion and instability that prevailed in the country. Eight of the ten rulers who occupied the throne after Nissankamalla were Kalingas and most of them were members of his family. All of them turned out to be weak rulers and their short reigns were terminated with violence resulting in their deposition or assassination. Nissankamalla's son, Vijayabahu, was killed on the second day after his accession by the general Tavaru and was succeeded by his uncle Viramabahu. The latter was killed by Cogagama, a nephew of Nissankamalla. The general Kiti deposed Cogagama and administered the kingdom for three years by placing on the throne Lilavati, a widow of Parakramabahu I. Lilavati and her supporters could not command the loyalty and support of some sections of the court and of the traditional ranks.

A rival faction led by the ministers Abonavan and Budalavan managed to oust Lilavati from the throne and, thereafter, held power for about eight years by raising to the throne successively Sahasamalla, Kalayayavati, who was one of the consorts of Nissankamalla, and an infant princeling called Dhammasokadeva. Aniganga, who is referred to as Mahadipada in the Culaamsa and who was the father of Dhammasokadeva rose against the faction that held authority at Polonnaruwa, killed its principal leader Abonavan and secured for himself the throne which he was not destined to occupy for long. Aniganga was eliminated by the general Vikrama Gamumuka with whose support Lilavati secured the throne for the second time. Loksevara, another aspirant for kingship, deposed Lilavati and held authority for a period of nine months. Lilavati was once again restored to the throne by the general Parakrama. She was finally eclipsed from power by the Pandya armies under the leadership of Parakrama Pandya who occupied Polonnaruwa in 1212.

The history of this period has been described as one of a struggle between the Kalinga and Pandya factions at court. Among the rulers of this period Lilavati and Parakrama Pandya were of Pandya descent while almost all others were Kalingas, mostly relatives of Nissankamalla. Yet, the assumption that there were two factions of royalty competing with one another for power does not seem to have any valid foundation. There was hardly any Pandya faction at the court during this period. There is no justification for assuming that Lilavati and Parakrama Pandya were closely connected. The latter was an invader who took advantage of the chaotic conditions in the island to conquer it. The fact that Lilavati was ousted by Parakrama Pandya may suggest that Lilavati was not at any stage supported by the Pandyas of Madurai. It may also be recalled that Parakramabahu I who was of Pandya descent through his father, nominated Vijayabahu II, a Kalinga prince, as his successor. Moreover, the Kalingas were badly divided and were never united in their opposition to Lilavati and the dignitaries who supported her. Their rivalries led on two occasions to the assassination of their own kinsmen or those who supported some members of their family. Vikramabahu, the brother of Nissankamalla, was, for instance, killed by the latter's nephew, Cogagama. The activities of Mahadipada Aniganga and the Generals Tavaru and Abonvan clearly show that there were no strong bonds of loyalty and unity between the members of the Kalinga family and the dignitaries who served under them. It

---

4. Virabahu was a son of Nissankamalla. Vikramabahu and Cogagama were, respectively, the brother and nephew of Nissankamalla. Sahasamalla was his co-brother, while Kalyayavati was his chief queen.
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would appear that these generals were bent on consolidating their power and position and were not at all motivated by considerations of loyalty to the Kalinga dynasty. Court disunity, however, served to undermine the influence and power of the royalty and led to the ascendency of generals and ministers.

In medieval Sri Lanka, as in most other countries administrative efficiency depended on the power and personality of the monarch who stood at the apex of a hierarchy of traditional ranks. The weakness of rulers need not necessarily always lead to anarchy and civil war. Whenever a king was incapacitated or was incompetent it was usual for a prince, or a senior member of the royal family or a trusted minister to manage the affairs of the kingdom. The confusion and anarchy that followed Nissankamalla’s reign seem to have been the cumulative effect of several factors, some of which, as mentioned earlier, were peculiar to this period.

Dissensions at court and the incompetence of monarchs encouraged local adventurers to play the role of king makers and seek to gain control of state power. Such a situation had arisen partly as a result of some of the changes which took place in society during the Polonnaruwa period. An important development during the eleventh and twelfth centuries was the growth of the power and influence of the aristocracy, which consisted mainly of landholders of the agricultural caste (Govikula) who held positions of high rank in the army and the administration. Some of them had considerable influence at the court and had close connections with the Buddhist Sangha. Besides, they dominated the provinces and ran their affairs. They also enjoyed several privileges including exemption from punishment for such offences as treason.14

14. The Panadukada Copper plates of Vijayabahu furnish some evidence of the grant of immunities and privileges to the general Budhanhi (van) who may have been an ancestor of Budhanhiyan, who was associated with Abhavan in inviting Sahasamulla the islander. See. EZ, V. op. 1–27.

In a society organised on a hierarchical basis the support of the aristocracy was essential for the effective exercise of royal power. Under the successors of Parakramabahu I the aristocracy ceased to be an instrument of state power. Its activities had the effect of undermining the authority of the ruler, and in a contemporary inscription they are accused of having obstructed the establishment of a strong government with a view to promoting their own personal interests.15 During the time of Nissankamalla the court began to entertain doubts about the loyalty of some of the dignitaries and possible challenges to royal authority from sections for the aristocracy seem to have been anticipated by the king. His exhortations to the people to keep members of the Govikula away from the throne may suggest that some dignitaries aspired to secure royal power.16 The privileges and immunities granted to the dignitaries by rulers during earlier times were now used by them to entrench themselves in positions of power at the expense of the crown.

The growth of the military establishment on an unprecedented scale during the Polonnaruwa period had the effect of enhancing further the power and influence of the aristocracy. The wars of unification and conquest waged by Parakramabahu I had led to the creation of a large and composite army under the charge of many able and experienced generals. Under weak rulers who had no charismatic qualities they proved to be overwhelming subjects. In the Sinhalese Kingdom as in many others, the Senapati or general was one of the most important functionaries whose loyalty and support were essential for a monarch’s security and survival. During this period there were many generals who cherished disloyal ambitions. Circumstances enabled them to

15. An inscription of Sahasamulla asserts that the two ministers Budhanhiyan and Abhavan secured the crown for Sahasamulla after having subdued the evil ministers who were causing obstruction with the object of gaining personal power for themselves and so were not desirous of having kings. EZ, II, No. 36, p. 220.

play the role of King-makers and thereby relegate the royalty to the background. In fact the generals were the central figures in the power politics of this period. They were grouped into rival factions under the leadership of the more prominent among them. Tāvaru (nāvan) Abonā (van) and Budalān (van) were the leading generals who exercised a dominant influence in the kingdom for brief periods by raising members of the Kālinga family to the throne. The assassination of Virabāhu by Tavarunt and the deposition of Sāhasamalla and Kālyanavatī by Abonā show that they were not motivated by any considerations of loyalty to the Kālinga dynasty. It would be misleading to describe them as supporters of the Kālinga faction. They did, of course, form a particular faction among the dignitaries who were bound together by common interests and aspirations. Their rivals, however, were consistent in their support to Lilāvati, who was acceptable to them.

There were a number of foreign invasions of the island during this period and most of them were organised or inspired by the Côlas. Besides, some of the contenders for the throne brought armies from the Tamil Kingdoms in India in order to fight against their rivals. Parakrama Bahu's intervention in the war of Pandyya succession against the Côlas and the Pandyas princes who received Côla support led to a renewal of hostilities between the Côlas and the rulers of Polonnaruwa. After having decisively defeated Parakrama Bahu's armies in the Pandyas Kingdom the Côlas followed up their success by organizing an expedition against Parakrama Bahu under the leadership of his nephew, Sīri Vallabha, who had fled from the island and perhaps sought to enlist foreign support for his cause. This expeditionary force is said to have destroyed Parakrama Bahu's fortifications at Mātōṭam, Māṭīval, Valikāmam and Uṇatturāi and raided extensively along the littoral and carried away elephants and men as booty. The expectations of Sīri Vallabha were not fulfilled but the fact that the Côlas used him for their own ends may suggest that they may have been inclined to intervene in the wars of succession that developed in the island at a later stage.

Sīnhelese-Cōla hostilities continued through the reign of Nissankamalla when both parties claimed victories over each other. Nissankamalla claims to have sent his armies to India to wage war against the Côlas and Pandyas and some of his inscriptions even assert that he led some of the campaigns there. His Côla contemporary, Kukkutanga III, from his ninth year onwards claims victories over Ilam and one of his prasastis even asserts that his sway extended in the South up to Anuradhapura. The details of these wars are obscure and as both sides had a tendency to make exaggerated claims it may be assumed that little or no decisive gain was made by either side.

After the demise of Nissankamalla his successors were not in a position to send armies to South India and as their capacity for resistance was greatly reduced Côla raids on the island were felt with greater intensity.

Kukkutunga once again claimed victories over Ilam in 1199 and the evidence from a contemporary Sīnhelese work, the "Sasadavata" written during the reign of Lilāvati, shows that this particular claim of the Côla monarch was not altogether without foundation. This text makes it clear that there were some Côla invasions during Lilāvati's reign and it credits the general Kitti with having defeated the Côlas.  

17. The Pali chronicle refers to Abonāvan as Ayaśmantā. Tāvaru Senovirat was probably identifiable with Vijayasingha Tavarunā who was in all probability known Vijayasingha Tavarunā. For a detailed discussion on the identity of these generals see The Decline of Polonnaruwa... pp. 52-56.

18. V. Venkalasamhara Aiyar, 'Tiruvāḷāṅgādu inscription of Rājādhirāja II, EI, p. 86.
20. SIH, III, p.86.
21. Sānadhāva Pāṇḍjārattār, A History of the later Côlas. pt. II, (Anna-

23. JRASCB, XXXI, pp. 381-87; The Decline of Polonnaruwa... p. 57.
THE ORIGINS OF THE KINGDOM OF JAFFNA — I

(1210—1211) the island was invaded by the Cōḷa, perhaps for the last time.\footnote{29}

When Cōḷa power declined the Pāṇḍya began to assert their power in South India and their revival had almost immediate repercussions on the island. In 1212 Parakkama Pāṇḍya came with an army from South India, deposed Līlāvati and her general and, thereafter, administered the country from Polonnaruwa for a period of three years.\footnote{30} As the Cūḷavamsa refers to him in complimentary terms,\footnote{31} it has been suggested that he could be identified as the prince Madhurinda, otherwise called Madurappurumal (a), who was being trained for kingship during the reign of Līlāvati. Although this is possible there is no evidence to prove it. The complimentary references to Parakkama Pāṇḍya may rather suggest that he was a benign ruler favourably disposed towards Buddhism than imply that he had any legitimate claim to the throne of Polonnaruwa before his conquest of the island. Parakkama Pāṇḍya, presumably, belonged to the Pāṇḍya line of Madurai but his precise relationship with the contemporary Pāṇḍya ruler, Jālavarman Kulasekhara (1196—1215), is not all clear.

During the two decennia that followed the reign of Nissanka-malla the kingdom of Polonnaruwa had declined steadily and on the eve of Māgha’s invasion the decline had reached an advanced state. Disputes over the succession and the raids of foreign armies may have resulted in the dislocation of the administration and the loss of central control. The rulers, who were confronted with court intrigues, rebellions and other problems, were not in a position to mobilise resources for organizing defence and for maintaining large irrigation works and architectural monuments. Chaotic conditions in the country and successive raids by foreign armies may have caused a sense

---

\footnote{24.} JRASC, XXI. p. 385.
\footnote{25.} ARE, 170 of 1902.
\footnote{26.} CV, 80: 43-44.
\footnote{27.} According to the Cūḷa-amite and the chronicles, Kalyāṇavati’s reign from Polonnaruwa lasted for six years. It would appear that some parts of the Kingdom continued to owe allegiance to her even after her dislodgement from Polonnaruwa and that she exercised authority from Minipe after her sixth year. EZ, V, No. 12, p. 158.
\footnote{28.} CV, 80: 47-48.
\footnote{29.} The only inscription of this ruler that has come to light provides the information that he was a prince of the Kalinga dynasty and that he had to face an invasion of the island by Cōḷa armies. See EZ IV, pp. 87-88.
\footnote{30.} CV, 80: 51-53.
\footnote{31.} He is said to have ruled without transgressing the precepts of Manu.
of insecurity in the minds of the people. The large number of mercenaries brought by Aniganga, Iokesvara, Parakrama Pāṇḍya and others could have been a source of tension and anxiety causing shortages in food supplies and dwellings at Polonnaruwa and other important towns. The presence in large numbers of these strangers who were ever ready to serve any master on the promise of substantial rewards was a potential threat to a tottering political order. As the institutions which safeguarded life and property under such conditions had become ineffective organized plunder and looting, as later events proved, were already imminent. The palace, the aristocracy, the richly endowed public institutions and the mercantile towns which possessed wealth in different forms could have been expected to be the targets of attack.

It was against such a background that Māgha invaded the island in 1215. Māgha occupied a large part of the island, and ruled it for a long time from Polonnaruwa. As no inscriptions, coins or medals issued by Māgha have come to light modern studies on Māgha’s conquest have been based on literary evidence, mainly from the Pujāvaliya, Cūlavamsa, and other Pāli and Sinhalese chronicles, which give a fairly long descriptions of the events of his reign. The Tamil chronicle Maṣṭak-kāḷappu pūrva carittirum (‘The Ancient History of Batticaloa’) contains useful information on Māgha which to a certain extent corroborates and supplements the details found in traditional Sinhalese history.

In the view of the local chroniclers Māgha’s reign represented the climax of a dark age in the history of the island. In certain respects the religious and social institutions in certain parts of the island suffered greater damage in later centuries under conquerors more resourceful and virile than Māgha. But the ravages of such conquerors are not chronicled in traditional history. As the misdeeds of Māgha loom large in the local chronicles, under the force of tradition the effects of Māgha’s invasion have been emphasized and blown rather out of proportion even in modern historical writings. The details relating to Māgha as found in the chronicles are by no means adequate for a full and proper study of his invasion and conquest of the island and of the nature and effects of his rule. Yet, enough has been recorded to enable us to get a glimpse of some of the main events which brought about important political and social changes in the island.

The Cūlavamsa gives the following account of Māgha:

‘But since in consequence of the enormously accumulated, various evil deeds of the dwellers of Lanka, the devatās who were everywhere entrusted with the protection of Lankā, failed to carry out this protection, there landed a man who held to a false creed, whose heart rejoiced in bad statesmanship, who was a forest fire for burning down of bushes in the forest of the good—that is generosity and the like—who was a sun whose action closed the rows of the night lotus flowers—that is the good doctrine—and a moon for destroying the grace of the groups of day lotuses—that is of peace—a (man) by name Māgha—an unjust king sprung from the Kālinga line, in whom reflection was fooled by his great delusion, landed as the leader of four and twenty thousand warriors from the Kālinga country and conquered the island of Lankā.’

This poetic description implies that māgha who was of Kālinga descent invaded the island with a large army. The chronicler believed that māgha was a non-Buddhist whose activities caused considerable damage to Buddhism and its institutions. The author of the Cūlavamsa believed that māgha was a tyrant whose reign caused a great deal of confusion in society. As regards the Kālinga descent of māgha there is unanimity among the Sinhalese chroniclers.

32. CV, 80: 54-60.
33. The Cūlavamsa in one instance, however, refers to Māgha as a Dambulu king. The Pujāvaliya calls Māgha a Kalinga king at first and a Dravidian or Tamil king later on. This confusion was due to the fact that Māgha, who was of Kalinga extraction, led an army which consisted mainly of Dravidian warriors. All the chroniclers, however, claim that Māgha was of Kālinga descent. See CV, 89:115, PJV, pp. 108, 114, 116.
pūrva caritirāma provides the additional information that Māgha was the third son of king Manuvratana of Kālinga. Māgha was presumably connected in some way to some of the Kālinga princes and princesses of the Polonnaruwa court, who are described as belonging to either the Kālinga cakravartti Vamsa or the Ganga vamsa. The landing of Cōḍaganga—whose name was common among the Eastern Gangas of Kālinga—at Trincomalee during the reign of Māgha may perhaps suggest, as claimed in the historical traditions of the Batticaloa Tamils, that he had the support of the rulers of Kālinga.

Māgha had the longest reign among the Kālinga princes who held sway over the island from Polonnaruwa and his reign of forty years suggests that he had the support of a large army. Māgha is said to have invaded the island with an army of twenty-four thousand men. Many years later when he was attacked by Parākramabahu I Māgha is said to have had at his disposal an army of forty-four thousand men. Although these numbers are incredible the claims made in respect of the strength of his army during the time of his invasion and during the latter part of his reign suggests that Māgha had considerably increased his military strength after his occupation of Polonnaruwa. It would appear that a large number of Dravidian mercenaries and soldiers who were in the island on the eve of his invasion had come under his influence and leadership.

The Pāli and Sinhalese chronicles are not very precise about the composition of Māgha's armies. The Cūḷavamsa, for instance, mentions at one place that Māgha came from Kālinga with an army of twenty-four thousand men. In the whole Cūḷavamsa account Māgha's soldiers are referred to in three places as Keraḷas, in eight places as Tamils and in one place as Tamils and Keraḷas. The Māgha and his armies as 'the many thousands of enemy forces with their Kings, the Cōḍas, Keraḷas and the like, who had destroyed the sāsana and were living in Pulattipura.' Despite their lack of precision the chronicles clearly show that Māgha had a large and composite army which consisted mainly of Dravidian warriors recruited from Keraḷa and the Tamil Kingdoms of South India. It may be assumed that the Keraḷas figured prominently in his army during the time of his invasion and that subsequently other Dravidians joined them in large numbers. The 'Ancient History of Batticaloa' asserts that the Mukkuvar came from Calicut as the allies and supporters of Māgha and that the latter occupied Polonnaruwa (Tippaavai) with the support of the Patayatci vanniyar and placed its territories under their charge. The account of the Tamil chronicle implies that Māgha placed the administration of the conquered territories under the charge of warrior chiefs.

Māgha's armies were divided into many units and were posted at military outposts mostly along the littoral. Most of these were located in the north west, the north and the north east of the island. Vallikagāma (Valigāmm) and Urata (Kayats) were in the Jaffna Peninsula. Kothaśāragama (Kotiyāram) Gonarāṭha (Trincomalee), Gangitalāka

---

34. The Mājjakāḷpa Māṇṭiyan (MM) edited by F. X. C. Nadarajah (Colombo, 1962), was traditionally known as Mājjakāḷpa Pūrva Caritirāma, See, MM, p. 52.
35. Nisansakamalla and Sūhasakamalla are described in their inscriptions as consorts of the Kālinga cakravartti Vamsa whereas Kālyāṇētali, a consort of Nisansakamalla, it said to have belonged to the Ganga Vamsa.
36. CV, 80: 59.
37. CV, 83: 80.
38. CV, 80: 61, 70, 76, 81: 14; 82: 6, 20; 83: 12, 14, 20, 24; 87: 25.
39. The Decline of Polonnaruwa... p. 109.
40. MM, pp. 95, 104.
41. CV, 83: 15-19.

The Pāli chronicle testifies that fortifications were maintained at other places also. They are, however, not mentioned by name. The name Dehorapatan, which does not occur in the CV, is mentioned only in the RV. It could perhaps refer to Devaippiriam in the South-eastern coast of the Pāṇḍya Kingdom. The 'Ancient History of Batticaloa' asserts that Māgha had brought Rameyaram under his control. See, MM, p. 54; The Decline of Polonnaruwa... p. 106.
The chronicles mention another ruler called Jayabahu in connection with Māgha. Jayabahu is said to have been an associate of Māgha.\textsuperscript{42} The recently discovered short and undated inscription from Rankot Vihāra in Polonnaruwa seems to refer to this ruler.\textsuperscript{43} The inscription provides the interesting information that a Veḷḷaikkārān called Cētarāyan was serving a certain Jayabhūdevar. The latter as suggested by his name -ending devār was a person of royal or princely rank. The initial portion of the inscription which runs ‘Iḷam elunṟukkātam yeṭtinu Koṭṭaruḷiya Ceyapaikutevar nilal Veḷḷaikkārān’\textsuperscript{44} implies that Cētarāyan was a Veḷḷaikkārān serving under Jayabhūdevar and that a conquest of the island was effected either by Jayabhūdevar himself or by the Veḷḷaikkārān on behalf of his master.

The historical value of the evidence from this inscription depends to a large extent on the identification of Jayabhūdevar mentioned therein. Only two persons who had the name Jayabhū were mentioned in traditional history relating to the Polonnaruwa period: One was the younger brother and immedi-

\textsuperscript{42} CV, 80 : 15.
\textsuperscript{43} CTI, pt. I, pp. 24-26.
\textsuperscript{44} ibid.

ate successor of Vijayabhū I \textsuperscript{45} and the other was the associate of Māgha. It is difficult to identify Jayabahu mentioned in the inscription with the brother and successor of Vijayabhū I because the claim of the conquest of Iḷam made in the inscription is totally inconsistent with the account of Jayabahu as found in traditional history. According to the Cējavamsa and other chronicles Vijayabhū’s brother who enjoyed a short spell of power was dislodged from the throne by Vikramabahu, the son of Vijayabhū. Vikramabahu is said to have been uniformly successful in all his engagements against Jayabahu and his supporters. From the account of Jayabahu in traditional history one gains the impression that Jayabahu was a weak ruler who is not known to have gained any military victory over any rivals.

The palaeography of the inscription is another important consideration against identifying the person referred to in it as the younger brother of Vijayabhū I. Its palaeography represents a more advanced stage of development than that to the slab inscription of the Veḷḷaikkāras from Polonnaruwa and resembles that of the Panduvasuvvara inscription of Nissaikkamalla.\textsuperscript{46} It may, therefore, be suggested that Jayabhūdevar mentioned in the present record is different from and later than Jayabhū, who had a brief spell of power over Rajarata during the second decade of the twelfth century.

Jayabhūdevar of our inscription was a conqueror of princely rank who had a Veḷḷaikkāran among his principal supporters. Māgha, who had Jayabahu as his associate, conquered and dominated a part of the island with the aid of

\textsuperscript{45} Jayabahu was consecrated king at Polonnaruwa in 1010 by the leaders of the Sangha and the sons of Mīttā. The son of Vijayabhū, Vikramabahu, whose claim for the rank of Yuvārāja were set aside in favour of his cousin Māṇjūkaraṇa returned to the capital from Rahanā and secured power. The King and his accomplishments fled to the southern part of the island. \textit{CV}, 61 : 1-26.

Tamil and Kerala troops. The conqueror referred to in the inscription may, therefore, be identified as Jayabahu, the associate of Māgha. The precise nature of the relationship between Māgha and Jayabahu is not known but the evidence from the Cūjavamsa suggests that Jayabahu was in some way associated with Māgha in the conquest and administration of Rajarata. Both are said to have maintained fortifications at several localities and held sway over Rajarata for a long time.

The Veñkēkkār Cētarāyan was not an ordinary soldier but a dignitary of high rank. He was placed in charge of the administration of a large territorial division called Mahamanalā. It was in all probability a military leader, who may be considered as one of the key figures of the time of Māgha. It could also be inferred from the evidence of this inscription that the Veñkēkkārār were included among those who served Māgha’s cause in the island.

Māgha’s invasion, in a sense, appears to have assumed the form of a looting expedition, and the palace, the upper class of society and the religious establishments seem to have been the targets of attack. Pārkrama Pāṇḍya was seized at Polonnaruva and his possessions were plundered. It is also claimed that his soldiers dispossessed the people of their garments and ornaments, their cattle and other such belongings. Moreover, it is said that fetters were put on the rich and wealthy people, who were dispossessed of all their belongings and forced to render service. The chaityas and monasteries were destroyed and dispossessed of their valuable and in this manner a considerable amount of booty must have been collected. Māgha is also accused of having seized villages, fields, houses and gardens, slaves, cattle, buffaloes and other property that belonged to the local inhabitants and given them over to his warriors.

The seizure of immovable property in all probability was done with a view to provide accommodation and maintenance to his warriors. It may be assumed that fields and garden lands were given by Māgha as jīvita, life tenure, to those serving under him. As Māgha had a large army consisting of thousands of mercenaries and adventurers divided into many groups posted at military strongholds maintained at several points in the areas conquered by him, the arrangements made for their maintenance must have almost permanently affected the fortunes of a large number of people. The measures adopted by Māgha in this respect may have led to great changes in society. The traditional ranks were almost permanently dislodged from positions of power and influence and with their disappearance traditional society in the affected parts of the country could no longer regain its former strength. While another Kāliga ruler, Nissankamalla, sought to control and restrain the aristocracy, with appeals and veiled threats, Māgha sought to and almost succeeded in liquidating the basis of their power.

Māgha created a new class of warrior chieftains most of whom happened to be Kerals and Tamils owing to the composition of his army and the land grants made to them by him, causing their settlements to be established on a permanent basis. Most of these chiefs were presumably entrusted with the administration of territorial divisions as in the case of the Veñkēkkārān called Cētarāyan who became the chief of the province of Mahamanalā.

There is some evidence to suggest that in their attacks against the Buddhist establishments Māgha and his followers were motivated also by considerations other than looting. Māgha is also accused of having caused people to adopt false views and to have brought confusion into the four unmixed castes. Moreover, the Cūjavamsa adds that ‘many books known and famous they tore from their cord and strept them hither and thither.’ That these books concerned matters of Buddhist.

48. CV, 80: 71-73.
49. CV, 80: 62-63
50. CV, 80: 64
51. CV, 80: 76
52. CV, 80: 75
53. CV, 80: 67
doctrine and teachings is clear from a subsequent statement in the chronicle in its account of Vijayabahu III, 'that on the island of Lanka so many books that dealt with the true doctrine had been destroyed by the alien foe.' One of the institutions against which Māgha's attacks were directed was the Sangha. The inmates of the Viharas were driven out of the monasteries and their dwellings were given as residences to soldiers while some of the monks are said to have been subjected to ill treatment. It is thus clear that Māgha made an attempt to undermine the influence of Buddhism and its institutions. Buddhist literature, architectural monuments and the monastic order became the targets of attack. That Māgha had also disendowed some of the Buddhist establishments could be inferred from the claim in the same chronicle that Parākramabahu restored to monasteries property 'that was confiscated earlier.'

His attempt to convert people to an alien faith and the attempt to destroy Buddhist books suggest that Māgha and some of his followers were inspired by partisan religious sentiments. Besides, they imply that a certain amount of tension and animosity had been generated by religious differences. Māgha's religious activities have aptly been compared to those of the iconoclast Harsha of Kashmir and of the Sinhalese king Rājasingha of Sitawaka who became a Saivite convert. On the basis of circumstantial evidence Liyanagamage has rightly focussed attention on some of the similarities between the actions of Māgha and those of some Indian rulers who had leanings towards Viśva Saivism. The traditions embodied in 'The Ancient History of Batticaloa' in fact claim that Māgha was a Saivite of the Langiyat school (Mahālingavāsan). Moreover, this text asserts that

Māgha came to the island during a period of social tension caused by partiality in religious matters on the part of those who held authority in the country. It is also claimed that he was sent by the ruler of Kālinga to promote the cause of Saivism and chastise those who had harmed it. Māgha, according to this chronicle, once he had occupied Poṇinaruwa, demolished the Buddhist monuments in and around that city and persecuted the Buddhist monks and the adherents of Vaishnavism. As the claims made in 'The Ancient History of Batticaloa' about Māgha's religious activities are substantially corroborated by the evidence from the Pāli and Sinhalese chronicles it may be assumed that the Tamil chronicle records an authentic tradition about Māgha's religious leanings.

Māgha's attack on Buddhism was not something that was unique in the island's history, and it recalls the measures adopted by Vikramabahu I, the son of Vijayabahu I by the Kālinga princess Tilokasundari.

As regards the anti-Buddhist measures adopted by Vikramabahu the Cūlavamsa asserts:

King Vikramabahu took the maintenance villages which belonged to the Buddha and so forth and gave them to his attendants. In Puhathinagara he gave over several Viharas distinguished by (the possession of) relics to foreign soldiers to live in. Precious stones, pearls and the like, presented by the pious as offerings for the Relic of the Alms-bowl, and for the sacred Tooth Relic, the sandalwood, the aloe, the camphor, the many images of gold and the like which he took forcibly, he used it as he pleased him.

There is a great deal of similarity in the measures adopted against Buddhism by both princes, Vikramabahu and Māgha. Vikramabahu, like Māgha a century later, plundered

54. CV, 81: 41-43
55. CV, 80: 65, 66, 77-79
50. The Decline of Polonnaruwa, p. 112.
57. ibid., pp. 115, 122-23.
58. ibid., pp. 124-25.
59. MM, p. 104
60. MM, pp. 52-53
61. MM, pp. 53-70
62. CV, 61: 54-57
and looted image houses and monasteries and had them disestablished and disendowed. Besides, he also converted monasteries and other such buildings into residential quarters for the mercenaries. Vikramabahu's measures were presumably undertaken in retaliation against the Sangha for having connived with others in barring his way to the throne. It has been suggested that Vikramabahu was kept out of the order of succession and subsequently denied the consecration on account of his religious affiliations. It has also been argued with some degree of plausibility that Vikramabahu had Hindu leanings and as such had no claim to the throne since custom demanded that a prince should be a Buddhist in order to be eligible for the royal consecration. It may, therefore, be assumed that Vikramabahu's attacks on Buddhist institutions were inspired by both political and religious considerations. Māgha, who went several steps further than Vikramabahu in his attack on Buddhism, may also have been influenced by the same considerations. Such an explanation presupposes that there was a strong undercurrent of religious animosity among the ruling classes and the religious of the land as claimed by the historical traditions of the Batticaloa Tamils.

Māgha's invasion resulted in the conquest of a major part of the island by his armies. Besides Rajarāja, Mayarāja and most of the eastern littoral were brought under his sway. However, within a few years Mayarāja slipped out of his control. Two important developments that followed Māgha's invasion were the division of the kingdom into many units of varying size and importance and the almost total liquidation of the old social and political order in the conquered parts of the country. As Māgha struck with great power, the inhabitants of the capital and its environs fell victims to his onslaught, and the official hierarchy, the prop of the old regime, was completely overwhelmed and dislodged from positions of power and influence. The survivors among the dignitaries drifted to areas remote from Polonnaruwa and difficult of access to the armies of Māgha. Rocks and natural eminences became the centres of resistance against his armies. Subhā, one of the generals under the earlier regime, is said to have established himself in independent authority at Yapahuwa, which town came to be known as Subhāpattana after the name of its founder. Prince Bhuvanekabahu, who had held the rank of Adipada, established himself on the Govindamala mountain and is said to have held sway over the province of Rōha. The general Sankha founded a town on the Gangadoni mountain in the district of Maṇimekhala and defended himself against the armies of Māgha. During the early years of Māgha's rule his armies met with feeble and sporadic resistance led by chieftains and generals who had retreated to secure places in Mayarāja and Rōha. But, after the rise of Vijayabahu III they encountered greater resistance in a somewhat organized manner and could no longer retain control of the lands outside Rajarāja and the eastern littoral.

Vijayabahu III, who had retired to the jungles, found opportunities for a new career open to him in Mayarāja. The breakdown of the administration and the sense of insecurity among the inhabitants which developed after Māgha's invasion and conquest provided avenues for the elevation of an adventurer who had ambition and considerable ability for organization. Vijayabahu took advantage of the circumstances and gradually extended his authority over many chiefs.

64. ibid., pp. 12-14. The attacks against the Sangha may have partly been caused by their refusal to recognize his claim to kingship.
65. Māgha, who could not have conformed to the requirement that the king should be a Buddhist appears to have undergone consecration. The Cūlayya asserts that he was consecrated by the soldiers led by Māñabharana. The details of his consecration presumably differed from those of the other kings of Polonnaruwa.

66. CV, 81: 3.
67. CV, 81: 7-8
68. CV, 81: 5-6
living in the Vanni and attained the rank of ‘Vanni king’. He organized a small force, attacked and expelled the soldiers of Māgha and eventually made himself master of Māyarakata. He fortified the Dambadeni hills and ruled from there. His achievements were considerable especially when one considers the circumstances and the forces against which he had to contend. He founded a new kingdom and a new dynasty which restored order and stability over a major part of the island. The efforts of Vijayabahu were continued by his more fortunate son and successor, Parākramabahu II.

The reign of Parākramabahu II, which has been chronicled at some length in the Pali chronicle in imitation of the account of Parākramabahu I, witnessed greater success. His successful efforts in bringing the lands in the hill country and the South Western lowlands under his rule scarcely attracted the attention of the local chroniclers. In the North the efforts of his predecessor to fight Māgha were pursued with greater vigour and these have been recorded in a detailed manner in the chronicles. That part of the account of Parākramabahu which deals with his wars against Māgha has assumed the form of a panegyric and its historical value, is, therefore, considerably reduced. The chronicles do not give a clear and convincing account of Māgha’s defeat by the armies of Parākramabahu. The Cūlagamaka account of the war ends rather abruptly like the account of the South Indian campaigns conducted by Parākramabahu I. It is claimed that Māgha’s armies evacuated Polonnaruwa in panic. What is interesting is that the chronicles do not give any description of any campaigns or even skirmishes between the combatants in and around Polonnaruwa. It is rather strange that the chronicler, who gives an elaborate description of the war-efforts of Parākramabahu, has chosen to omit the details of the final stages of the war which according to him led to Māgha’s evacuation. It is also unlikely that Māgha, who held authority over Rajarata for a long time, decided to evacuate Polonnaruwa on the mere approach of the enemy forces. Besides, the statement recorded in the Cūlagamaka that Māgha and his armies left the country is vague and leads to the suspicion that the chronicler has taken care to omit certain details which conflicted with his conceptions of Parākramabahu as a great and heroic ruler.

In the circumstances it may be assumed that Māgha suffered a reverse at Kālāvīrā as claimed by the Pali and Sinhalese chronicles but continued to hold ground over most of Rajarata. Either he continued to rule from Polonnaruwa or withdrew to a centre to the north of it which was considered to be more secure. It could also be surmised that he repulsed the attack on Polonnaruwa by Parākramabahu’s forces. The accounts of the chronicles suggest that the war against Māgha had been concluded by 1247, the eleventh year of Parākramabahu II. The fact that Parākramabahu was able to undertake restoration work in Polonnaruwa only around 1264, after the defeat of Candrabahu, also provides some justification for entertaining serious doubts about the authenticity of the claims made in the chronicles about the defeat of Māgha and his abandonment of Polonnaruwa. That Māgha continued to be in power for a long time after the conclusion of his wars with Parākramabahu is evident from the statement in the Pujaśvaliya that he held sway over Rajarata for a period of forty years.

The claim made in the Pujaśvaliya that Māgha exercised authority over Rajarata for forty years would seem to conflict with the statement made in the same chronicle that he held sway over Lanka for a period of twenty-one years. But this contradiction could be easily explained when we recognize that the regnal period of twenty-one years attributed to Māgha had no bearing on the duration of his rule or the date of his supposed evacuation of Polonnaruwa. The claim that he ruled over Lanka for twenty-one years is a wrong one and...

60. Cf. 81:16-11.
71. The Decline of Polonnaruwa, p. 130.
was adopted by the chroniclers who were confused by the official scheme of chronology followed by the Sinhalese court.72

The period of twenty-one years between Māgha’s conquest of Polonnaruwa in 1215 and the consecration of Parākramabahu II at Dambadeniya as king of Lanka in 1236 was reckoned as a Rajāntara in the official scheme of chronology. The chroniclers have attributed this period of twenty-one years to Māgha. On the basis of the statement made in the chronicles that Māgha held sway over Lanka for twenty-one years it cannot and should not be concluded that Māgha’s rule was only of twenty-one years’ duration especially in view of the fact that he continued to occupy Polonnaruwa for many years, even after the consecration of Parākramabahu. Parākramabahu’s campaigns against Māgha were not fought in 1236, when the former was consecrated as king, but after making preparations spread out over several years after that event. There is, therefore, no justification to raise doubts about the statement in the Pujavaliya that Māgha held sway over Rajarata for a period of forty years.

Māgha’s rule over the northern parts of the island appears to have been superseded by that of the Jávakašas under the leadership of Candrabhānu, an invader from the Malay Peninsula. Candrabhānu invaded the island around 1247 after the conclusion of the wars between Māgha and Parākramabahu II, and raided the territories subject to the rule of Parākramabahu II. It is claimed that Virabhū, a nephew of Parākramabahu, repulsed Candrabhānu’s invasion.73 Candrabhānu, thereafter, directed his energies against the Kingdom of Māgha. On his second attempt to conquer the island, he is said to have landed at Māloja with reinforcements from the Cōla and Pandyas countries.74 By about 1253 Candrabhānu had already established himself in the northern part of the island and was threatening Parākramabahu from the north. The Gajavamsa asserts that the Jávakaša ruled had brought under his sway the people living in Kurundi, Padi and other places. Candrabhānu and his followers seem to have brought under their control the Jaffna peninsula and the Vanni area extending from Māntai to Trincomalee. The kingdom which was under Jávakaša rule appears to have been known among restricted circles of the literati as Javagama, and a medieval Sinhalese text, the Kadaiimpoṭa, gives the following description of it.

'Moreover in Javagama, there are five main districts, Jávariparāta, Marśēiraṭa and Bâlaḍirāṭa, Mudundumalli-yarata and Kāṇukkinirata; stone pillars with Tamil inscriptions have been set up for the boundaries so that this region of ten thousand is enclosed by them. This region is endowed with tanks, lakes, pools, ponds, fields, gardens, and other objects.'75

All the territories that have been mentioned here as the constituent parts of Javagama were to be found within the Tamil kingdom which later came under the rule of a Tamil dynasty, the Arya Cakravartis, who traced their origins to Rāmēṣvara in the Rāṇḍya Kingdom. The sources relating to this period do not, however, indicate precisely how and when Candrabhānu

72. The Gajavamsa states that Māgha, who attained the dignity of kingship and lived in Polonnaruwa, held sway over Lanka for twenty-one years, but later it refers to his period as a rajāntara. CV, 86:74,76; 811.
73. The Decline of Polonnaruwa...p. 130
75. The ORIGINS OF THE KINGDOM OF JAFFNA — 1 117

this power in the northern part of the island and was threatening Parākramabahu from the north. The Gajavamsa asserts that the Jávakaša ruled had brought under his sway the people living in Kurundi, Padi and other places. Candrabhānu and his followers seem to have brought under their control the Jaffna peninsula and the Vanni area extending from Māntai to Trincomalee. The kingdom which was under Jávakaša rule appears to have been known among restricted circles of the literati as Javagama, and a medieval Sinhalese text, the Kadaiimpoṭa, gives the following description of it.

'Moreover in Javagama, there are five main districts, Jávariparāta, Marśēiraṭa and Bâlaḍirāṭa, Mudundumalli-yarata and Kāṇukkinirata; stone pillars with Tamil inscriptions have been set up for the boundaries so that this region of ten thousand is enclosed by them. This region is endowed with tanks, lakes, pools, ponds, fields, gardens, and other objects.'75

All the territories that have been mentioned here as the constituent parts of Javagama were to be found within the Tamil kingdom which later came under the rule of a Tamil dynasty, the Arya Cakravartis, who traced their origins to Rāmēṣvara in the Rāṇḍya Kingdom. The sources relating to this period do not, however, indicate precisely how and when Candrabhānu

74. Of the five main districts of Javagama, Marśēiraṭa has been identified with Marciṣa, a territorial unit in the Jaffna Peninsula presently consisting of the two divisions Vatamārāci and Ten-nuvaṭe. Kāṇukkinītī seems to be a variant form of Kāṇukkiṇa, the name of a village in the Mulviyana division of the Vavuniya district. Mudundumalli-yarata has been identified as Mulliyavāṭa, a division of the same district. Instead of Javagama some manuscripts have the form Gajagama which cannot easily be identified as the present Gajakesari. The fifth division, namely Balāḍirāṭa, seems to be the one referred to as Balāḍi by Queyroz, according to whom it formed part of the chiefcy of Mulliyavāṭa. JRASC (New Series) Vol. VII, pt. ii, p. 184-185.
conquered most of Rajarata, which was formerly under Māgha. As the evidence from the Pañāya inscriptions suggests that the Javaka had established a kingdom in the island by 1258, it may be assumed that the principal conquests of the Javakas in the north of the island were made after the demise of Māgha in 1255. It is also possible that Candrabhumī established some strongholds in the north after his defeat at the hands of Virabahu in 1247 and directed his energies against Māgha thus contributing in course of time to the latter’s downfall.

The invasions of Māgha and Candrabhumī had the effect of establishing on a permanent basis a new and independent kingdom which came to be gradually and effectively isolated from the Sinhalese kingdom in the south by territories that were being encroached by jungles.

The Dravidian warrior chiefs with whose support Māgha and Candrabhumī conquered a part of the island became the dominant element in society in those parts of the country that came under their rule. Some of the social and cultural institutions of the Ceylon Tamils, especially in the eastern littoral, were crystallized during the time of Māgha. The traditions incorporated in 'The Ancient History of Batticaloa' presuppose that Māgha exercised effective authority over most of the eastern littoral through chieftains established at military strongholds at Mannumani and other localities. These traditions claim that the division of each caste into units called Kollu which were conventionally seven in number had their origins under Māgha. This claim presupposes that the period of Māgha's rule was an important and decisive stage in the development of Tamil settlements in the eastern littoral.

Vira Śivīrīn, which once exerted a strong influence in the eastern littoral, seems to have been introduced among the Tamil settlements there during the period of Māgha's rule. The priestly functions in some of the Hindu temples in the eastern littoral have been and are still to a certain extent performed by the Cankamār who form a strong and influential element in some localities in the region. They continue to wear on their chests the Vira Śivīrī emblem, the lingam, encased in bronze caskets which have the figures of the recumbent bull and the trident carved upon them. Tradition claims that the ancestors of the Cankamār had come from the town of Mallikārjuna-puram in Mahāvītu in the distant past. Their rituals and worship are still guided by manuscript texts expounding Lingāyat doctrines and beliefs.

It is significant that the Tāntrīśvarī temple at Kokkatticoli, the leading Śivīrī shrine in the entire eastern littoral to the south of Kāttiyāram, was, according to tradition, established during the period of Kālinga rule. The architectural style of the Vimāna of this temple, which was dominating by its massive stūpi and was of brick construction and the Pindīya style of architecture seems to suggest that the temple had been constructed on an elaborate scale during the thirteenth century.

Another famous shrine on the eastern littoral associated with Māgha by local tradition is the Subramanya Temple at Tirukkōvil. Among the buildings of this ancient shrine only the Vimāna has remained intact while all other structures have collapsed. This gracefully designed Vimāna has, on the grounds of its architectural style, been compared to the Pindīya monuments in South India and been assigned to the thirteenth century. A Tamil inscription which could be assigned to the fourteenth century records the donation made to this temple by a certain Vijayabahu. Māgha is also associated with Koṅgavaram in the traditions recorded in 'The Early History of Batticaloa.' It is claimed that Māgha granted to this temple the

78. Unpublished manuscripts.
79. M.I., p. 43.
80. The other parts of the original structures have vanished in course of time. The mūrōda and the surrounding subsidiary shrines are recent constructions.
THE KINGDOM OF JAFENA

revenues, from the town of Trincomalee. The Kollakottan traditions as found in the Kōnēcar Kalvēṭṭu and other texts relating to Kōvessaram, as will be seen later, presuppose a revival of Saivite religious and artistic activity in the Trinco-
malee region during the time of Māgha.

The Sanskrit inscription on the seal recently discovered at Padaviya which has been assigned to the thirteenth century on palaeographic considerations shows that there was a Brahmin settlement at Padaviya. The inscription states that it was issued by Mahesa who resided at Śrī Padigrāma inhabited by Brahmins and whose feet were adorned by the diadems of Indra and other gods. It has been assumed that the Mahesa mentioned in the epigraph could have been Māgha, and on the basis of this assumption it has been surmised that Māgha resided at Padaviya after evacuating Polonnaruwa. It is, however, difficult to accept the explanation that the seal was issued by Māgha because Mahesa meaning 'The great God' is an epithet of Śiva and a person whose feet are described as being adorned by the diadems of Indra and of other gods could only be a God and not a King. Moreover, Māgha, who was a staunch Saivite, could not have imagined that he could command the homage of the gods headed by Indra. The seal was in all probability issued by the authorities of a Saivite temple at Padaviya.

The evidence from this inscription may perhaps show that Saivism and Saivite institutions continued to flourish at Padaviya during the time of Māgha. The issue of a seal in the name of a local temple presupposes that the temple had an institution to manage its affairs. The Hindu architectural remains at Padaviya show that there were a number of Saivite shrines in medieval times. Most of these

83. MM, pp. 74-75.
84. See Chapter V.

...temple which had their origins under Čēla rule, continued to flourish until the fourteenth century. The Hindu shrines at Padaviya were presumably supported by the warrior chiefs settled at the local military outposts by Māgha and by the mercantile and other Drauvīḍian communities living in that town. Saivite and other Hindu institutions were presumably set up or maintained at Polonnaruwa and other centres in a similar manner during the period of Māgha's rule.
were Saivite Tamils like the Vanniyar of 'Jaffnapatnam' and claimed descent from conquerors who had come from the Tamil country in South India. The Vanni chiefs in the north central parts of the island were Sinhalese and Vedda but little is known of their history after the thirteenth century.

During the early thirteenth century the Vanni principalities had emerged as centres of feudal power and after the late thirteenth century the Culaavana and some Sinhalese and Tamil texts make mention of them. The Vanni Chieftains were to be found in the territories that were subject to the control of Magha (1215—1255) and his two contemporaries at Dambadeniya, Vijayabahu III and Parakramabahu II (1236—1271). Vijayabahu himself is said to have attained the rank of a 'Vanni King' and is credited with the conquest of the Mahavanni region beyond Magha’s control. Parakramabahu II is said to have brought under his influence the Sinhalese kings in the land of the Vanni and the Vanni kings living in Rajarata and Ruhuna are said to have acknowledged his overlordship. During the reign of Parakramabahu, when the Pujavaliya, which contains the earliest reference to the Vannis, was written, there were many Vanni Chieftains holding sway over areas which were under Magha and his contemporaries at Dambadeniya. Besides, the term ‘Vanni’ was also applied to a large area in the dry zone. As Magha and his contemporaries at Dambadeniya, Vijayabahu II and Parakramabahu, had connections with the Vanni, the origins of the territorial divisions called the Vanni and the Vanni chieftaincy as a feudal institution must go back to a period before Magha’s invasion. During the thirteenth century, specifically under Parakramabahu II, the privileges of the Vanni chieftains were well defined; they were autonomous and had their own retainers and paraphernalia according to their rank. Such a state of

1. The Chieftaincies of the Vanni Origins and Development

The thirteenth century witnessed the development of the autonomous or independent principalities called the Vanni. They were confined mainly to the dry zone and were administered mostly by Tamil chiefs called Vanniyar, some of whom claimed descent from South Indian Warriors. Among the medieval Vanni chieftaincies those of Panakamum, Melpatu, muliyavalai, Karunaiyapattu, Kariakatathomai and Tennamaravath in the north were incorporated into the kingdom of Jaffna.

The Vanni principalities of Batticaloa and Puttalam were dominated mostly by mukkuwar who were of Kerala origin and were matrilineal in their social organization. The chieftains of Trincomalee, who enjoyed considerable prestige and influence,

1. The concordance of Jaffnapatnam, one of the three divisions of the Dutch possessions in Ceylon, embraced most of the lands which were formerly included in the kingdom of Jaffna. The territories within this concordance were classified by the Dutch into four groups or divisions. The concordance covered (a) the Vanni and (b) the other territories of the Jaffna. There were six provinces in the Vanni: (c) the Eastern Province, (d) the Western Province, (e) the Northern Province, (f) the Central Province, (g) the Southern Province, (h) the Colombo District, (i) the Negombo District, and (j) the Trincomalee District.


3. A copper plate grant of Jayamahakara VII dated in Saka 1410 (A.D. 1518) mentions Nawamuna Vigniya, a Mukkuwar Chief, who was living at Jaffna and ruling over the area of Puttalam. See Simon Creel, The Ceylon Gazetteer, (Cotta Church Mission, 1930), pp. 78—80 and appendixes 1 and 2.


5. Cf. 84:11, A Contribution to the History of Ceylon Translated from the "Pujavaliya" (PSV), pp. 37—42.

affairs presupposes that those chieftaincies had developed over a considerable period of time.

The word ‘Vanni’ and its variants as used in Sinhalese, Tamil and Pali Texts had four different connotations: a caste group among both Tamils and Sinhalese, a feudatory province, a feudal chief and lastly a unit of territory confined primarily to the dry zone. The Sinhalese chronicles and literary works make mention of eighteen vannis and refer to two broad divisions called Mahâvanni and Sirîvanni. The Vanni principalities were conventionally referred to as the eighteen vannis in Sinhalese works, presumably under the influence of a South Indian tradition and not because there were eighteen such principalities. The basis of the distinction between the Mahâvanni and the Sirîvanni is not at all clear.

In the thirteenth century the Vanni area was as extensive as to include portions of the three traditional territorial divisions of the island: Rajarata, Mâyârata and Rôhânâ. The question arises as to how an extensive and contiguous region and the principalities spread over it came to be known as the Vanni. Tennent conjectures that the name must have been derived either from the word Vana (forest) or from the word Vâhni (Vanni in Tamil) meaning ‘fire’ on account of the intense heat of the region but he does not take into account historical evidence. Gnanapragasgar contends that the Vanniyaar, who belonged to a warrior caste, had come to the island in the armies of foreign invaders, settled in regions where anarchy prevailed and gradually established principalities in the areas included in the Vavuniya and Trincomalee districts. He does not attempt to examine on a chronological basis the process by which the chieftaincies of the Vanni had evolved.

In endorsing the view of Gnanapragasgar Indrapala adduces three main arguments. Firstly, the traditions concerning the origins of the Vanniyaar are found in India but not in Sri Lanka. Secondly, the epigraphic and literary references to the Vanniyaar of India belong to a period earlier than that of the references to the Vanniyaar in the island. Lastly, the traditions embodied in the local chronicles claim that the Vanniyaar had come to the island from the Tamil country. Moreover he asserts:

The traditions in the Tamil chronicles refer to a time when invaders and settlers from South India, including the Vanniyaar, occupied the present Northern and Eastern provinces and set up chieftaincies there. These were undoubtedly the chieftaincies which later came to be known as the Vanni. There were a few prominent leaders, one of whom was Mâgha, who were responsible for the creation of Vanni chieftaincies in the Trincomalee and Batticaloa districts.

The validity of the conclusions arrived at by Gnanapragasgar and Indrapala may be examined in the light of the South Indian evidence on the Vanniyaar.

The Vanniyaar in South India

In the Tamil country, as in Sri Lanka, the term ‘Vanni’ denoted a community or a feudal chieftaincy. As a caste of community of professional warriors the Vanniyaar were prominent

---

8. The dry zone, the low country wet zone and the central highlands are the three main geographical divisions of the island. The first of these includes the Northern, North Central, North Western and Eastern Provinces and a part of the Southern Province.


10. The number of Vanni Chiefs and their territory is sometimes given as eighteen and sometimes as three hundred and sixty-four. In the opinion of Javanakotta (perhaps these (the eighteen) were the Maha Vanni and the three hundred and sixty four the Sirî-Vanni), ibid.


in medieval South Indian armies. Since the epigraphical references
to the Vanniyar soldiers and regiments date from the period of
Cōla expansion under Rājarāja I and his successors it may be
inferred that the growth of Cōla military power had contributed
to the emergence of the Vanniyar as a distinct social group—a
community of professional warriors. Under the Cōlas the mode
of remuneration for military service was often in the form of
land-assignments to be held on service tenure. Such assignments
to the Vanniyar were referred to as Vanniyaṟappu in Cōla
inscriptions.

Cōla inscriptions also mention feudal chieftains who held
the rank of Vanniyaṟṟayan, ‘The chief of the Vanniyar’. In
the Cōla Kingdom three lines of feudatory chiefs, namely the
Malayaman chiefs of Malayamainīṭu otherwise called Jananātha
Valanaṭu, the Gangas of Paṅkalanaṭu and the Sambuvāriyar chiefs
appear to have borne the epithet Vanniyaṟṟayan. All
the principalities under the charge of these chieftains were in
Toṭāmaṇālam. The Malayamains, who were descended from
an ancient family of local chieftains, exercised authority from
the centres of Kīṭhūr and Āṭṭiyur under the later Cōlas. The
chiefs of Malayamainīṭu had the epithets Malayamain, Pēriya
uttaiyaṇ and Cēṭiyaraiyaṇ. During the reigns of Rājarāja II
(1143–1178) and Kulottunga III they had the additional epithet
Vanniyaṟṟayanaṇ. Rājarāja Cēṭiyaraiyaṇ, mentioned in inscriptions
issued since the sixth year of Rājadhiraja, was referred to also
as Iraiyaṉ Sārvakkuṭātān Vanniyaṟṟayanaṇ. He was succeeded by Rāman, otherwise called Vanniya Devendra Malayamain,
around the tenth year of the same king.

During the early years of Kulottunga III the chieftain who
ruled over a part of Malayamainīṭu from Kīṭhūr was Rājarāja

16. S. Pathmanathan, ‘Feudal Polity in Medieval Sri Lanka: An Exa-
mination of the Chieftaincies of the Vanni’, CJISS, Vol. 11, (New
17. ARE, 1934/35, p. 61 Nos. 188, 189
18. ARE, 1934/35, pp. 61, 63 Nos 125, 186
19. ARE, 1934/35, pp. 61 63, Nos. 125, 188

Kōvalraṇy Vanniyaṟṟayanaṇ,20 the son of Rājarāja Cēṭiyaraiyaṇ,
who was a general and Vassal of Rājadhiraja.21 This chief, who
continued in authority until at least A. D. 1209, had the addi-
tional epithet Paḷavāyudha Vaḷḷaṁbu, ‘The one who is proficient
in the use of many weapons’. Another general and feudatory of
Rājadhiraja was Narasimhamvaṇar Karikālaṇoṇ, the Malayamain
of Āṭṭiyur, referred to in inscriptions as Vanniyaṟṟamakkaṁṇaṇ.22
He was one of the generals sent by the Cōla government to
support the Pāṇḍya Prince Kukaseṅkara in his wars against the
armies of Parākramabāhu I of Sri Lanka.23

A ganga chief of Paṅkalanaṇṭu, Kuttāṭuntēyaṇ Pēṭhivāgarṇa, is
described as Vanniyaṟṟayanaṇ in inscriptions from Tiruvannā-
malai.24 The Sambuvāriyar chiefs, who claimed Pallava descent,
were another line of chiefs who had a claim to the epithet
Vanniyaṟṟayanaṇ. An epigraphic record of the thirty eighth year of
Kulottunga III refers to Cēṭiyēṅ Ammaṅgaiyaṇ Sambuvāriyan
as Vanniyaṟṟayanaṇ.25 He may be identified with Cēṭiyēṅ Ammaṅ-
gaiyaṇ, otherwise called Vikramaṅgəḷi Sambuvāriyan, an ally of
Narasimhamvaṇar Karikālaṇoṇ, who was the Malayamain of
Āṭṭiyur.26

The epithet ‘Vanniyaṟṟayanaṇ’, a variant of which was
Vanniyaṟṟamakkaṁṇaṇ, may be defined as one that denotes a
dignitary who was either a general who held regiments of
Vanniyar under his charge or a chief of the people called
Vanniyar. During the period of the imperial Cōlas the word
Vanniyar had two connotations. Firstly it denoted a particular
group of people—a community, as suggested by the expression
‘Vanniyaṟṟamakkaṁ’. Secondly it signified the rank of a feudatory
chieftain, as suggested by an inscription of the reign of
Kulottunga III which records a compact between two Malaya-
māns of Kiliyur, Rājarāja Ceyṭiyarēya and Abākiya Cōlan Aćkārēyā. The inscription records that they agreed to perform together and in mutual collaboration the 璠jaikārēya, the service for ‘the King’ and the service for the Vanniar. The Vanniar was evidently a dignitary of higher rank and one who could command their allegiance and service.

Some of the Vanniar apparently had connections with the Vēlaiakārēr. Several epigraphs from Tirukkōyilur record the vow of loyalty taken by the Vēlaiakārēr to the Vanniarēya Rājarāja Ceyṭiyarēya, the Malayaman of Kiliyur. The Vēlaiakārēr pledged individually and in some instances jointly to serve and defend him even at the cost of their lives and to perish with him in the event of his death. The Vēlaiakārēr in the service of these chieftains were a sort of retainers and recall the ‘household warriors’ of feudal society in medieval Europe.

Some of the Malayāmāns are known from inscriptions to have been Vēlaiakārēr. Ceyṭiyarēya Malayāman, Kovalarēya Malayāman Kiliyurē and Palavāyudha Vallabhē Malayāman are said to have been Vēlaiakārēr serving under Irutērēya Ceyṭiyarēya Vanniarēya Kiliyur. As the Malayāman chiefs were both Vanniar and Vēlaiakārēr it may be inferred that some of the Vēlaiakārēr were Vanniar. Indeed a Vēlaiakārēr is described as a Vanniarēcci. Therefore, a chief who had the epithet Vanniarēya could have been a Vēlaiakārēr.

The Cōla feudatories who had the epithet ‘Vanniarēya (nāyān)’ exercised authority over certain principalities which were for the most part contiguous on a hereditary basis. Some of them were quite powerful and held sway over fairly large territorial divisions. The Malayāman Ceyṭiyarēya for instance had under his jurisdiction the divisions of Malayāmanālū, Vānākōppālētu, Cēṇkunātātu and Ujaikākātātu. They maintained armies of their own and, as part of their obligations presumably supplied their Cōla overlord with a certain number of troops whenever necessity arose. They also served as generals in the armies of the Cōlas and were honoured for their valour and success in wars. Epithets such as Cēṇukkutāti, ‘The one who does not yield’, Anakātiṇa, ‘The one who treads the elephant’, and Palavāyudha Vallabhē, ‘The one proficient in the use of many weapons’ were presumably conferred on them by the Cōla Kings.

The question of the origin and development of the Vannī principalities in Sri Lanka may now be considered in the light of the conclusions that have emerged from the analysis of the evidence from South Indian inscriptions. The use of the term Vanniyapātā to denote territorial or administrative divisions in the Tamil country and Sri Lanka and the application of the word Vanniyar(nāyār) to signify the rank of a feudal chieftain in both countries cannot be an accidental coincidence. As Sri Lanka was subject to strong South Indian influence during this period it may reasonably be assumed that the word Vanni and its variants were introduced into the island by Tamil conquerors from South India. In the circumstances two explanations could be postulated regarding the emergence of principalities called the Vanni in the island. The first is that they developed from the practice of placing the administration of territorial divisions under the charge of Vanniyar regiments and their leaders. The second is that pockets of local authority which gradually developed into autonomous principalities as a result of the decline of central authority came to be referred to as Vannis when they were occupied and administered by Tamil warriors belonging to the community of Vanniyar. 32

32. Regarding the use of the term Vanni in the island Indrapala observes: ‘It is difficult to trace how this name came to be applied to Sinhalese Chieftains, too. One possibility is that the term Vanni became current for chieftains in the abandoned regions of Hejratu and in the forest tracts elsewhere after the Vanni Chieftains from South India established themselves in the Northern parts of Ceylon. Another possibility is that the term was introduced into the island before the migration of South Indian Vanni Chieftains, in the same manner as South Indian administrative terms were to be introduced. Vanni, however, was not used in South India as an administrative term and the Vanni Chieftains were not part of an administrative unit.’ (The Ceylon Journal of Humanities, Vol. I, No. 2, July 1970, pp. 15-136. If Vanni was not used in South India as an administrative term, then it cannot be any possibility of it ever having been introduced into the island in the same manner as other South Indian administrative terms came to be introduced.

(Continued)
It would be useful to consider here the origins of the term Vanni(yaparpu). The word parpu denotes a territorial division consisting of several villages. In South India it was a unit of the nātu. Sometimes, however, the nātu was a sub-division of the parpu. The expression Vanni(yaparpu) mentioned in Tamil inscriptions is generally defined as a land-holding held by Vanniyar regiments on service tenure. The term Vanni(yaparpu) could have come into vogue in Sri Lanka in the same manner as in the Cola kingdom. It may have been introduced during the period of Cola rule (993–1070) or adopted later in the Polonnaruwa period, owing to the influence of South Indian warriors serving in the island. The earliest Vanni chieftaincies of Sri Lanka could have evolved from land-holdings given to Vanniyar regiments on service tenure. The fact that the Vējāikkārār were in the service of Vanniyar chiefs in South India and the further fact that some of those chiefs themselves were Vējāikkārār would suggest that the origin of the Vanni chieftaincies in the island could have been connected with the activities of the Vējāikkārār.

The Vējāikkārār had come to the island during the period of Cola rule and their settlements were to be found even after the fall of Cola power. They were employed by the Sinhalese kings until the end of the twelfth century and wielded great influence in politics and society. The Vējāikkārār and other Dravidian soldiers formed an important section of the royal armies posted at military outposts like Padaviya, Kōttiyāram and Kandažāj. Moreover, there is evidence to suggest that the administration of territorial divisions were placed under the charge of generals. The relaxation of central authority naturally tended to enhance the power and authority of such chieftains at the local level. In the light of these considerations the origins of the chieftaincies called the Vanni may be traced from the changes that occurred in the military and administrative systems in Sri Lanka during the period of Cola rule and the centuries that followed thereon.

Political conditions in the Polonnaruwa period were conducive to the growth of the centres of local power. Except during the reigns of Viyabāhū I (1070–1110) and Parākrama Bāhū (1153–1186) the country witnessed political instability. Frequent wars and the lack of effective central control produced a sense of insecurity, and under such conditions generals and local chiefs could wield greater influence and power than usual as testified by manifold examples in history. Even under Parākrama Bāhū there were settlements which enjoyed local autonomy. After his death the Polonnaruwa kingdom declined and finally disintegrated when Migaha conquered Polonnaruwa in A. D. 1215. The breakup also facilitated the culmination of the process of the evolution of the feudal chieftaincies. These chieftaincies emerged as independent or autonomous centres of political power and began to play a crucial role in the politics and the administrative management of the island.

The term Vanniyaar, which was generally applied to the chiefs of the Vanni in South India and the Tamil districts of Sri Lanka,

---

33. The term Vanni(yaparpu) is explained as one that denotes lands held under military tenure. See STII. III, pt 2, (Epigraphical Glossary) and Madras Tamil Lexicon, V, pp. 2557–8.

34. Parpu (Colloquially Parpu) is a Dravidian Word (parpu in Malayalam and Tamil; pattu in Canarese) which denotes a territorial division consisting of several villages. This word came into vogue in Sri Lanka probably after the Cola conquest. In Tamil Nadu a parpu was a unit of the nātu. Sometimes, however, the nātu was a subdivision of a parpu. See T. V. Mahalingam, Administration and Social Life Under Vijayanagara, p. 81, and I. N. MTL.

35. See Chapter III

36. Patka, a general of Gejabaḥū II, exercised authority over the hill country. Malayātigai, a general of Parākrama Bāhū I, administered the North western divisions of Dakhinadu. Another general of Parākrama Bāhū, Naṭayana, was in charge of the province around Awaradhapura. Bhūta, another general of this king, was appointed to administer Rohana. See CV, 69-6-11; 70: 5-6; 72:65-68; 75:190.
may be said to have been derived from the title Vanniya(r)nāyan which was originally a military title signifying the rank of a general. This development was the result of a process of progressive growth in which the general became a feudal chief exercising territorial jurisdiction. However, the original significance of the title was subsequently forgotten and in course of time it came to denote only the rank of a feudal chief. During the late thirteenth century the title Vanniyanār or Vanniṣṭa was no longer confined exclusively to the chieftains of the Vanniya caste. It came to signify the rank of any feudal chief in the dry zone and all the lands subject to the authority of such chiefs were collectively known as the Vanni.

**Māgha and the Chieftains of Batticaloa**

The eastern littoral, extending from Pānumai in the South to Verukalāru in the north and comprising most of the lands in the Batticaloa and Amparai districts, has been marked out as a separate region by geographical factors. In medieval times geographical environment and historical circumstances had led to a sense of identity among the inhabitants of this region. The Tamils who inhabited this region, which was isolated to a considerable extent from the political and cultural developments in the rest of the island, developed a social organization and cultural traditions which were in many ways distinctive. Although a uniform pattern of social and economic institutions was developed throughout the land, politically it was divided into a number of small principalities. They were generally known as pāṭu and were placed under the authority of chiefs styled Vanniya(r)nāyan. The most important among these principalities were those of Batticaloa, Māṇumānai, Paḷukakāmn and Nāṭukātu.37

Sammānatturai, Eravur, Pottuvil and Koṟałappattu are the other

37. The population of Nāṭukātu was a mixed one consisting of Tamils, Sinhalese and Vedda(s). The nāṭukātu paravaṇi Kalseputtu (Br. M. Mas. Or.) contains interesting information on the topography, history, society and administration of this division. S. Pathmanaathan, ‘Nāṭu Kaṭu Paravaṇi Kalseputtu’, Batticaloa National Conference Souvenir, IATR (Sri Lanka National Unit), March, 1976, pp. 82-90

The seventeenth century Portuguese chronicler, de Queyroze, asserts that these principalities were originally set up by the sons of a Mukkuvar prince who ruled over a major part of the region. But the account about these princelings as recorded by de Queyroze is confused and does not seem to be based on any authentic tradition.38 As the historical traditions of Batticaloa claim that the obligations, rights and privileges of various social groups living in Batticaloa were once defined by Maṅgaṃ in it may be inferred that some of the Vanni chieftains of Batticaloa had their origin under chiefs of the Vanniya caste who were connected to the Maṅgaṃ family of feudatory chieftains in the Tamil country.39

In course of time the Mukkuvar acquired power over most of the Batticaloa region. Their settlements in the eastern littoral may have been the result of periodic migrations from Keral. Local tradition claims that the Mukkuvar who came as the allies and soldiers of Māgha secured positions of power and authority during his time. The traditions concerning the Mukkuvar chieftains as recorded in the Maṭṭakkalappu Māṇṇiyam may briefly be summarized here:

When Maṇuvaratana, the ruler of Kalinga, learnt of the unfavourable developments in Sri Lanka he sent his third son called Māṅkōn (Māgha) with instructions to propagate Savism and to install Cukātan in the ruler of Maṭṭakkalappu. Māṅkōn and his army landed at a spot in Manippuram (Jaffna), proceeded to Maṭṭakkalappu, and had Timciṅkan and his kinsmen put to death. Moreover, he conquered the province and appointed Cukātan, a Kālinga, as its ruler. With the help of the Paṭaiyāṭe Vanniyar he occupied Tōppivā (Polonnaruwa), divided its territories and gave them to the members of the Paṭaiyāṭikulam. Maṭṭakalappu (Jaffna), Tirukkōṇai (Trincomalee) and Mannār were placed under the chiefs of the

38. The Temporal and Spiritual Conquest of Ceylon by Fernao de Queyroze tr. S. G. Perera, Colombo, 1930, p. 18

39. MM, p. 93
Tirukkulam. He gave Māgha a fortress at Mānumnai and placed it under Cukatiraj. The chief of the Mākkavu whom he had brought from Kālikātī k (Calicut) were raised by him to the rank of Vannipam.  

The foregoing account claims that Māgha appointed several chieftains to administer territorial divisions in Mannar, Jaffna, Trincomalee, Polonnaruwa and Batticaloa. This tradition may be considered authentic as it is basically consistent with the claim made in the Cēlavansa that Māgha and his associate Jayabhū held sway over Rajaratha by posting Kerala and Tamil warriors at military outposts at Mannar, Trincomalee, Padaviya, Kantalāy, Polonnaruwa and other military strongholds in Rajaratha. In the light of this tradition it may be assumed that Māgha raised to the rank of Vanniyar some of the leaders who led his armies and placed territorial divisions in Batticaloa and other areas under their authority. But this does not necessarily imply that the Vanni chieftaincies in the island had their origins under him.  

Although the traditions of the Makkavu of Batticaloa, as embodied in the Makkakkalappu mānniya, attribute the origins of the chieftaincy of the Makkavu of Batticaloa to Māgha, these traditions do not prove that the Vanni chieftaincies of that region had their origin under Māgha. The Makkavu were not of the Vanniyar community. They had come from Kerala and not from the Tamil country. In South India the community of Vanniyar and the chieftaincies of the Vanni were to be found, for the most part, in the Tamil country and not in Kerala. Therefore, the Makkavu could not have been responsible for the origins of the Vanni in Sri Lanka. Māgha was not a Vanniya by caste or rank, nor did he come from the Tamil country. The tradition that Māgha conferred the rank of Vannipam on the chiefs of the

Mākkavu does not necessarily mean that the Vanni chieftaincy of Batticaloa had its origins in the time of Māgha.  

The tradition recorded in the chronicle concerns only an episode in the history of some chieftaincies in Batticaloa. Invasions and conquests often result in the transfer of power from traditional ranks to the allies and supporters of the conqueror. The Makkavu who had swelled the ranks of Māgha's army seem to have wrested political power from local chieftains and this is implied in the traditional account of Māgha's invasion.  

The chronicle asserts that Māgha displaced Tinacikān and appointed in his place another dignitary, Cukatiraj, as the chief of Mānumnai. This evidence suggests that there was a local chieftain ruling in that region on the eve of Māgha's invasion. Moreover, the chief appointed by Māgha to rule Mānumnai was a Kālinga and not a Vanniya(n). Thus, it is clear that the tradition embodied in this chronicle cannot support the claim that Māgha created the Vanni chieftaincies of Batticaloa. The tradition itself does not claim that Vanniyar of South India or chiefs from South India who had already acquired the rank of Vannipam before their arrival in Sri Lanka were settled in Batticaloa and vested with political authority by Māgha. The tradition would rather suggest that the local chieftaincy had evolved before Māgha's invasion. In raising chiefs to the rank of Vannipam Māgha was only accepting and adapting a prevailing institution rather than introducing a major innovation in regional government.

The Chieftaincies of Trincomalee

In the Trincomalee district, as in Batticaloa, small principalities dominated by Tamil chieftains called Vanniyar had emerged in the thirteenth century. Some of the events connected with their development have been chronicled in the Kōner Kērvētu which records the traditions and legends relating to the famous Saivite temple at Trincomalee — Kōnescavaram. The origins and develop-

40. ibid., p. 96
41. S. Pathmanathan, 'Feudal polity in Medieval Ceylon: An Examination of the Chieftaincies of 43 - Vanni', CHSS Vol. II (New Series) No. 2 (July-December 1972), 122-129
42. See Chapter II
ment of the chieftaincies in the North-eastern littoral may be viewed as the culmination of the process of the growth of Tamil settlements spread over a long period of time.

The Tamil settlement at the port of Trincomalee was one of the oldest settlements in the island and the Kōṇĕśvaram temple had been maintained to satisfy the religious needs of this settlement. But, there is not much evidence on Tamil settlements in the other localities within this region until the tenth century. The process of the transformation of the North-eastern littoral stretching from Koskijy in the North to Verukal in the South and extending from the coast up to such places as Kantalāy and Padaviya in the interior into a predominantly Tamil speaking area began in the tenth century and was almost completed by the mid-thirteenth century. Tamil settlements had sprung up at many places in this region during the period of Cōḷa rule. The impact of Cōḷa rule on this region was great and a substantial amount of archaeological evidence relating to Tamil settlements has come to light in Trincomalee, Nilavellī, Periyakulam, Kantalāy, Padaviya and a few other sites. The number of Cōḷa inscriptions hitherto brought to light in these localities is substantial and is greater than the number of those found in any other area of comparable size in the island.

The Cōḷas had exercised effective authority over the North-eastern littoral from such centres as Padaviya and Kantalāy. Inscriptions have preserved for posterity the names of at least four administrative divisions which were renamed and possibly reconstituted by them in this region. Kōṭiyaram was divided into two units called Vikrama Cōḷa Valanāṭu and Rājarāja Valanāṭu. The Villages of Māṇēkkēnī and Kantalāy seem to...


44. Cōḷa inscriptions have been discovered also at the Bhedrakāli Amman temple and the Sīvan Temple at Trincomalee. Both inscriptions are badly damaged and the one at the first of these sites contains a portrait of Rājendra Cōḷa.

45. Trincomalee Inscriptions Series - No. I

46. Vira Parakāṣari Valanāṭu had two other names, Rājendra Čīṅka Valanāṭu and Abhayāsaya Valanāṭu. ET., pt. I.
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of Tamil Buddhists around Periyaku’ām.²⁰ Besides, the occurrence of Tamil or Tamilised place names such as Kantajāy, Velkām and Tirukōṭāmalai may also suggest that there were permanent Tamil settlements in the region during this period.

The twelfth century witnessed a further growth and extension of these settlements. The composite military group called the Vēḷākkārrar were in occupation of military outposts at Kantajāy and Koṭīyāram. The Brahmin settlement at Kantajāy enjoyed royal favours and continued to flourish. At Padaviya and Vahalkada the large and composite Dravidian mercantile group called the Ayāvole had established mercantile towns under their control and participated in cultural and religious activities. The Hindu and Buddhist institutions established under Cola rule continued to flourish. Besides, the establishment of additional

³⁰ Architecturally Rājarājamperumplāli was a Dēḷa monument. Almost all the benefactors whose pious gifts are recorded in a dozen Dēḷa inscriptions recovered from this site appear to have been Tamils. Some of them held high positions in the administration as suggested by their epithets while the rest were commoners. An analysis of the items donated to this institution also seems to confirm the view that the Rājarājamperumplāli was supported by persons of different levels of economic and social status and influence.

³¹ The evidence from the Pālamoṭāl Tamil inscription presupposes that the Veḷākkārrar had a permanent settlement at Kantajāy. (Sho E. Z. IV No. 24, pp. 191-198). In one of my recent visits to Sigiriya I saw among the graffiti a Tamil passage of seven lines which records the visit of many princes, Punnιyan and a few other Tamils of Kantajāy to Sigiriya. The text seems to have been engraved with a sharp metallic stylus on the wall beneath the paintings. As the text is written in characters of the twelfth century it may be assumed that Manjāpāṇ蜱 and his associates had lived at Kantajāy during that century. They were, perhaps, people of means who ventured to climb the rock in order to have a view of the extraordinarily attractive paintings which had become famous all over the island by that time. I have not come across any reference to this Tamil passage and the entire text could be properly deciphered only if a photo-copy of it could be prepared. It could be a useful addition to the impressive number of graffiti edited and published by S. Paranavitana.

religious institutions as suggested by the remains at Pōtankāțu, Kandasimimalai, Kumpakannamalai and Buddhistgala indicate that further Tamil settlements were established in this region. Towards the end of the twelfth century the Tamil society in the North eastern littoral was strong, influential and prosperous. During the next century, it could have become still stronger as a result of migrations and invasions from India. As tradition claims that Māgha and his associate had military outposts at Gona (Trincomalee), Koṭhāsāra (Kottiyar), Padi (Padaviya) Gangatātaka (Kantajāy) and Kāvudāvulu (Kattukkūṇam) it may be assumed that the Dravidian warriors in his service secured a controlling influence over this region. Local traditions recorded by the Konēcār Kālveṭtu seem to imply that chieftains called Vanniyar had authority over Trincomalee and other principalities in this region around this time.

The appointment of chieftains called Vanniyar is credited to Kulakkōṭan in the local traditions embodied in the Konēcār Kalveṭtu. The account of Kulaṅkōṭan as found in the Konēcār Kalveṭtu may briefly be summarized here.²⁶

Vararāmatēvan, the son of Manunlí kaṟṟa Cōḷa, and his son Kulakkōṭan came to Trincomalee with their retinue and army after hearing of the greatness of the sanctified site at Trincomalee. Later, Kulakkōṭan decided that the services at the shrine of Konēcār should be revived and elaborated with help from the Cōḷa country. He brought craftsmen including smiths from the royal mints (Akkāḷaiyar) and constructed a Saivite temple

²² A stone image of Viṣṇu and the remains of a Saiva temple were found at this site. ASCAR for 1933, p. 18
²⁶ The old Hindu temple at this place, which is about eight miles to the north of Padaviya, has bricks with Tamil inscriptions on them.
²⁴ The ruins of a Saiva Shrine and fragments of stone images are to be found in a cave at Buddhagala which is almost midway between Padaviya and Kumbakannamalai.
²⁵ CV, 80:58-59
²⁶ KK, pp. 2-6, 40-42
surrounded with several lofty gopuras, created the sacred springs and endowed the temple with fields and tanks which he had reclaimed and made elaborate arrangements for conducting religious services. He settled at Trincomalee six families selected from the best of the Cōlas and brought from Marunkār, and granted them lands to be held in hereditary succession. He deposited treasures in the temple and ordained that the expenses incurred and the income obtained daily should be recorded by the tāvattār who also had to ensure that the ceremony of ālāttā and other services were duly performed.

Moreover, he settled at Trincomalee twenty-one families of Varippattir who had been brought from the Tamil country. They were to perform such services as gathering flowers, making garlands, cleaning and preserving silk garments used to decorate the images, carrying banners and umbrellas on festive occasions, singing to rhythm when the dancing girls perform their dances, lighting lamps, distributing sandal powder, pounding rice and polishing the floor. People of the tānām and Varippattir rice fields at Pallavei as remuneration for their services.

Kulakkōṭṭan brought Taniyannāppūlān from Madurai raised him to the rank of a Vannipam and placed the administration of the ‘town of Trincomalee’ under his charge. Furthermore, he settled a chief of a Kārālar family from Trinovelly at Katujukkalam and made him the ruler of the division of Kaṭuukkanār. This chief was assigned lands in Nilvēl and endowed with the insignia of a Vannipam. Kulakkōṭṭan ordained that the accounts of the income for the Konecar temple should be in the custody of the Vanniyanar of Kaṭuukkanāmarktur and his successors. The inhabitants of Kaṭuukkanalam were required to serve the temple. The people of Nilvērī were to conduct the festivals. Kulakkōṭṭan also proclaimed that the revenue in the form of Āsai, Āyam, tirai,57 and the dues from the salt ports should belong to the temple. On the orders of Kulakkōṭṭan,

57. Āsai, Āyam and tirai denote tax on land, income from customs and tolls and grain tax respectively.

Nilačōtīyann and his armies diverted the waters of the Mahāveli and constructed a huge reservoir. And to the sowing extent of 2,700 avanām was converted into fields and granted to the temple.

The value of the foregoing account as a source of historical information would depend on the historicity of Kulakkōṭṭan and the veracity of the details concerning his activities. It cannot be said of Kulakkōṭṭan, as it can of Manunītt Kāla Cōḷan and of Varārāmatevān that he is a legendary figure. The Tāvikālācārā purāṇam states that Kuḷakkōṭṭan had the name Cōḷa Kāla Kān.38 As there were many princes and dignitaries who had the name Cōḷagana(n) in Kalinga, South India and Sri Lanka, Kulakkōṭṭan Cōḷa Kāla Kān may be regarded as a historical personality. That he had close connections with Konecar and Trincomalee is suggested by persistent local traditions which credit him with the reconstruction of that temple.59 He could not have lived before the eleventh century because it was only after the rise of the Imperial Cōḷas that the name or title Cōḷa Kāla Kān came into use.

There had been princes or dignitaries who had the name Cōḷagana in the island during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. A prince called Cōḷagana Kumāra was at the court of Polonnaruwa during the reign of Gajabahu II (1132-1153).60 Another Cōḷagana was the nephew of Nissankamalla who seized power at Polonnaruwa after having put to death Vikramabahu.61 Yet another Cōḷagana is known of from a fragmentary Sanskrit inscription discovered at Fort Frederick, Trincomalee.62

58. TKP, ravayam, V 8
59. Kulakkōṭṭan’s activities in Trincomalee are dealt with in considerable detail in the TKP, the Timūṅgaḷalapurāṇam and other works. Besides, the sixteenth century Tamil inscription at Fort Frederick also asserts that the main structures at Kōḷēvaḷaṟu were constructed by Kulakkōṭṭan.
60. CV, 70.238
61. CV, 80.29
This inscription states that Cōḍaganga came to the island in Saka 1245 (A. D. 1223). The inscription was inscribed on a door jamb found among a set of images, and it may be assumed that the missing portion of the epigraph recorded certain benefactions of Cōḍaganga to the temple of Konēcar the remains of which were used as building materials for the fort constructed by the Portuguese in 1624. As there is some evidence to prove that the Cōḍaganga who had come to the island in A. D. 1223 had some connections with Kōṇēṣvaram, he may provisionally be identified as Kūjakkōṭṭan Cōḍakanikan who, as claimed by the local Tamil traditions, rebuilt Kōṇēṣvaram and reorganized its services.

The fragmentary Sanskrit inscription which begins with a description of the illustrious Cōḍagangadeva suggests that Cōḍagangadeva was a dignitary of princely rank. His landing at Trincomalee, which according to traditional Sinhalese history was under the effective control of Māgha, is significant. The relationship between Māgha and Cōḍaganga is open to speculation. Kūjakkōṭṭan Cōḍakanikan appears to have been a ruler who exercised authority over the areas extending from Trincomalee on the sea-coast to Kantalāy in the interior. His grant of a very large extent of paddy fields, his construction of major irrigation works and the reclamation of lands carried out under his orders, as claimed in the tradition, imply that he exercised power and authority over the region. The Tamil traditions concerning Kūjakkōṭṭan and the claim made in traditional Sinhalese history that Māgha had effective control over Trincomalee and other localities in the North eastern littoral may be reconciled by postulating that Cōḍaganga, whom we have identified as Kūjakkōṭṭan, came from some part of India, presumably with an army in order to reinforce Māgha, that he subsequently exercised power over Trincomalee and the surrounding areas as an associate of Māgha and that in that capacity he raised some military leaders serving under him to the rank of Vannipam.

The Cōla descent attributed to Kūjakkōṭṭan and the claim that he brought many settlers from the Cōla country may suggest that the account of Kūjakkōṭṭan contains a substratum of traditions concerning the activities of the Cōla prince called Lūṇkesvarar devar who is known to have held authority over this region and patronized Kōṇēṣvaram. The Tamil settlements referred to in the Kōṇēcar Kalvēṭṭu, may, therefore, have originated after the Cōla conquest and continued to expand in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Māgha’s conquest of Polonnaruwa seems to have led to a further growth of these settlements and the Tamil and other Dravidian military leaders who came to the island during his reign seem to have acquired control over the local administration in the territorial units of the North eastern littoral as in other regions. All the Vanniyar chiefs who held authority over Trincomalee in the subsequent centuries claimed descent from Taniyängappapulaṇ, the chief who was raised to the rank of Vannipam by Kūjakkōṭṭan.

The traditions recorded in the Kōṇēcar Kalvēṭṭu presuppose that there were chieftains called Vanniyar in Trincomalee before Māgha’s invasion. A certain Gajabahū is said to have had dealings with the local Vanniyar. The account of Gajabahū as given in the Kōṇēcar Kalvēṭṭu is summarized in the following paragraph.

When the services at the Kōṇēcar temple were interrupted by the death of the Pāsupat Brahmins Gajabahū came to Trincomalee, summoned the Vannipim, the tāṇam, varippaṭṭu and the nāṭṭavar and inquired as to why the temple services were discontinued. On being informed that it was due to the death of the Pāsupata Brahmins he raised to the rank of Mutan-mai two Brahmins who had come from abroad. Moreover, he bestowed on the temple 1,100 gold pieces which he caused to be recorded in the register of temple accounts. The king also proclaimed that a tenth of the grain tax and of the income from the sale of all commodities should be given over to the temple.
Gajabihû may be identified as the second ruler of that name. The claim (made in the Kôñcar Kâvettu and other works based on it) that Gajabihû extended support to Koñesavaram would appear to be based on authentic traditions in the light of the evidence from inscriptions and traditional Sinhalese history. Inscriptions set up during the period of his rule suggest that he had Hindu leanings. His religious outlook appears to have been viewed with disapproval by the author of the Cûlavamsa who chronicled the events of his reign. As Gajabihû had resided at Kantâjây during the last years of his reign it is very probable that he visited Koñesavaram and endeavoured to restore that temple and its institutions. The Vanniyar of Trincomalee may have, as claimed in local traditions, supervised the management of Koñesavaram even during the time of Gajabihû II.

It may be assumed that in the region of Atâkâppâru, as in Trincomalee and Batticaloa, warriors serving under Mâgha and Jayabâhu were raised to the rank of Vannipam and given authority over territorial divisions in that region. Mâgha’s reign proved to be a decisive stage in the development of local chieftaincies in Râjarâstu and the eastern littoral. He does not appear to have established a centralised administration over the territories that had come under his rule. The meagre evidence from our sources suggest that his kingdom comprised a number of principalities subject to his overlordship. Most of such principalities came to be dominated by warriors who had come in his armies and, since they owed their elevation to Mâgha, they may have remained loyal to him and supported his cause. After his demise such chieftains and their descendants sought to rule their respective principalities without any outside interference.

VI

The Impact of Pândya Power

The Kingdom in Northern Sri Lanka, which was dominated for the most part by Dravidian warriors under Mâgha and later under Candrabhâhu, soon came under Pândya influence. The Pândyas became the principal power in the Tamil country under Mâravarman Sundara Pândya, who succeeded Jayavarman Kulasekhara to power in 1215. The Cûla power was in an advanced state of decline towards the end of the reign of Kulottunga III, and the Cûla monarchy was no longer capable of repressing its turbulent and overweening vassals. The Bânas, the Kâtâvas and the Telugu-Côdas were striving to disrupt the remnants of the Cûla empire and assert their independence.

Mâravarman Sundara Pândya took full advantage of the troubles and weakness of the Cûla monarchy and invaded the Cûla Kingdom in full force during the early years of his reign. As the Cûla resistance collapsed Kulottunga, who was enfeebled by old age, fled and the invaders sacked his capital. The Pândya ruler solemnized his triumph by celebrating the ceremony of Vikrbhisaka at the coronation hall of the Cûlas.1 The Cûla monarch, who, subsequently, rendered homage to the victor and promised him tribute was allowed to administer his ancestral dominions.2

2. Ibid., p. 128
The Pāṇḍya impact on Sri Lanka during the reign of Māravarman Sundara was slight. An inscription of his fifteenth year claims that he conquered Ilam and Kalinga. This claim does not have any valid foundation but suggests that the relations which the Pāṇḍyas had with the rulers of Ilam and Kalinga were hostile. An expedition launched against Kalinga Mahā, who occupied Polonnaruwa after displacing Parākrama Pāṇḍya, may have been the basis for this exaggerated claim.

Under Jatāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya,(1253-68) one of the great South Indian conquerors, the Pāṇḍyas attained the zenith of their power and splendour. Some time after 1250 Sundara invaded the Cōla country in full force. The Hoysalas, Somesvara and Rāmanātha, who ruled over a part of it, abandoned their strongholds of Sṛṅgagam and Kaṇānur and fled. Their power was subsequently confined to their original homeland in the Karnātaka. The government of Rājendra III collapsed and thereafter the last vestiges of the Cōla monarchy disappeared. The Telugu Cōla of Nellore, the Kākatiya and even the Seuna one after another fell victim to his onslaught. The entire Tamil country and even some Telugu districts came under Pāṇḍya rule. Besides, the Cēra kingdom and a part of Sri Lanka were reduced to submission.

The Pāṇḍya inscriptions of the time of Jatāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya refer to some events in the island which are not recorded in the local chronicles. The Pāṇḍya inscriptions casually refer to his relations with the island. The Sanskrit inscription from Sṛṅgagam figuratively describes Sundara Pāṇḍya as the second Rāma in that he invaded the island of Lanka 7 while the Tiruppuṭki inscriptions asserts that he vanquished the ruler of Lanka. Such claims are repeated in the Tamil Prasasti which adds, more specifically, that from his fifth year onwards Sundara levied a tribute of gems and elephants from the ruler of Lanka.

Inscriptions of his associate ruler, Vira Pāṇḍya (1253-72), engraved from his tenth year onwards claim that he took the Cōla country, Ilam, and the crown and the crowned head of the Cavak. The prasasti of the 73rd day of his eleventh year gives a somewhat detailed account of the expedition against the island and the part the Cavak played in it.

As Nilakanta Sastri, who focussed the attention of scholars on the historical significance of the data in these inscriptions, suggests, there were two invasions of Ilam. As the king of Lanka was already subject to Sundara Pāṇḍya in 1258, the first invasion as a result of which a king of the island was made to pay tribute must have taken place around that year. The details about the expedition as set out in the Kuṭumīyāmalai inscription of Vira Pāṇḍya, relate to a second invasion which led to a more active intervention by the Pāṇḍyas in the affairs of Ilam. As the prasasti in the inscriptions of Vira Pāṇḍya issued before his tenth year does not make mention of his invasion of the island but gives a brief description of his other conquests, it may be inferred that he invaded Ilam only around his tenth year (1263)

Sundara Pāṇḍya's inscriptions do not mention the name of the king of Lankā who gave him gems and elephants as a tribute. Nevertheless, Paranavitana and a few others believe that

3. ARE for 1922, p. 60, para 3.
4. The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom, p. 130
6. The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom, pp. 129-140
7. Indian Antiquary, XXI, p. 121-2; EI, VII, p. 115.
the ruler of Lanka mentioned in the inscriptions of Sundara Pāṇḍya was Parākramabāhu II. This belief, as will be seen later, has no foundation. There were two kings ruling over separate kingdoms in the island and there is no justification for the assumption that the ruler referred to as 'The king of Lanka' in Pāṇḍya inscriptions was Parākramabāhu II.

Paranavitana is of the opinion that the Pāṇḍyas invaded the territories subject to Māgha as a result of an understanding between them and Parākramabāhu. His contention is based on three considerations. Firstly he believes that Māgha was in league with the Cōlas, while the ruler of Dambadeniya was allied to the Pāṇḍyas. Secondly, since the Cōḷavamsa mentions that the forces of Māgha, which had decided to evacuate Polonnaruwa through the eastern gate of that town, instead panicked and left through the western gate, Paranavitana surmises that this was due to the advance of a powerful enemy force towards Polonnaruwa from the East as well as from the North. Thirdly since the Pūjavalīya asserts that Māgha held authority over Rajarāja for a period of forty years, Paranavitana assumes that Parākramabāhu II dislodged Māgha from Polonnaruwa around 1255.

Moreover, Paranavitana adds:

"...There was an invasion of Ceylon by Jaṭāvarama Sundara Pāṇḍya some time before 1258, and it must have been this threat which caused Māgha and his forces to abandon Polonnaruwa. The Pāṇḍya forces must have landed at Trincomalee and in the North; Māgha feeling himself not strong enough to meet them, retreated westwards, to become the prey of the Sinhalese in guerrilla warfare. The fact that the Sinhalese forces, were at Kālavāva waiting for Māgha's retreating troops would indicate that the invading Pāṇḍya armies and the Sinhalese were acting in concert. Sundara Pāṇḍya thus invaded Ceylon to render assistance to the Sinhalese king, who himself claimed to be of Pāṇḍya stock, against an enemy from Kalinga supported mainly by mercenaries from Malabar. If such was the course of events, the silence of the monks who chronicled these events with regard to the assistance which their patron received from a great Tamil power for subduing a band of Tamil and Malayali mercenaries is understandable. The statement attributed in the chronicles to Māgha's followers that the monarchs of foreign lands had come under the influence of Parākramabāhu supports the conclusion that he received external aid in dealing with his enemies."14

Paranavitana's explanation is ingenious but highly speculative and is not supported by any historical evidence. There is hardly any evidence to show that Māgha received any Cōla support nor is there any justification for the assumption that the Pāṇḍyas were in alliance with Parākramabāhu at this stage. Although Māgha may have continued to occupy Rajarāja until 1255, Parākramabāhu's campaigns against him are said to have been completed by his eleventh year15 (1247) and this was several years before the accession of Sundara Pāṇḍya. Therefore, it could not have been the case that Sundara Pāṇḍya helped Parākramabāhu II to defeat Māgha, and Paranavitana's contention that Māgha's forces evacuated Polonnaruwa because of the appearance of a Pāṇḍya army could only be mere speculation.

The identification of 'The king of Lanka' mentioned in the inscriptions of Sundara Pāṇḍya as Parākramabāhu could be disputed because the whole island was not subject to the authority of a single ruler during this period. Some portions of Rajarāja, especially those to the north of Anurādhapura, were beyond the sphere of Parākramabāhu's authority and influence.

14. ibid
15. CV, 83:15-41
Besides, they constituted a separate kingdom, initially under Māgha and subsequently under the Jāvakas. ‘The king of Lanka’ referred to in the Pāṇḍya inscriptions could be a ruler of either of the two kingdoms in the island. Considerations of geographical proximity would suggest that ‘The king of Lanka’ subdued by Sundara Pāṇḍya was in all probability the Jāvaka, Candrabhānu, who had established himself as the ruler of the northern part of the island after the demise of Māgha. A study of the inscriptions of Vira Pāṇḍya, an associate of Jātāvarman Sundara, seems to confirm the view that the ruler of Lanka who had sent tribute to the latter was the Jāvaka king.

Inscriptions issued by Vira Pāṇḍya from his tenth year onwards claim that he conquered Ceylon (iḷam) and the Cola country and took the crown and the crowned head of the Cāvakan.17 The Kutumiyal inscription of his eleventh year refers to his expedition against Ceylon in considerable detail.18 This inscription is damaged and some expressions of historical significance are not clear. However, from the expressions Araciyal Vajjakam nerippattā nāṭtuṇkurippunu and ... tirunta mantiri caranamalinti tukki Nilakanta Sastri infers that Vira Pāṇḍya intervened to settle a dispute that arose in the island.19

The Prasasti, in the legible position of it (from line 9 onwards), states:

Having fought and killed one of the rulers of iḷam (Vira Pāṇḍya) seized his retinue, cavalry, weapons of war, his ornamental chariot, garments of silk, gem set earrings, the nine kinds of gems, the crown, sword, garlands of pearls, the flag, the umbrella, fly-whisks, the drum, conch, treasures and other paraphernalia of royalty; thereafter he engraved the double carp at Koṇamalai and the peaks of Tirikutakiri, and levied a tribute of elephants from the other king of Ceylon (enai ventanai anai tirukottu). When the son of the Cāvakan who did not formerly render services and was indulging in hostile acts, came and paid homage in submission, reflecting that it was only proper that the son should rule the sea-girt iḷam, which was formerly ruled by his father, Vira Pāṇḍya caused him to be adorned with the anklets of heroism, and to be mounted on an elephant and allowed him to go in procession (to his own city).20

The foregoing account does not indicate that the king of iḷam who was killed by Vira Pāṇḍya was the Cāvakan (Jāvaka) nor does it assert that the son of the Cāvakan was the son of that ill-fated ruler. Nevertheless, as his other inscriptions claim that he conquered iḷam and took the crown and the crowned head of the Cāvakan, one of the two rulers of Ceylon who was killed by Vira Pāṇḍya, as testified by the Kutumiyal inscription epigraph, could be identified as the Cāvakan. The Cāvakan was doubtless Candrabhānu, the Jāvaka invader from the Malay peninsula.

On the basis of his interpretation of the prasasti of Vira Pāṇḍya, Nilakanta Sastri suggests that Vira Pāṇḍya invaded Ceylon in order to intervene in a dispute at the request of a minister. But the contention that there was a dispute between the rulers of Ceylon is not supported by the evidence from the Pāṇḍya inscriptions. The expression முருகன் முன்னாச்சு செற்றும் பெரியில் நீர் குளியாங்கன் in which Nilakanta Sastri bases his contention, may be rendered as ‘with a view to establishing in proper form the customs of royalty’. This expression has to be construed in the light of the settlement effected by Vira Pāṇḍya. He allowed the

17. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, ‘Sel Vijaya-Candrabhānu and Vira Pāṇḍya’, TBO, pp. 252
18. IPS, No. 306
20. IPS, No. 306
son of the Cāvakān to rule the kingdom of his father on the consideration that it was the custom that the son should rule the sea-girt island formerly ruled by his father. Therefore, Vīra Pāṇḍya's claim that he established the institution of kingship in proper form seems to be a reference to the restoration of the kingdom to the son of the Cāvakān in adherence to customs relating to royal succession.

The Ceylonese chronicles, which are silent on the Pāṇḍya invasions of the island, however, claim that Candrabhānu was vanquished by the Sinhalese princes, Vijayabahu and Vīrabhānu. The Cūlārāmasa asserts:

"...After Vijayabahu had thus fought and slain many soldiers, he sent the Lord of men Candrabhānu flying defenceless. But the loveliest of women of his court and all the elephants and horses, the swords and many other weapons, the entire treasure, the trumpets of victory, the drum of victory, the banner—all these he sent to his father."

Paranavitana and Liyanagamage interpret the account of Candrabhānu's second invasion as recorded by the Pāli and Sinhalese chronicles on the basis of Nilakanta Sastri's suggestion that Vīra Pāṇḍya intervened to settle a dispute in Ceylon. Both are inclined to believe that the Pāṇḍyas and Parākramabhānu II were in alliance against Candrabhānu; the latter, however, subscribes to this view with reservations. Paranavitana even surmises that the minister referred to in the Kūtniymalai epigraph was a minister of Parākramabhānu II. The inscription does not mention the name of the minister at whose request Vīra Pāṇḍya effected a settlement in Ceylon after his invasion. One could speculate further that he was a minister of Parākramabha-.  

bahu II but it cannot be proved that he was a minister of that king. It could even be surmised that he was one of Vīra Pāṇḍya's officials.

In explaining the apparently contradictory claims made by the Pāṇḍya inscriptions and the Ceylonese chronicles Paranavitana observes:

"...This Jávaka (i.e. the Cāvakān of the Pāṇḍya inscriptions) can be no other than Candrabhānu. As the same cannot be slain more than once, we may conclude that the Jávaka king lost his life, in a battle in which the Sinhalese and the Pāṇḍyas fought as allies. Eulogists on either side would have given full credit for the Jávaka's defeat to their own hero, allowing no diminution of his own glory by stating that the achievement was facilitated by an ally."

As Liyanagamage suggests this could well be a plausible interpretation of the events as reflected in the confused and conflicting accounts of the sources; but it loses much of its validity in the light of the revision of Nilakanta Sastri's view that there was a dispute in Ceylon.

The Pāṇḍyas seem to have attacked Candrabhānu on account of their own quarrel with him and in their own interest rather than on a request from Parākramabha. Such an explanation is supported by the prasasti of the late years of Sundara Pāṇḍya's reign, which runs:  

Kārumārajā曙kajāri yükakōkju tulākōjī  
mānīyam cūlējaum ilaikaikāvalagai ilaikōjārūjī  
Varutjaipāmakā tānēkāvagai pēšittukkara makil vēnākāla  
cēntu vētar kāntāriyā virāppuraicē Cēntanaikālac  
cēlumpati mūrip pallaΛa nānēkkappāla pōrāt..."

22. The Pāli Chronicle does not claim that Candrabhānu was killed in battle by the Sinhalese princes, Soc. CV, 88: 73–76  
25. ibid.  
26. The Decline of Polonnaruva —, p. 148  
This passage may be translated in the following manner: (He) received a tribute of elephants from the ruler of Karnataka and levied brilliant gems and decorated elephants as tribute from the ruler of Ceylon. When the latter refused to send the tribute (he) had him caught and tied to the leg of an elephant that resembled a wave of clouds. (Later) he entered the strong fortress of Centamankalam which was guarded by valiant bowmen and which had not previously been stormed by any other king, and waged several campaigns which terrified the Pallava chief.

Krishnaswamy Ayengar and Nilakanta Sastri hold that the expression *.highlighted* relates to the Pallava chief and not to the king of Ceylon. But this is unlikely because in the Prasasti this expression is placed immediately after the reference to the ruler of Tamil and before the description of the attack on the Pallava chief. K. V. S. Iyer asserts that this expression refers to the king of Ceylon. He interprets this passage to mean that Sundara Pandya refused to accept the tribute from the king of Ceylon, seized him and tied him to the leg of an elephant. This interpretation is not tenable because it is unlikely that the Pandyas refused to accept tribute and attacked a ruler who had sent them tribute. Gnanapragasar and Rasayankam assert that *highlighted* refers to the king of Tamil but the latter, in opposition to K. V. S. Iyer, says that the Pandyas caught and chastised a ruler of Ceylon by tying him to the leg of an elephant for his failure to send tribute. This appears to be the most plausible explanation of the course of events in Ceylon, especially in the light of the evidence from the Kutumbiyamalai Prasasti.

The expression *highlighted* relates to the Pandya chief, the son of the Cavakan who formerly had ceased to render service and instead engaged in hostile acts occurring in the prasasti of Vira Pandya also implies that the Pandyas had a claim to command the allegiance and service of the Cavakan and that he had turned out to be hostile in course of time. It may, therefore, be assumed that the ruler of Ceylon mentioned in the Prasasti of Sundara Pandya from his seventh year onwards is none other than Candrabhanu and that he was reduced to submission by the Pandyas around 1258, as suggested earlier. Thus in the light of the evidence from the Pandya inscriptions it may be inferred that Candrabhanu, who was reduced to submission by the Pandyas on an earlier occasion, ceased to pay tribute and homage after he had established his rule firmly in a part of the island and thereby, antagonised the Pandyas. Vira Pandya’s expedition was meant, as suggested by his prasasti, to punish Candrabhanu for his acts of defiance and hostility.

As regards the almost identical claims made in the Ceylonese chronicles and Pandya inscriptions about the destruction of Candrabhanu’s power, two explanations are plausible. One is that he was defeated in succession by the Sinhalese and the Pandyas acting independently of each other. Considering the panegyric character of the account of Parakramabahu in the local chronicles it could be inferred that the claim that Candrabhanu was destroyed by the armies of Parakramabahu is an exaggeration made on the basis of a major military victory over him. In this connection it may be mentioned that the claim made in the Cujavamsa that Parakramabahu annexed the province formerly subject to Candrabhanu and brought the whole island under his rule has no valid foundation, especially in the light of the evidence from South Indian inscriptions. It is probable that Candrabhanu who had suffered a military reverse at the hands of the Sinhalese, was subsequently defeated and killed by Vira Pandya. The other explanation would be that the Pandyas, who had their own reasons for hostility against Candrabhanu, came to some understanding
with Parākramabāhu II, who was threatened by Candrabhānu. The expedition of Vīra Pāṇḍya more or less synchronised with Vijayabahu's campaigns against Candrabhānu. Vijayabahu is said to have defeated Candrabhānu when he entered Polonnaruwa around A.D. 1262, whereas Vīra Pāṇḍya had concluded his campaigns in Ceylon by A.D. 1263. But this synchronism cannot by itself constitute strong evidence of an alliance or understanding between Parākramabāhu II and the Pāṇḍyas.

The evidence from the Pāṇḍya inscriptions which testifies that the Āvakan had a kingdom in the island is corroborated by the local chronicles, which testify that Candrabhānu had brought under his rule a substantial portion of Rajarata when he attacked Parākramabāhu for the second time. As Candrabhānu is referred to as the King of Āvam in the inscriptions of Sunandra Pāṇḍya, and as he had established himself as the ruler of North Ceylon around A.D. 1258, it could be inferred that his conquests in Ceylon were effected during the period of the three years that followed the demise of Māgha (1255). However, it is possible that he succeeded in establishing a foothold in the North even earlier and gradually consolidated his power over the territories that had previously been under Māgha.

31. The belief that Vīra Pāṇḍya attacked Candrabhānu on the pretext of Parākramabāhu II has led to serious misconceptions. For instance, Paranavitana asserts: 'Instead of a Sinhalese state in a unified Ceylon, the Pāṇḍyas no doubt wanted both the contending parties in the island to be the subordinate allies of theirs.' Commenting on Vīra Pāṇḍya's restoration of the kingdom of the Āvakan to his son, the author of a more recent work adds: 'It may have been a concession to expediency, though it was a measure which detracted from honest diplomacy.' Such speculations arise from a superficial analysis of the evidence. See UCHC, Vol I, pt. II, p. 628. and The Decline of Polonnaruwa...p. 158.

32. The Decline of Polonnaruwa...p. 152

33 ibid

34. See Chapter IV

The policies pursued by Candrabhānu together with the political conditions in the region contributed to his downfall. His conquest of North Ceylon, which was far away from his homeland in the Malay Peninsula was in itself a remarkable achievement. He sought to dominate the whole island despite the limited resources at his disposal. In his political adventures Candrabhānu does not seem to have received active support from any Malayan king or from any other foreign power. His conquests in Ceylon were achieved mainly with the support of armies raised from South India and these armies had little in common with the Jāvakas. Candrabhānu's defiance of the Pāṇḍyas, to whom he had submitted earlier, at a time when he had started an aggressive campaign against the Sinhalese king was an act of imprudence and which he was hedged in between two powerful enemy forces he had little chance of survival.

The son of Candrabhānu, impressed by the immense superiority of the enemy forces and realizing the futility of further resistance was anxious to bargain for a favourable deal and had therefore decided to come to terms with the conqueror. Vīra Pāṇḍya responded with moderation when he received the submission and homage of the Jāvaka prince. He was treated with the honour worthy of his rank and was permitted to rule his father's kingdom presumably on the terms imposed by the conqueror. Vīra Pāṇḍya's expedition, therefore, resulted in the re-establishment of Pāṇḍya suzerainty over North Ceylon, which was eventually absorbed into the Pāṇḍya empire.

Nothing is known about the career of the Jāvaka prince after the Pāṇḍya invasion. Indeed, this prince is not known to any of the Ceylonese sources. In the light of subsequent developments it could be assumed that the Pāṇḍya generals took over the government of the kingdom in course of time. Jāvaka rule in North Ceylon was of short duration and made little impression on the life and culture of the people. No inscription or coin issued by the Jāvakas has hitherto come to light and the only relics that perpetuate the memory of their rule are a few toponyms.
The island was invaded again by the Pandyas at least on two occasions during the reign of Maravarman Kulasekhara, under whom the Pandyas empire was at the plentitude of its power and prosperity. These invasions, directed mainly against the Sinhalese kingdom, synchronised with the decline of that kingdom, which began to disintegrate in the face of court intrigues, dissensions among the royal family and the rebellions of local chieftains in the frontier provinces. In the second year of his reign, Vijayaabahu (1271-1272), the son and successor of Parakramabahu II, was assassinated and the general Mitta, who won over to his side the Sinhalese soldiers in the army, proclaimed himself king. But the Rajput regiment which remained loyal to the former ruler displaced the usurper and secured the throne for Prince Bhuvanekabahu, the brother of the late king. Tradition claims that Bhuvanekabahu repulsed the Tamil invasions led by Kalindarayar and Celaanakatavan. These invasions coincided with the revolts of several chieftains of the Vanni. The instability at the court created by the usurpation of Mitta appears to have provided the foes of Bhuvanekabahu with an opportunity to exploit his weakness. However, it is unlikely that the Pandyas were in league with either Mitta or the chieftains of the Vanni.

It is not easy to establish the identity of the two Tamil generals who attacked Bhuvanekabahu because several dignitaries who had identical names were serving the Pandyas kings during the thirteenth century. A minister named Kalindarayar is known about from the inscriptions of the three Pandyas kings, Jatavarman Sundara Pandiya (acc. 1251), Jatavarman Vira Pandya (acc. 1253) and Maravarman Kulasekharachandra (1268-1311). Evidently the Kutumiyamal inscription was engraved on the order of this minister, who is probably identical with the dignitary referred to in the Culaunas. The other dignitary, Celaanakatavan, may be the same as the one mentioned in an epigraph of Maravarman Kulasekharachandra in the Sundaresvara temple at Aruppukottai in Ramanad. The true significance of the invasion led by these two chiefs cannot be assessed owing to the lack of adequate evidence. As the Culaunas testifies that Bhuvanekabahu repulsed their attacks it may be assumed that the expedition failed to achieve its objective as regards Bhuvanekabahu, but there is some justification to infer that it was successful in another direction. As the inscriptions of Kulasekharachandra claim that he took the temple among other countries it may be suggested that the expedition led by Kalindarayar and Celaanakatavan resulted in a re-conquest of the Javaka kingdom in North Ceylon.

The second Pandyas invasion that occurred in the last quarter of the thirteenth century was much more decisive in its results. Towards the end of his reign Bhuvanekabahu moved his royal residence to Yapahuwa, perhaps compelled by a need for greater vigilance in the North and in order to stabilise his authority in the Vanni region, where the disaffection of the chieftains threatened to undermine his power. Whatever success he could have achieved in this direction was however, nullified by the Arya cakra vartti's invasion which immediately followed his death. As regards that invasion the Culaunas records:

'Once when a famine arose, there landed, sent with an army by the five brothers, the kings who held sway in the Pandu realm, a Damila general known by the name of Arya cakravarttin who though he was no Arya was yet a great dignitary of great power. He laid waste the kingdom in every direction and entered the proud stronghold, the town of Subhagiri. The sacred Tooth Relic and all the costly treasures there he seized and returned with them to the Pandu kingdom. There he made over the Tooth Relic to king Kulasekharachandra who was the sun for the lotus blossom of the stem of the great kings of the Pandus.'

35. CV, 90 : 2-16
36. CV, 90 : 17-30
37. CV, 90 : 52
38. CV, 90 : 53-55
40. CAIL, Vol. V, p. 88
41. CV, 50 : 43-47
 Arya cakravarti’s invasion, according to the Dalada siriya, coincided with the Rajanta that followed Bhuvanekabahu’s death. A succession dispute between the king’s son, also named Bhuvanekabahu, and Parakramabahu, the son of Vijayabahu IV, plunged the kingdom into civil war and led to a temporary division of the kingdom. Parakramabahu visited the Pandyas court and successfully negotiated for the recovery of the Tooth Relic, with which, perhaps, he sought to rally the support of the people and the monks. On his return to the island he resided at Polonnaruwa but could not remain in power for long for his rival, Bhuvanekabahu, who probably held the southern parts of his father’s kingdom ousted him and seized the Tooth Relic, which he subsequently kept at Kurunagala, where he had established his residence.\(^{42}\)

Arya cakravarti’s invasion exposed the military weakness of the Sinhalese kingdom and led to the abandonment of Yapahuwa, which was a rock fortress. It contributed, in a limited way, to the decline of this kingdom, which was already weakened by internal dissension. The more important development that followed this invasion was the rise of the Arya cakravarti line of rulers in the kingdom in North Ceylon, which was absorbed into the Pandyas empire during the late thirteenth century.

### VII

**The Arya Cakravarttis**

**Origins and early affiliations**

The generals and chieftains who came from the Pandyas country during the late thirteenth century acquired authority in North Ceylon and established an independent kingdom when the Pandyas empire declined. The local Tamil chronicles do not give a clear account of the beginnings of this kingdom or the origins of its rulers. Their accounts present a combination of legend, folklore and historical tradition which centre round three personalities; Yalppañan, Ukkiraciñkan and Cinikaiyariyan who are associated with distinct stages of political evolution.\(^{1}\) Yalppañan is said to have brought Tamil families from India and settled them in the Jaffna Peninsula. Ukkiraciñkan is represented as the first king of the realm and Cinikaiyariyan was the founder of a new dynasty—the Cinikaiyariyar otherwise called Arya Cakravarttis.

The legend of Yalppañan which exists in two versions seeks to explain the origin of the kingdom and the name Yalppañam.\(^{2}\) Indeed tradition claims that the northern peninsula derived its

---

2. The Vaiyapālē is perhaps the earliest text that records the legend of Yalppañan. Certain traditions of the Rāmāyana story, the legend of Yalppañan and Mārutappūṟu kavali and traditions concerning

(Continued)
name from Yāppān. Nevertheless, the account of Yāppān in its developed form appears to be nothing more than a legend.

The Ukkiracīkān story as found in the Tamil chronicles seems to be a modified version of the Vijña legend and hence history cannot be reconstructed from this legend. But, the account of Cīnkaivēryan as recorded in the Tamil chronicles is, however, not altogether unhistorical. Yet, the origins of the Kings of Jaffna cannot be traced from the evidence of these chronicles alone.

There is no consensus among the scholars who sought to explain the origins of the Kings of Jaffna. In the opinion of Rasana-yakam 'A Brahmin of Rameśvaram married a princess of the Kalinga dynasty of Ukkiracīkān in Jaffna and his descendants adopted the patronymic of Ārya and the Setu crest but retained their maternal Vamma name and insignia of royalty.' Gnanapragasar, however, contends that these kings were of Eastern Ganga descent but Paramavittama argues for a Jayaka connection of these rulers. The theories advanced by these writers could be studied one by one in order. The explanation that the Kings of Jaffna were the descendants of a Brahmin of Rameśvaram and the princess of the Kalinga dynasty of Ukkiracīkān has no historical basis.

As Gnanapragasar believes that the first Ārya cakravarti otherwise called Cīnkaivēryan was Māgha he attributes an Eastern Ganga origin to the Kings of Jaffna. Three main arguments are adduced to prove the claim that these kings were of Eastern Ganga descent. The first is that both dynasties had a similar device on their coins; the bull couchant and the crescent surmounting it were impressed on the coins issued by the Eastern Gangas of Kalinga and the Ārya Cakravarti rulers of Jaffna. The second is that the traditions of their origins are almost identical. The last is the assumption of the epithets Kaiikainātana and Kaiikaiyēryan by the rulers of Jaffna.

As the similarity of their coins it is suggested that it may only indicate the influence of the coinage of Kalinga over that of Jaffna and this similarity in itself cannot be a valid evidence of a dynastic connection. The similarity in the traditions about the origins of the two dynasties is only a superficial one. According to the tradition recorded in the Nidāṇī plates of Vajrahasta the Eastern Gangas were of the Ārtha gotra and received their insignia of royalty, the unique conch, the drum, the Paśīca maha sādhas, the white parasol.

6. Gnanapragasar asserts: These two rulers (Māgha and Jayabhūti) founded the kingdom of Jaffna. The above, it appears that the Cekrā cakrāvartini refers to those rulers who belonged to the Ganga vamsa of Kalinga as the two among the 312 Brahmins who received a boon the right to rule the earth'. YVV, p. 64.

7. ibid, pp. 59-61.


9. The epithet Paśīca maha sādha was applied to feudatory princes and officials of high rank in Medieval India. Certain remarkable services rendered by a vassal to his overlord enabled him to earn this privilege which signified the use of five musical instruments, namely: Śrīga (horn), Tumulā, Samgāsins (conch), bheri (drum) and Jaya-gāthā (belt of victory). See Ram Shōn Sharma, Indien Feudalism: A. C. 310-1200, University of Calcutta, pp. 22-23.

---


im Tamil manuscripts can be easily mistaken for Kūlan-
kai and Vijaya Kalinga Chakravarti was thus mutilated
to Vijaya Kūlankai chakravarti either by Mailvagan-
Pulavar himself or by some later copyists.  

Rasanayakam's suggestion that Kūlankai cakkara-varti is a misreading for Kalingac cakkara-varti, which is endorsed by Gnanapragasgar, is ingenious but not convincing. His assumption that this error was made by either Mayilvakanappulavar or one of the copyists of the manuscript is wrong because one of his sources, the Vaiyapāṭal and its prose version—the Vaiyā—make mention of Kūlankaiyiyiar. The tradition about Kūlankaiv is evidently an old one and was anterior to the period of Mayilvakanappulavar. Therefore Kūlankai cakkara-varti cannot be identified as Māgha on the basis of a wrong assumption.

Even if we assume, inspite of the foregoing considerations, that Kūlankaiv cakkara-varti is a distorted form of Kāliṅka cakkara-varti it is difficult to establish that the latter was Māgha. Even Vijaya, who was according to tradition, the first king of the island, could be so referred to. Indeed, the Vaiyapāṭal has confused and combined the Viyaya legend with the traditions relating to the Kings of Jaffna.

Commenting on the epithet Kaṅkaiyiyiar Paranavivata writes:

"A number of chieftains who exercised authority under the first king are described in the Kailasamalai as belonging to the Kenakula. This claim of the Aryan rulers to be of Ganga lineage can be upheld if they are taken as the successors of the Javaka kings of the Kalinga Vamsa. A ruler of Polonnaruwa who belonged to the Kalinga family bore the name Cōḍaganga; one of the queens of Nissankamalla, Kalaṇyavati, was of the

10. Chowry, made of the bushy tail of yak, is used as a fly-flapper for idols or as royal insignia.
11. EL, IX, p. 43, Ancient Jaffna, pp. 308-309.
12. Tujasi or Occimum sanctum is commonly used in Hindu worship and ritual. In mythology Viṣṇu is described as wearing the garland of tujasi.
14. YV, pp. 64-65
16. The Vaiyapāṭal has the form Kūlankaiv while the Vaiyā mentions Kūlankaivcakkara-varti. See Vaiyapāṭal, vv. 20-25 and Vaiyā, p. 84.
Gangavamsa. There was a Ganganagara in the Malay Peninsula. It has been suggested with a great degree of plausibility that the name Kalinga was transplanted into the Malay Peninsula by princes of the early Eastern Ganga family who were forced to leave their homeland and seek fortunes overseas due to political upheavals, for example the conquest of Indian Kalinga by Pulakesin II. When these Kalingas from the Malay peninsula founded a kingdom in North Ceylon, they must have regarded their Ganga connections with sentiments and pride, and the Ariyans who inherited the kingdom by marriage might very well have continued these traditions. 17

Paranavitana’s contention that ‘the claim of the Ariyam rulers to be of Ganga lineage could be upheld if they are taken as successors of the Javaka kings of the Kalingavamsa’ is wrong. If the Cinakayariyar were the successors of the Javaka kings they could not have claimed to be of the Gangavamsa because the Javaka king Candrabhata who ruled over North Ceylon for a short period was of the Padnavamsa. 18 Moreover, there is no definite evidence whatsoever to show that the Javaka kings were of the Kalingavamsa. Toponyms such as Ganganagara and Simhapura found in the Malay Peninsula cannot be considered as sufficient evidence for the existence of the Gangavamsa in that region. Paranavitana’s explanation stems from his wrong belief that Kalinga referred to in medieval Ceylonese sources was somewhere in South East Asia. 19

18. The Decline of Polonnaruwa . . . Recueil des Inscriptions du Siam 11, 26, tr. 27.
19. Paranavitana suggests that Kalinga referred to in medieval Ceylonese sources was in Malaysia. He observes:

‘Thus there is evidence for the name “Kalinga” having been in use in former times for more than one area in Malaysia. Various states must have considered it as adding to their prestige to be known by this honoured name, and their rulers must have taken pride in tracing their descent to the mythical Kalinga chakravarti famed in Buddhist legend’. (Continued).

Medieval Chinese sources refer to a locality called Ho-ling in Java. Several scholars once believed that Ho-ling was a Chinese transcription of Kalinga. After a detailed examination of the Chinese sources relating to Ho-ling Louis Charles Daminas has shown that Ho-ling is the Chinese transcription of Walain and not Kalinga. He rejects the identification of Ho-ling as Kalinga on the following grounds. Firstly, the word Kalinga is trisyllabic whereas the Chinese word Ho-ling is disyllabic. Secondly, in the Chinese sources Ho-ling is sometimes referred to as Po-ling. Thirdly, Kalinga in India was well known to the Chinese and it was always transcribed as Kie-ling-Kie. The last syllable of Kalinga is never missed in the transcription. If there was a kingdom or locality known as Kalinga in South East Asia the Chinese transcription of that name would have been as that

See S. Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia in Medieval Times and JCBRAS, New Series, VII (1), pp. 1-42.

K. A. Nilakanta Sastri who disagrees with Paranavitana’s novel theory remarks:

‘This is not history. Not even Parāṇa, but pure fable, and in this fable Malaysia is at once a land of holy Buddhism and one whose Buddhism was so degenerate that it could be considered no Buddhists at all’. and further adds:

‘And so Paranavitana concludes that the period between the demise of Parākramabahu I and the second of that name must be called the Malay period of Ceylon History. Not yet, nor for the considerations brought forward by Paranavitana in his monograph throughout for his long and learned article, we have not got one new historical fact or well sustained interpretation calling for the modification of current views on Ceylon History but only vague surmises and plays with phonetic similarities’. See K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, ‘Ceylon and Sri Vijaya’, JCBRAS, New Series, VIII (1), pp. 125-140.

Yet, Paranavitana continued his efforts to prove his theory. The monograph Ceylon and Malaysia was a culmination of these efforts. Paranavitana claims to have discovered new materials which support his theory. Most of these are, according to him, in the form of interlinear inscriptions engraved in minute characters. The texts of these inscriptions, published in his monograph, are of exceptional literary merit. Nevertheless, no one else has hitherto been able to find any trace of the so-called interlinear engraving on the stones from which he claims to have discovered these texts.

(Continued)
of Kalinga in India. Moreover, he shows that the syllable ka in Chinese is usually transcribed either as hā or ha in Chinese characters. It may also be added that Damais has found evidence in the Chinese documents which suggests that Ho-ling is a transcription of Walain.20

Endorsing the views of Damais, Yutaka Iwamoto writes:

‘Now, Ho-ling has been generally admitted to be a Chinese transliteration of Kalinga in East India. It has been generally held that the Ho-ling kingdom was founded by the immigration of refugees from Kalinga. To my regret, however, I cannot approve of this widely accepted view, because the syllable ‘Ho’ of Ho-ling in Chinese had not been adopted in those days to transliterate a sound ‘Ka’ in foreign languages, of which we can cite examples from Chinese scriptures of those days, viz, Hsuan-Chang’s Ta-tai-hsi-yu-chi and so on. Furthermore, Ho-ling is denoted as...Po-ling in the Sung-Kao-Seng-Chuang. It would therefore be clear that the original first sound of the Ho-ling is quite different from ‘Ka’. From the antiquarian remains of Java, neither can we trace the remnants of the then culture which originated in Kalinga. Sorry to say the view that there was in Java a kingdom dominated by immigrants of Kalinga from the seventh down to the first half of the ninth century, was only a mirage or castle built in the air.21

In the light of the studies of Damais and Iwamoto Paranavitana’s equation of Kalinga with Jāvaka is unacceptable.


THE ĀRYA CAKRAVARTTI

In order to support his claim that the rulers of Jaffna were connected to the Jāvakas Paranavitana attempts to use the evidence of the inscription of Vikramabahu III (1359-1371) from Madawela which records an agreement between Vikramabahu, the ruler of Gampola, and Mārtanda perumāl.22 Paranavitana identifies the latter as Martanda Cinkaiyariyan—a ruler of Jaffna and contends that ‘the occurrence of the word Savulupati is the most significant factor in the record’ for the investigation of the origins of the Kings of Jaffna.23 However, unfortunately there is a hiatus in the inscription and the letter between Sa and Iu is missing. Therefore, it is not certain that the word is Savulupati.

The Kings of Jaffna were never referred to as Savulupati or by any other term equivalent to that designation in contemporary sources either in Sinhalese or Tamil. The Tamil chronicles or contemporary texts do not hint at any connection between them and the Jāvakas. Moreover, the royal epithets and emblems of these kings do not in any way indicate that they had any connections with the Jāvakas. Yet it is possible that an Ārya cakravarti married a Jāvaka princess but there is no evidence for it.

Titles and royal epithets:

An examination of the titles and epithets of the Ārya cakravarttis of Jaffna and the traditions recorded in contemporary texts may throw light on their origins. The Sinhalese texts of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries refer to the King of Jaffna as Ārya Sakviti or as Ārya cakravarti.24 The Yājñapāna Vaipava

22 EZ, IV, p. 168
23. ibid
mālai testifies that all the Kings of Jaffna had borne the epithet Ciṅkaiyāriyan which was usually suffixed to their personal names.25

The epithet Ciṅkaiyāriyan only signified the Āriyan ruling from the town of Ciṅkainakar which was the capital of the kingdom. The word Āriyan could have been used as an abbreviation of the title Āriyacakkaravartti. However, the word Āriyar had a wider connotation in the Tamil texts written under the patronage of the rulers of Jaffna. In certain instances it stood for a dynasty of rulers—the Kings of Jaffna, in others for a community of Brahmans from whom, however, the Kings of Jaffna traced their descent.26 These Kings had also borne the title Četukāvalan and the epithets Kaṅkainātan and Kaṅkaiyāriyan.

Traditions recorded in contemporary literature

The Cekarācecekara mālai records the following tradition concerning the origins of the Ciṅkaiyāriyar, Rāma during his exile, killed Virājan, Mārican and Vāli and uprooted seven great trees with the single aim of his arrow. Thereafter, having bridged the sea, he entered Lanka, defeated Kumpakannan and Iravaṇan and freed his consort, Śītā, from captivity. When Rāma with his large army reached Kantamātanam he felt relieved of the sin of having slain the Rāksasa. He told of his sense of relief to the sage Agastya of the Potiya hill. The latter revealed to Rāma the sanctity of the site. Rāma being impressed by the story established a shrine of Śiva at that site, named it after himself and invited the 512 Āriyar "of the five villages" and gracefully directed them to officiate at the temple. He invested two of them with the paraphernalia of royalty, granting them the garland of the fragrant Tulasi, the title of the Ārya King of the faultless scriptures, the beautiful parasol, the single conch and the victorious bull banner.27

This tradition contains three elements, namely, the foundation of the temple of Rāmesvaram by Rāma, the settlement of the 512 Āriyar at Rāmesvaram and the bestowal of the title of the Ārya King and the insignia of royalty on the remote ancestors of the Ciṅkaiyāriyar. The story of Rāma’s connection with Rāmesvaram is a legend which seems to have originated from the Rāmāyana. It must have been invented with a view to establish the antiquity and sanctity of the Rāmesvaram temple.28

The second element in the tradition recorded by the Cekarācecekaramalai, namely, the settlement of the 512 Āriyar at Rāmesvaram appears to have a historical basis. The Tevai Ula mentions that the sage Lokanātha settled at Četu the 512 Āriyar who conduct religious services in accordance with scriptural injunctions.29 As this text attributes the settlement of the Āriyar to Lokanātha and not Rāma, it would appear that it records a tradition independent of the one found in the Cekarācecekaramalai. The tradition that the Āriyar were settled in Rāmesvaram as recorded in these texts, receives some confirmation from epigraphic evidence. An inscription of Virapa Nāyaka

25. YVM, pp 25, 35, 44.
26. Cekarācecekaran is described as Kantamalai Āriyarkōn. Kantamalai is also referred to as Kantanātanam in Hindu Mythology. (YVV, pp. 58-59). The Kantapurānam and the Tevai Ula locate it in the southern extremity of India. The latter asserts that it is situated at Četu (YVV, p 58). The Četuaprānam asserts that it was on that site that Rāma established the shrine of Śiva which was named Rāmānātha in the distant past. Therefore, it is evident that Kantamātanam and Rāmesvaram are identical. The expression Kantamalai Āriyarkōn may be interpreted as the King who belonged to the lineage of the Brahmans of Rāmesvaram.

27. GCM, citappuppaηvram, vv. 1-8.
28. The frequent allusion to this legend in the Tevaram reveals that it had already developed in the seventh century. The latter Sekalapurana, such as Cetupurāγam and Četunāṭhāmītyam seem to have elaborated it further. See Famulī Tirumayim pirumparamul, ed. P. Rāmānāthapurām, Madras, 1901, pp. 403-405.
29. Tevai Ula ed. Uṭ̄tamaṅamaṇapuram Cāṁgāṅaṅyaiyar, Madurai, 1907, vv. 94-95.
of the sixteenth century found on the gopura near the potumaa-tapa at Madurai mentions among other things that the income in the form of taxes received in the treasuries of the Nāyaka and of Cōkkannātha on behalf of the Rāmesvaram temple were distributed between the temple of Rāmanātha and the Āriyar paicätēsīyar in the proportion of two to three. The expression Āriyar paicätēsīyar recalls the paicakārama vetiyar of the Cēkaraçaēcākaramālai who presumably belonged to a Caturvedimāṅkalam—a Brahmin village—which had an assembly of 512 members. Moreover, the Cēkaraçaēcākaramālai adds that Cēkaraçaēkaran, the king of Jaffna, was a descendant of a Brahmin who had mastered the four Vedas and belonged to the Kāṣyapa gotra. Thus the traditions recorded by the Cēkaraçaēcākaramālai asserts that the Kings of Jaffna were in the lineage of the Brahmins of Rāmesvaram.

In his Temporal and Spiritual Conquest of Ceylon de Queroyz apparently records the same tradition but in a confused manner when he says:

"In course of time, there came some Brahmans, natives of Guzarat called Arus, who claimed royal descent, and with the favour of the Nāyque of Madura, they erected a pagoda at Ramancor, whence they began to have trade and friendship with the King of Jaffnanpatao, and one of them married a daughter of that King; and finally her descendants became heirs to that Kingdom."

The tradition that a Brahmin of Rāmesvaram acquired sovereignty over the Kingdom of Jaffna after Sapumal’s conquest, as recorded by de Queroyz, is however anachronistic. The Ārya cakravartti dynasty had emerged long before the time of Sapumal; even the settlement of the Āriyar at Rāmesvaram seems to have taken place very much earlier than the commencement of Nāyaka rule in Madurai. Therefore Queroyz’s testimony about the Gujarati origins of the Brahmins of Rāmesvaram, and the marriage of a Brahmin to a princess of Jaffna cannot be accepted. The evidence from Queroyz is in fact contradicted by the Cēkaraçaēcākaramālai which asserts that the Āriyar of Rāmesvaram had come from Benares.

Ārya cakravartti in the Pāṇḍya Kingdom

Any explanation of the origins of the rulers of Jaffna has to take into account the evidence relating to the dignitaries called Ārya cakkāravartti who held positions of high rank in the Pāṇḍya kingdom and are mentioned in some Pāṇḍya inscriptions. An inscription of the fifth year of Māravarman Kulasekhara (1268-1310) from Sivapuri in Ramnad mentions a certain Devar Āriyacakkaravartti. The Śrīrangam inscription of the tenth year of the same monarch records the donations made by Matitukānan Taniṅṅu vença perumāḻi otherwise called Āriyacakkaravartti of Cakkavartti Nallār in Ceviruk-kai nātu. Yet another inscription of Kulasekhara from Tirupullānī in Ramnad refers to a dignitary called Devar Āriyacakkaravarttikāḷ. As this inscription is said to have been engraved on his orders it may be assumed that Āriyacakkaravarttikāḷ was holding a high position in the Pāṇḍya administration. He may have been a minister or a feudatory. Yet

32. CCM, V. 204. It is not easy to determine when the Brahmins of Rāmesvaram were settled there. Brahmanical influences had penetrated into Tamil society even before the Christian era. The Čaṅkāram literature provides evidence of Brahmin settlements in the Tamil country during the early centuries of the Christian era. The Turkish conquest of Northern India during the thirteenth century and the subsequent establishment of the Delhi Sultanate seem to have contributed towards the immigration of large numbers of North Indian Brahmins to the Deccan and the Tamil country.

33. ARE, 1928, p. 29, No. 21.
34. ARE, 1936, No. 7
35. ARE, No. 110 of 1903; SII, VIII: No. 296
another inscription from the same place mentions three persons, namely, Teyvaccialayān Ajakār Ariyacakkaravaratti, Itāman V...kkai Ariyacakkaravaratti and Mērutilukan Kakai nāryaṃacacakkaravaratti.16 They appear as parties to a transaction involving the transfer of lands situated in Kilcempī nāṭu and cēvirukkai nāṭu which were territorial units in the southern division of the Pāṇḍya Kingdom. Furthermore, an epigraphic record from Tiruvarāṅkūlam refers to a person known as Inpan Ariyacakkaravaratti.37

One of the Tiruppulān inscription testifies that Ariyacakkaravaratti was not a personal name but a title. In this particular epigraph persons called Ariyacakkaravaratti are referred to with their distinct personal names Ajakān and Itāman. Ariyacakkaravaratti was then apparently a title that belonged to the members of a particular family. Since all persons who are known from the Pāṇḍya inscriptions to have borne that title except Inpan, who is mentioned in the epigraph from Tiruvarāṅkūlam, were from Cēvirukkaināṭu or from a place close to that nāṭu in the South eastern region of the Pāṇḍya Kingdom it may be assumed that they were living in Cēvirukkai nāṭu during the reign of Māravarman Kulasekhara.

The Tiruppulān inscription which mentions Kilcempī nāṭu and Cēvirukkai cempi nāṭu testifies that Tiruppulān belonged to the first of these divisions.38 Therefore, it may be inferred that Kilcempī nāṭu and Cēvirukkai nāṭu were identical or that they were sub-divisions of one territorial unit. As Tiruppulān which is situated in Ramnad district belonged to Kilcempināṭu, Cēvirukkai cempi nāṭu must have been a medieval administrative unit corresponding to the coastal region of the present Ramnad district.

Some of the epithets which belonged to the members of the Ariyacakkaravaratti family are suggestive of distinction earned in military service. Arya cakkaravarti Matituukan had the epithet Tāninnatu venta perumāl (தநின்னது வெண்டா பெருமாள்) which evidently signified military honour. Either Matituukan earned this epithet himself or he could have received it on account of the fact that he belonged to a family which had a claim to it. Another title suggestive of military distinction was Teyvaccialayān (தேவாசிலயன்) borne by the Arya cakkaravarti called Ajakān.39 As two different members of the Arya cakkaravarti family had epithets illustrative of military distinction it may be inferred that they belonged to a feudatory family which had produced generals who had distinguished themselves in battle.

Inscriptions testify that the word Cakkaravarti denoted a certain rank in the administrative hierarchy of the Pāṇḍya kingdom. Titles such as Mājavacakkaravarti (மாஜாவாசக்கராந்தி), Maracakkaravarti (மாறாசக்கராந்தி) and Elacakkaravarti belonged to several dignitaries who held posts in the Pāṇḍya administration. The first of these titles evidently belonged to the chiefs of the Mālavar who held the foremost position among the traditional ranks in the service of the Pāṇḍyas. During the late twelfth century a Mālavacakkaravarti played a leading role in the war of Pāṇḍya succession.40 Another Mālavar chief, Sivanintakālan Mālavacakkaravarti was a minister of Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I (1215 - 1238).41 Yet another Mālacakkaravarti was an officer of Vira Pāṇḍya.42 Moreover, Māravarmanikkam Mālavacakkaravarti was an officer of Māravarman Kulasekhara.43

36. ARE, No. 112 of 1903; SII, VIII, No. 398.
37. IPS, No. 619
38. SII, VII, No. 393.
40. It is claimed that Lankāpura, a general of Pāṇakramahālu I, subdued Mājavacakkaravarti Mālavārayar, a chieftain of the Pāṇḍya kingdom. CV, 76: 132, 137
41. ARE, No. 14 of 1916.
42. ARE, No. 413 of 1928/9.
43. He belonged to the family of Māravarmanikkam Tirukkānappār Ulaiyan. a Sāmanta of Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I.
Similarly, Maraccakakaravartti seems to have been a rank conferred on the chiefs of the Maravar. The Maṭa mutali chiefs of Ponnamarappati nātu are said to have jointly conferred the title of Maraccakakaravartti on the Uṭaiyan of Tiruvaramkalam as a reward for his valour and achievements. Chiefs who had the title Eḻakkacakakaravartti are also referred to in the Pāṇḍya inscriptions. The expression Eḻakkacakakaravartti may be interpreted as the rank of a chief who belonged to or had authority over the group of Eḻakam.

On the analogy of titles such as Mājavacacakkaravartti and Maraccakakaravartti, Aṟiyacakakaravartti may denote a chief of the Aṟiyar who held the rank of Cakkaravartti. The word Aṟiyar has several meanings; it may denote Brahmins, Rajputs, members of the first three vargas, and highly esteemed or noble persons. Nevertheless, as the Cekaracakakamalai testifies that Cekaracakakaran was a Brahmin King and traces his origin to one of the 512 Aṟiyar who were settled at Rāmesvaram, the title Aṟya cakrarvartti may be considered as one confined to Brahmins exclusively (in the Pāṇḍya kingdom). This title could be synonymous with Brahmarāyan which belonged to Brahmins who held positions of authority in medieval South Indian administration. The Brahmin ancestors of the Aṟya cakrarvartti of Čevirukkai nātu must have acquired the title Aṟya cakrarvartti when they were enlisted into the service of either the Čola or Pāṇḍya government. Indeed, the Cekaracakakamalai refers to the origin of the title Aṟya cakrarvartti when it asserts that two of the 512 Aṟiyar of Rāmesvaram acquired the ‘grand eloquent title of Aṟiyar ventu’ (the Aṟya king) and the insignia of royalty.

yūr. Pāṉiṉkuni, Kōṅkukuti, Mēḻakaram, Marutamaḻkalam, Hāṅcul, Tīrūkkusthalm and Tōṇkāsi were in Tēnṉāri nātu while Kāṉjaṉīṉ, Tāṉpōṉjī, Aṭivararāma nāṟu and Mūṟunṭuṟicē caṭavēṟi-maṉāṟam belonged to Vāḻavaṟi nātu. Moreover, Āri nātu included also the villages of Malaiyakuricē and Tēnṉālam. See ĀRE, 1917, Nos. 40, 401, 403, 407, 409, 412, 418, 440, 441, 495, 517, 523, 526, 527, 532, 546, 550, 563, 570, 585, 603, 621, 164; ĀRE 1918, No. 397.

The origins of the name Āri nātu, however, are not known. It may denote a nātu that was inhabited or ruled by people who claimed to be Āṟiyar. However, although several villages called Četturveṟi-maṉāṟam were found in this locality, there is no evidence to suggest that families claiming Rajput origin were living or ruling from that nātu. Further, there is no evidence to show that the Aṟya cakrarvartti had any connection with this nātu. Brahmins and others who had come from various parts of Aṟayarvartti held positions of high rank in the administration of the Čola empire. Kaṭṭiṉai Āriyar Padumāṟai otherwise called Trucirṟpillai uṟaiyan of Kāṁṉirada am was an officer of Rājaṟajai I. Āriyar Vāṉudeva bhaṭṭan otherwise called Rājārāja Brahmarāyan of Aṟiṉkai in Kāṁṉirada am was an officer of Kuloḻungai. In an inscription of Viraṭoḷ, a feudatory of Rājārāja, Viraṭoḷa and his ancestors are referred to as Lāṟaṟaṟai. This expression may suggest that they had come from Guṇarat. See ĀRE, 1911 No. 365; ĀRE, 1936/7, p. 8, No. 14; EI, IV, No. 14, p. 138.
The rise of the Arya cakravartis of Jaffna was evidently connected to the Pāṇḍya invasion of the island around 1284.\(^{49}\) It may be suggested that the Pāṇḍya general Arya cakravarti, on his return after his expedition against Yapahuwa, was deputised by Māravarman Kulasekhara, the Pāṇḍya King, to administer the kingdom in North Ceylon which was absorbed into the Pāṇḍya empire as a result of the Pāṇḍya invasions against it since the time of Candrabhūtih. Either the general Arya cakravarti who sacked Yapahuwa in 1284 or one of his kinsmen must have assumed royal power and become independent of Pāṇḍya control once when the Pāṇḍya power declined in consequence of internal dissensions and the aids of Malik Kafur around A. D. 1310.

Such a conclusion is supported by the tradition incorporated in a contemporary text—the Cekarācacakaramśalai which is more specific about the ancestors of the rulers of Jaffna. After narrating the account of the 512 Ariyar and the investiture of two among them this text goes on:

Of the many kings who were ruling through the ages one was the “Vedic King” whom the victorious Pāṇḍya summons from the Department of copper plate charters; another king fought and triumphed over the Karunāṭaka at Antaravalli. Yet another was the ‘ruler’ who slashed the trunk of an elephant that was furious in attack and chastised the Hoysala.\(^{50}\)

---

49. CV, XC: 43 — 47.

50. குற்றநாயக் ரத்தவைகள் முறையான மலைகள் கொண்ட ஒன்றாகும் கோர்கோர் மலைகள் முறையான மலைகள் கொண்ட ஒன்றாகும் கோர்கோர் மலைகள் கொண்ட ஒன்றாகும் கோர்கோர் மலைகள் கொண்ட ஒன்றாகும் கோர்கோர் மலைகள் கொண்ட ஒன்றாகும் கோர்கோர் மலைகள் கொண்ட ஒன்றாகும் கோர்கோர் மலைகள் கொண்ட ஒன்றாகும் 

CCM, Cirappppayiram

The contention that the Arya cakravartti rulers of North Ceylon were connected to the Arya cakravartti chiefs of Cevi-

rakkai nātų in the Pāṇḍya Kingdom is not based merely on the identity of their titles and the traditions of their origins as recorded by de Queyroz and the author of the Cekarācacakaramśalai. A study of their epithets Ṭevaiyarkon, Kantamalai Ariyarkon and Cetukāvalan also leads to the same conclusion. The first of these epithets means ‘the king of the people of
and Srīrāma Tanukkōti are other such localities. As the Taksinakallīcā purāṇam describes the Ārya cakravartti as 'the guardian of the high coast of Cētu where the gods come down to offer worship' the expression Cētu must have denoted a sacred site on the sea-coast whenever it was used in connection with the rulers of Jaffna. As Rāmeśvaram which was also called Cētu held such a position it may be inferred that the title Cētukāvalopy which belonged to the Kings of Jaffna suggests that they had affiliations with Rāmeśvaram.

The Ārya cakravartti of the Pāṇḍya Kingdom also had connections with Cētu. The site of Cētumālam was on the coast of Cēvvirukkaināṭu, which was, as noticed earlier, a fieh held by the Ārya cakravartti. The inscription that records the order of Devar Ārya cakravartti contains the expression Cētukāvalopy—‘order or request from Cētu’. The use of the title Ārya cakravartti by the Kings of Jaffna and the chiefs of Cēvvirukkaināṭu and the occurrence of the expression Cētu on the coins and epigraphs of the former and the inscriptions of the latter cannot be an accidental coincidence. It shows that they were related. The kings of Jaffna, presumably, had a claim to the title Cētukāvalopy on account of their descent from the Ārya cakravartti of the Pāṇḍya Kingdom and they continued to use this title even after they had ceased to exercise any authority over the localities called Cētu in the Southern extremity of India.

---

51. Madras Tamil Lexicon, 111, p. 1630.
52. ibid.
54. ASII, IV: No. 2, p. 65
55. ASII, IV: Nos. 4 and 16, pp. 68, 98.
56. TKP, Tirukaraccaṟukkam, V. 108.
57. SII, VII: No 396.
The epithets Kaṅkaiyāriyān and Kaṅkaṇātān which belonged to the Kings of Jaffna could be explained in two ways. Either they claimed a connection with the Ganga vamsa or one of their remote ancestors had come from Kaṅkaṇātā — the Ganga country. After his conquest of North Ceylon Ārya cakravartti may have attempted to stabilise his power by marrying into a family of Ganga descent which had some sort of authority or influence in the Kingdom. There were several princes of Eastern Ganga origin at the court of Polonnaruwa in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries but there is no evidence of any Eastern Ganga prince holding sway over North Ceylon in the late thirteenth century or of any matrimonial ties between the Eastern Ganas and the Cīnaikāryārad. Therefore it could also be surmised that the Ganga chiefs with whom the Ārya cakravartti came into contact were of Western Ganga descent and were not related to any of the Ganga princes of the Sinhalese court. There were several feudatory families of Ganga descent spread all over the Tamil country. After the Cōla conquest of the Ganga Kingdom, members of the

58. Nissaṅkamallā and Sāhuṣamallā were from Kāḷinga. The former, 58 according to his inscriptions, was born in Sīhāpurā in Kāḷinga, Viḷayatjīva also had come from Kāḷinga Kalyāgavantā, a consort of Nissaṅkamallā, was of the Ganga vamsa. See EZ, II, pp. 80, 85, 115, 120; CV, LXXXV, p. 20.

59. An inscription from Kangūli which mentions Kollintān I as Abhaya describes a Ganga chief, Pūjāratiṅkāraṇa as the protector of Kacci and Maltā. Another chief of Ganga descent, Gajākṣipita Āvaṇ of Anālikaricchā in Cīnaikāryāraṇa is mentioned in the inscriptions of Kollintān III. The Vanniya chiefs of Paṭakāla nāṭu in Toṇjanamgalānu were of Ganga descent, Sīyagāna Amāra-parāgaṇa, the patron of Kollintān III is described as the ruler of Kuvāḷajapuraṇa and of Ganga lineage. Moreover, a Ganga chief, Viṅganga, was slain together with his ally, Paṭikhūraṇaḥaṇa, 'King of Ceylon', by the Hovanala generals in the reign of the Cōla King Kāḷarāja III. See ARE, 1934-5, No. 25; ARE, 1912, Nos. 556, 559; ARE, 1903, Nos. 116, 117, 546.

Western Ganga dynasty who had reconciled themselves to the loss of their Kingdom appear to have served the Cōlas in their armies and government. The dispersal of the Western Ganas in various parts of the Cōla empire seems to have been a result of this process. There were several Pāṇḍya feudatories and ministers who were of Ganga descent. 60 One of them, Cōla-gāntēvan led an invasion of Ceylon in the early years of Māravāman Kulasékhaṇa. Even some of the chiefs who served Cīnaikāryāriyān are said to have been of the Kaṅkaṇa-kulām.

An Ārya cakravartti may have espoused the offspring of a Gangeya chief: his descendants could be referred to with the epithet Kaṅkaiyāriyān to emphasize their descent from both the Āriyār who had social precedence over all others and the Ganas who were one of the oldest and esteemed dynasties in India.

These epigraphs could also signify the connection which the Ārya cakravartti claimed with the country 'sanctified' by the waters of the 'Holy' Ganges and not really their descent from the Ganganārāma. As the Čekarācagekaramālā asserts that the 512 Āriyār who were settled at Rāmesvaram had come from Kāsi it is even probable that these epigraphs only imply the connection which their remote ancestors had or claimed with the Ganganētī plain.

60. Viṅganga was one of the Ganga chiefs who opposed Kāḷapurā’s army during the war of Pāṇḍya succession. Kaṇṭha Utaya-gey-tyiṇ Kaṅkiyōma, a Śāman of Māravāman Sundara Pāṇḍya I seems to have been of Ganga descent. Another chief of Ganga descent was Nīla Kaṅkaiyāriyan of cempi nāṭu. Māravāman Viṅkram Pāṇḍya Ganganārāyaṇa, another Ganga chief, was an officer of both Viṅkram Pāṇḍya and Viṅ Pagāṇ. Cōla-gāntēvan and Nīlakāriyāriyan were two Ganga chiefs of the reign of Māravāman Kulasékhaṇa (1208 - 1310). See CV, LXXVI, 180 - 182; ARE, 1935-6, p. 78 Nos. 152 - 153, 165, 166, 176, 186; ARE, 1914 p. 93, No. 53 of 1905 and 41 of 1905.

61. KM, pp. 4 - 21.
Pāntimalavan of Ponparri, son of Cēlarāyan, who had fought many battles and was distinguished among the members of the Kaṅkākula, went to Madurai and requested the prince Ciṅkaiyāriyān to come and rule the kingdom of Jaffna which was disintegrating as there was no king. After carefully considering the pleas of Pāntimalavan, Ciṅkaiyāriyān acceded to his request, left Madurai with the blessings of the Panṭiyān and reached Jaffna for the purpose of ruling that kingdom. The Ciṅkaiyāriyān led an invincible army which consisted of a cavalry, an elephant corps and infantry that included within its ranks, Mākatār, Karunāṭar, Mālavār, Keralār and many other communities. 1

After having decided to establish a royal residence at Nallūr, Ciṅkaiyāriyān ordered the building of a palace supported by lofty columns that were carved with ornamental designs. The palace was surrounded by strong fortified walls on all the four sides. It consisted also of an upper storey and an audience hall which was adorned with paintings and garlands of pearls. Moreover, a throne set with gems was placed in the coronation hall. The Kailāyamālai further describes the ceremonies connected with the coronation of Ciṅkaiyāriyān. He was adorned with a profusion of jewels and the anklets of heroism and, while the Brahmins chanted benedictions to the accompaniment of various musical instruments, Pāntimalavan crowned Ciṅkaiyāriyān. Thereafter, the king performed several kinds of dānas from the adorned pavilion in front of the Coronation hall. Later he mounted an elephant that was specially decorated for the occasion and accompanied by courtiers, officers, units of the army and musicians, he was taken in procession along the main streets of the city. The subjects who had gathered along the main

1. The poetic description of Ciṅkaiyāriyān’s army is similar to that of the armies of Jātavāmman Vīra Pāṇḍya as found in the prasasti of his inscriptions. See KM, p. 5 and IPS, No. 306.
thoroughfares were exceedingly delighted on seeing him and felt relieved of the miseries to which they have been subjected until that time. They paid homage with due respect and prayed for the king's prosperity and long life.

The king, after ascending the throne, appointed as his chief minister PuvaneKavaku, a learned and eminent Brahmin from Madurai, and made him reside at Nallur. He made Pangalavanan of Ponpariyur, a man of the Keerakulam, to reside at Tirunelveli with his brother and his cousin, the heroic Cempakamalavan. Naraciinakavan of Kaviriyur, a leader of the Tuluva division of the Kaikkulam was made to reside at Mayilitti. The three chiefs, namely Cempakamappaan of Vavinakar, his kinsman Cantiracakaramappaan and the merchant Kaikkaraayan of Kalyannakar were settled at Telilpallai which was exceedingly fertile and which possessed sufficient water resources. The chief Perayiravan of Kovarpati was made to reside at Inuvil. The chief Nilakanthan Kaceur, who was a peer of the king in wealth and peerless in heroism, was sent together with his four brothers to rule Pacchipallai. Kanaamalavan and four others were sent to Puloli. Naraciinakavan and Kupakarakihan of Kupakanatu, who was an ornament of the Kakkakulam and a patron of the learned were sent to reside at Tolpuram: The great warrior Teveracenthir who was reputed for his liberality was asked to reside at Koyilakkaat. Mangatukotta mutali of Tontainatu who belonged to the Vejiila family that showered gold on Kampan for his work Erejupatu, was settled at Irupalai. The virtuous and powerful chief, Taninlayaka mutali

of noble descent on both the paternal and maternal ancestry was appointed to rule Nesuntivu. The Pallavan of Vaani and two others were placed at Vejinatu.

After having appointed these chiefs the king decided to appoint headmen called Talaiyari and other chieftains. Valliyathakkavan was appointed as the chief of the division called Melpattu. Imaiyayaa makkkan became the ruler of Vatapuru. Cempaka makkkan and Verri makkkan were appointed to rule the divisions called Kaipattu and Tenparu respectively. Viracinakan, an experienced general who had fought several battles, was made the commander-in-chief of the army. Moreover, the army was divided into several units and stationed in different localities.

The king who had long cherished in his mind the idea of building at Nallur a temple for Siva whom he had worshipped at Madurai in the form of Cekkanatam started to construct it at an auspicious time. He constructed beautiful enclosing walls, a shrine of admirable architecture for Siva, a shrine for Parvati with side apartments for minor deities, a sacrificial hall, a store-house and a tank for ceremonial ablutions. After completing the construction of the temple the king built houses for priests and a hall for reciting the Sama Veda. He also laid out a road for the processions of the chariot. A flower garden and parks were laid out in the vicinity of the temple. Thereafter, the king sent message to the ruler of Ceto asking him to send a suitable Brahmin to serve in the temple as the chief priest. The ruler of Ceto sent Kaikkataraiyer, a Brahmin from Kaasi who had mastered the Vedas. After his arrival the king conducted a consecration ceremony and named the temple after Kayalayanath and thus it became the third Kayalayam.

The foregoing account is important in several respects. Firstly, it gives an idea of the circumstances that led to
The arrival of Cinkaiyarayan. Secondly, it describes the foundation of Nallur as the capital of the kingdom. Thirdly, it throws light on the organization of the administration by Cinkaiyarayan. Lastly, it contains traditions concerning the construction of the Kayilayamatar temple at Nallur. The author of the Kailayamalai, Murthirasa Kavirarcar, like the authors or compilers of the other Tamil chronicles in the island, had no sense of chronology or historical sequence. He does not record historical events within any chronological framework. Besides, he has written this chronicle in verse and in conformity to poetic conventions. One could, therefore, expect in this work exaggeration and hyperbole as in any other poetical work. Yet, one should not lose sight of the fact that the historical events of a single reign form the main theme of this text. The chronicle was recording certain traditions concerning the activities and achievements of the founder of the Arya cakravarti dynasty of Jaffna, about which memories continued to linger among the people of ‘Jaffnapatnam’. The traditions recorded in the Kailayamalai should be examined in the light of historical developments in the island during the late thirteenth century and in comparison with the evidence about these developments from other sources.

Both the Kailayamalai and the Yalpana Vaipavamalai introduce the dignitary called Panchimalavan into the account of Cinkaiyarayan. It is claimed that Cinkaiyarayan came to Jaffna from Madurai on the request of Panchimalavan. The account of the latter as found in the Tamil chronicle presupposes that the kingdom of Jaffna was administered by the Pandya before the arrival of Cinkaiyarayan otherwise called Arya cakravarti. Panchimalavan is said to have been a son of Celvarayan. Moreover, it is claimed that Panchimalavan was formerly residing for some time at Venkatakiri.

The tradition concerning Panchimalavan as found in the Kailayamalai appears to be a reliable one. The Malavar chiefs were among the most powerful and influential feudatories in the Pandya kingdom; some of them held key positions in the army and administration. The rank of chief minister was usually held by a dignitary of the Malavar family. For instance, Sankaran Alakiyaperumal Malavarayan of Kaladi was the chief minister of Mavarman Sundara Pandya I (1215–1238). Inscriptions recording grants of land and money to public institutions, found at several localities in the Tamil country, show that Malavar chiefs were placed in positions of authority in the various parts of the Pandya kingdom. A branch of the Malavar family was to be found in Cevirukkaiempinatu. Malavarayan Tirumalirunchalai nirthan was the chief of this territorial division in the time of Vikrama Pandya. The fact that the Arya cakravartis were also from the same territorial division may perhaps explain the intimate connections which Arya cakravartti had with Panchimalavan and other Malavar chiefs in Jaffna.

According to inscriptions, Ponparri was situated in Natuvilkuru, a subdivision of Mialaikurum in Panchimalam.

7. An inscription from the Krsna temple at Puliyur registor a gift of tax-free land in the uppamparkuricci otherwise called Kuneelkarai nailur in Nerusuram to the temple of Tirukkurinu muttipaiy naanar at the instance of Aliyan Malavarayan. Another record of the reign of Mavarman Sundara Pandya mentions the gift of land for the maintenance of a flower garden called ‘pattarapendi tirmunatavanam’ to the temple of Rajaraja Caturvedimanikulam in Muttinathu (Tokkai) at the instance of Malavarayan. An epigraph of Vikrama Pandya (acc. A.D. 1283) from Vrddhabhirajvarna temple at Virudhachalam mentions the gift of land from taxes in Pakajankutu in Paravaparppu by another chief called Malavarayan. See ARE, No. 529 of 1911 and Nos. 75 and 428 of 1918.
8. ARE, No. 75 of 1918
9. ARE, No. 589 of 1918; No. 229 of 1916
It was the centre of a chieftaincy and chiefs of Ponparṭṭi also were of some consequence in the Pāṇḍya administration. They seem to have been sent by the Pāṇḍya government to discharge military and administrative functions in the various parts of the Tamil country. Chiefs of Ponparṭṭi are referred to either as the signatories of grants or as having had them made in inscriptions in various parts of the Tamil country. The chief Karunamppi Kuttāṭuvaṇi otherwise called Uṭṭamaḍiṇīya Vilupparaiyān of Ponparṭṭi in Mīṭalai kāṭṭam is referred to as the donor of a grant in an epigraph of the reign of Jayavarman Kulasekharadeva at the Madhyasthāna temple in the Cankarānṭīnār taluk of the Tirunelveli district. The chief Ponparṭṭi utaiyaṇ Moṇnaippirān is mentioned in a record at Alakarkōyil in the Melēr taluk of the Madurai district. This is probably the same chief who is also referred to in the epigraph of the seventh year of Mātāvarman Vikrama Pāṇḍya (a.c. A. D. 1283) from the Nīṭeyevāra temple at Śrīmūnāṭē. According to this inscription Moṇnaippirān Cīríjaṭṭē, otherwise called Cēṭiyakatāraṇi of Karuvuv Ponparṭṭi, donated four villages in Rājendra cēṭiyarum for festivals and offerings at the service of Rājākkajāṭṭaṇi cēnti instituted in the name of the king in the temple of Tirunāṭuṭtiyaiyārē at Tirumuttam. An inscription registering an order of the assembly of Rājājīrṇa cēṭurvetiṇaṭkaḷam states that in the hamlet newly founded to the south of the village the right of kaiṭāma was to be held by the temple of Tirunelveli and that the Karāṇai by Teyayeṭṭūyaṇ Kāliṅkārīyaṇ. It further mentions that the document was signed by Ponparṭṭi utaiyaṇ kulasekkara Vānṭāṭēyarē. Moreover, another chief of Ponparṭṭi, Ponparṭṭi utaiyaṇ Sūryadevan otherwise called Gāṇgeṇa of Cīrumarutur in Vatavēṭṭē is mentioned as the signatory of a record from Sivadharmapurīvēra temple in Tirupṭṭēr of Rānnad.  

In the light of the evidence from inscriptions, concerning the Maṭāvar chief and the chiefs of Ponparṭṭi it is clear that the author of the Kāḷyāyaṇaḷai is not recording a legend when he describes Pāṇṭimalavaṇ as Ponparṭṭi cēntu kuttāṭuvaṇa ucchitaṇ, 'the eminent chief who had come after having guarded the village of Ponparṭṭi' and as one 'who was formerly of Vēṅkaṭaḷīkīri'. As Cīríjaṭṭēvaṇ, another chief of Ponparṭṭ, is known to have served in the region of South Aroci, it is not improbable that Pāṇṭimalavaṇ of Ponparṭṭi was serving in a region close to the Vēṅkaṭa hills, during the late thirteenth century and before his arrival in Jaffna.

The role of Pāṇṭimalavaṇ could be explained against the background of Pāṇḍya invasions of the island during the late thirteenth century. The Kāḷyāyaṇaḷai, as seen earlier states that since the kingdom of Jaffna was disintegrating because of anarchy Pāṇṭimalavaṇ went to Madurai and invited the prince Cīṅkaṭyaṭṭēyaṇ to come and rule the kingdom. In a limited way the Yāppaṇa Vaiṭyaḷaṭaiyē elucidates this statement. This chronicle asserts that, before the arrival of Cīṅkaṭyaṭṭēyaṇ, Pāṇṭimalavaṇ was protecting the kingdom without yielding to his enemies during the wars of the Sinhalesa. If this tradition, as found in the chronicle, is reliable, then it may be assumed that there was either a series of rebellions or an invasion of the Lāmm kingdom by a Sinhalesa king. In the circumstances it would appear that Pāṇṭimalavaṇ had come to the island with the Pāṇḍya armies which conquered the northern part of the island and emerged subsequently as the principal dignitary administering that part of the island as a deputy of the Pāṇḍya kings. On realizing that it was no longer possible to maintain his authority with the forces at his disposal he may have appealed to either the
Pandyya king or his feudatory, Arya cakravarti, for military aid. The arrival of Arya cakravarti, who is referred to in local tradition as Cinkaiyariyan was, in all likelihood, in response to that appeal.

The account of Cinkaiyariyan as found in the Kailayamalai is in the form of a panegyric. The historical facts that emerge from this account are that Cinkaiyariyan, the founder of Nallur as the capital of Jaffna, was a powerful general who came with a large retinue from the Pandyya kingdom and restored order and stability in the part of the island over which Pandyya rule had already been established. The Kailayamalai gives a conventional and exaggerated description of Cinkaiyariyan’s army which is said to have consisted of a cavalry force, an elephants corps and a large infantry which had in its ranks soldiers from various communities. It may be assumed that it was a composite one which included recruits from many communities in South Indian society.

The claim that Cinkaiyariyan was originally a great military leader, as found in the Kailayamalai, receives confirmation from other literary and epigraphic evidence. As shown elsewhere, the Cekaricecakaramalai asserts that the kings of Jaffna were the descendants of Brahmin generals who earned distinction in military service under the Pandyas. Pandy inscriptions, too, show that the Arya cakravartis of Cevirukkai nadu from where the kings of Jaffna traced their descent, had earned great honour and distinction in military service.

The Kailayamalai asserts that Cinkaiyariyan made Nallur the capital of the Kingdom of Jaffna. This ruler is said to have constructed the royal residence at Nallur after his arrival from Madurai. The Yalappana Vaipavamalai gives the additional information that besides constructing a hall of justice at Nallur Cinkaiyariyan had caused stables for elephants and horses to be laid and raised quarters for the soldiers of his army. The tradition that Nallur had been the capital of Jaffna since the time of Arya cakravarti is confirmed by de Queyroz who testifies that ‘they never had any other city save Nelur’.

Gnanaprakasar, however, suggests that the town of Jaffna was founded by about A.D. 1243 by Mahe after he had evacuated Polonnaruwa. His contention is based on two considerations: firstly, he believed that Cinkaiyariyan of the Kailayamalai was identical with Mahe; Secondly, he was of the opinion that the evidence from the stray verse appended to the Kailayamalai relates to the period of Cinkaiyariyan. According to the stray verse appended to this chronicle Puvanekavaku built the town of Yalappam and the Kandaecuni temple at Nallur in the year 870. As shown elsewhere, this tradition relates to the period of Sapumal’s rule in Jaffna. Gnanaprakasgar interpreted in a tendentious manner the word ennurreupatu as representing the numerals 1000 + 170 and assumed that this corresponds to A.D. 1247. His explanation cannot be accepted because the verse does not specify the era and there is no justification for interpreting in an unusual way, the word ennurreupatu as representing the number 1170 and not the number 870.

The Tamil chronicles do not mention the reasons for which Cinkaiyariyan decided to establish his residence at Nallur in Jaffna. Its remoteness from the centres of Sinhalese power, its proximity to the South Indian ports and the

19. KM, p. 5
20. CCM, Citt appppayaram, vv. 1–5.
21. See Chapter VII.
22. KM, pp. 7–8.
24. de Queyroz, p. 50.
26. See Chapter XI.
27. YFM, pp. 67, 96.
prospects of controlling the sea-coasts on both sides of the Gulf of Mannar may have been the considerations that influenced Cinkaiyariyan's decision to select Nallur as the most suitable site for establishing his royal residence. Pańṭimalavan who invited Cinkaiyariyan appears to have lived at Nallur before the arrival of Cinkaiyariyan. Presumably, Nallur was originally a military outpost of the Pāṇḍya armies that came to the island. It developed into a flourishing town of modest proportions under the Aryan cakravarttis.

The authenticity of the claim made by the author of the Kaḷaiyamalai concerning the consecration of Cinkaiyariyan cannot easily be established. The king is said to have been crowned by his chief minister, Pańṭimalavan. The successors of Cinkaiyariyan are known, from contemporary texts, to have undergone the ceremony of consecration. It is likely that the chronicler based description of the event on his knowledge of the ceremonies of kingship and court-life that were characteristic of later reigns.

There is no reason to dispute the claim that the Kaḷaiyamalai temple at Nallur was constructed by the first Tamil king of Jaffna. That temple must have been intended to fulfil the religious needs of the royalty and the court. The chronicle claims that it was a magnificent temple of large dimensions. Presumably, it was one of the largest of religious monuments within the kingdom. The temple was completely destroyed during the period of Portuguese rule in Jaffna and its architectural remains have been removed from the site and used as building materials for other constructions. It is, therefore, not possible now to form any idea about its architectural dimensions.

28. KMI, p. 6

29. The Cekaraṇeṣṭhakaraniṟṟai and the Taṅkima Kaḷaiṣcappuṟṟam contains incidental references to the golden crown of the kings of Jaffna. See TKP, Tirunakarar caṟukkam, v. 108.

The successive Pāṇḍya invasions of North Ceylon during the thirteenth century and the establishment of the Aryan cakravarttis dynasty in Jaffna, subsequent to those invasions, would naturally have led to the migration of a considerable number of persons from the Tamil country and to their settlement in the kingdom of Jaffna. Merchants, warriors, seamen, artisans and Brahmins have been important groups among the Dravidian settlements that were to be found in the island in earlier times. The development of Jaffna as a prosperous Tamil kingdom and the decline and fall of the Tamil kingdoms in India after the Turkish and Vijayanagara conquests resulting in the dislocation or disintegration of the social and economic institutions there naturally attracted large numbers of adventurers and fortune seekers to Jaffna. Such developments have led to a concentration of Tamils of various professional groups in the northern parts of the island. In fact, the process of the transformation of these areas into Tamil speaking ones, which had started much earlier was almost complete when the Aryan cakravarttis established their power in the kingdom. Another important development was the transformation of the Tamil settlements which had hitherto remained isolated and ill-organized into a cohesive and homogeneous agrarian society. The origin of the social organization characteristic of the Ceylon Tamils and the concepts which served as the basis of the Tecuvaḷamai could be traced from this time.

One cannot expect a reliable and comprehensive account about these developments from the Tamil chronicles. The Kaḷaiyamalai records the names of several warrior chieftains who were settled at different localities in the kingdom by Cinkaiyariyan. These chiefs were not merely settled in villages but were also made the chiefs of their respective villages. The Kaḷaiyamalai account is important as it records the traditions concerning the traditional ranks that were raised to positions of power and authority in the kingdom by the Aryan cakravarttis. They had come from various parts of the Tamil country during the period of Pāṇḍya
supremacy and claimed descent from some of the reputed and wealthy families of landholders with a long tradition of
chivalry and royal service in South India. Some of them belonged to the Maṭavār and Gangeya families of feudatory
chieftains in the Tamil country.

Paṭṭimalavan, his brother, and his cousin Ceṇpakamaṇ-
ḷavana are said to have been settled at Timnevelly in Jaffna. They were probably accompanied by a large retinue which
settled in the same locality. This village was apparently
named after the one in the southern part of the Paṇḍya kingdom
and it may be assumed that most of the settlers at Timn-
velly in Jaffna hail come from Timnevelly in South India.
The toponym Paṭṭimalavan vajavu still in vogue, at Timn-
velly, shows that the tradition about Paṇṭī malavan, as found
in the Kalliyamalai, is an authentic one. Besides, there
have been, until recent times, families which claimed descent
from this chief. Another chief, Naracinkatēvan is said to
have been settled at the village of Mayilīṭṭi, Thellippalai,
another important village in the Jaffna peninsula, was occu-
pied by the three chiefs, Ceṇpaka māppāṇa, Ceṇpaka māppāṇa
and the merchant Kanakarayān. A later work traces the
genealogy of some prominent personalities of the locality, from the dignitaries mentioned in the Kalliyamalai.

Periyaravan and Nīlakāntana were made the chiefs res-
pectively of Iqavil and Paṭalāṇa. Kanakamaravan and
his associates were sent to Paḷḷi: Naraciuvaḷavan and
Kupakāṇettana are said to have been made the chiefs of
Tolparaṇa. Tevarāṇettana and Maṇṇaṭu koṭu muṭu became
the chiefs respectively of Koḷilakkanṭa and Iruṭṭa. The
chieftain Tanināyikā muṭu became the ruler of Netundu
(Delī) and the Pallavan of Vaiṇa was placed in charge of
the division called Vejmuṭu. There is some evidence in other

31. Kalliyamalai whi made to South India, after the Portuguese
conquest of Jaffna during the seventeenth century, is said to
have been a descendant of Paṇṭī maṭu. Another descendant
of Paṇṭī maṭu was Ceṇpaka māppāṇa māṭu who lived in
the eighteenth century. Majavaraṇa māṭu and his descend-
ants who lived at Paḷḷi traced their descent from Kanaka
maṭu. Nīlakāntana māṭu and Paḷḷi muṭu of Mayilīṭṭi
were the descendants of Maṇṇaṭu koṭu māṭu. A descend-
ant of Brumānuttuvaṇna Tanināyikā of Ceyvīr was Keluṇaṇa māṭu
māṭu who lived at Nāṭu during the eighteenth century. The son of Tevarāṇettana, who was settled at Kūvīla
māṭu, was Kāṇaṭu koṭu, the ninth descendant of Tevarāṇè-
tana was Nīlakāntana koṭu māṭu. The descendants of
Periyaravan were known to have lived in the villages of
Netundu, Vaiṇa and in the Antony area. See K. Veluppili,}
Tolparaṇa muṭu, Jaffna, 1918, pp. 195, 202, 203, 216, 222, 237,
244-45, 250. The ancestor of Kanakarayān māṭu, who is
catalogued as ‘Amaras toṭa māṭu māppāṇa’ in the Taniṭkik
Kannakarayān patṭu, was a descendant of Cantiṭekana māppāṇa
who was a contemporary of Ceyvāryān I. See Taniṭkik
Kannakarayān patṭu ed. by V. Kumāravuṇa, Madura, 1932
p. 55.
The Kalliyamalai account presupposes that Cinkayariyan re-organized the administration of the Kingdom. In addition to appointing chiefs as heads of various territorial divisions, Cinkayariyan, is said to have appointed Matakkar, Talayarry and other chieftains. Four Matakkar are said to have been appointed to administer the four divisions called Melparru, Kilparru, Vataparru and Tenparru. Three out of these four divisions, which appear to have been named on account of geographical considerations, cannot be identified at present. Probably their names have been changed later. Melparru is probably identical with the division called Melpatru in the Vavuniya district.

As the Kalliyamalai, which records fairly reliable traditions relating to the period of Cinkayariyan, states that he had the name Ceyvira, it may be assumed that Ceyvira Cinkayariyan was the first Tamil King of Jaffna and was the founder of the Arya Cakravarti dynasty of kings. It is also significant that traditions which had been current in Jaffna and which were independent of the Kalliyamalai, also had regard Ceyvira Cinkayariyan to have come from the Pandya Kingdom and established a new dynasty.

As he had failed to recognise that Cinkayariyan of the Kalliyamalai was Ceyvira and because he had, relying on the Vayiyapal, believed that Cinkayariyan was identifiable with Kulaikayariyan, the author of the Vayippa Vaipavamalai has represented Ceyvira cinkayariyan, who was in fact the first king, as the ninth ruler of the dynasty. This is evident from the following account of that ruler as given by him.

He became king while in youth and inspite of it Ceyvira cinkayariyan protected the kingdom from enemies and achieved great fame on account of his success. As Puvanekavaku, the king of Kandy, went to war with him on account of the pearl fisheries, Ceyvira cinkayariyan defeated Puvanekavaku and ruled the whole island for twelve years. On the twelfth year Parakkiramavaku sought the intervention of the Pandya king and received from Ceyvira cinkayariyan the promise of paying tribute. Thereafter, Parakkiramavaku and his successors continued to pay tribute to the ruler of Jaffna.

32. Ceyvira may be identified as the village of that name in the Maduranthakam taluk of Chingleput district.
33. The chief Iraka varattu maJavu of Taiyipandr is said to have come with Cinkayariyan cakkavarti. The Kalliyamalai however, does not mention him. This chronicle may have left out the names of several other dignitaries who came with Cinkayariyan. See Vayippa Vaippa kumari, p. 257.
34. The territorial divisions called Tenparru, Vattaparru and Kilparru are not found in any part of North Ceylon. Some Pandyas inscriptions refer to such names. An inscription from Thuppillivannam in Tenjare mentions the nattuar of Tenparru [ARE 186 of 1927/8]. An Epigraph of the reign of Makkarracan Kulasivkarra refers to Vappparru in Kupalur nattu which belonged to Koralakshat vajjattu [ARE 110 of 1907]. Some other epigraphs refer to a division called Vattaparru in Punnamurupati nattu [ARE 150, 151 of 1907]. A Vaitrumpa inscription mentions that Arakil Kilparru was a sub division of Vayippa parru in Pandalakirika vailpattu included in the province of Buvanekavakar pitham.

36. VTM, p. 7.
Although the Sinhalese chronicles show that the Arya cakravarthi of Jaffna had secured a position of supremacy in the island when Gampola was the centre of Sinhalese political power the events described in the Yāḷpāṇa Vaiyavaṇālai cannot be assigned to the Gampola period. The Gampola ruler who was made to pay tribute to the Arya cakravarthi was Vikramabahu III (1356–1374) and not Bhuvanekabahu. There is no evidence to show that Bhuvanekabahu IV (acc. 1344), the predecessor of Vikramabahu III, was ever attacked by the king of Jaffna. As the Yāḷpāṇa Vaiyavaṇālai refers to the intervention by the Pandyas in the dispute between the Arya cakravarthi and Bhuvanakabahu many years before the Gampola period because the Pandyas had fallen from power before the rise of Gampola as the centre of Sinhalese political power.

The Yāḷpāṇa Vaiyavaṇālai account of the war between Ceyavira Ciṅkaiyiriyam and Puvaneka Viku closely resembles the Cūḷavamsa account of Arya cakravarthi’s invasion around 1284. The Cūḷavamsa records that Arya cakravarthi sacked Yapahuwa and carried away the tooth relic and other treasures which he presented to Maravarman Kulasekhara, the Pandya king. Moreover, during the interregnum that followed the demise of Bhuvanakabahu I (1272–1284), Parakramabahu III went to Madurai and successfully negotiated with the Pandyas for the return of the tooth relic and other valuables. He invested them at Polonnaruwa and ruled from there. In the Cūḷavamsa account, Arya cakravarthi is said to have been a powerful minister of the Pandyas. Nevertheless, Ciṅkaiyiriyam of the Kailāyamālai might have been identical with this minister and it is probable that Arya cakravarthi who invaded Yapahuwa subsequently became the ruler of Jaffna. It is also possible that Ceyavirak was another member of the Arya cakravarthi family, who had come to the island together with Arya cakravarthi who is referred to in the Cūḷavamsa as the minister of the five brothers who were ruling the Pandyas kingdom. The tradition recorded in the Yāḷpāṇa Vaiyavaṇālai that the war between Puvanekavakku and the king of Jaffna was due to their dispute over the pearl fisheries may have a historical basis. The Pandyas were eager to control the pearl fisheries and, if Marco Polo is to be believed, towards the end of the thirteenth century, they had control over the fisheries on both sides of the Gulf of Mannar. When the Pandyas power declined in the fourteenth century the pearl fisheries on the Ceylonese side of the Gulf of Mannar came under the control of the Kings of Jaffna and the Arya cakravarthi, as testified by Ibn Battutah, was very much concerned with the pearl trade.

It would appear that the suzerainty claimed by the Pandyas over Parakramabahu is attributed to Ciṅkaiyiriyam by the author of the Yāḷpāṇa Vaiyavaṇālai owing to some confusion either on his part or in the tradition recorded in his sources. His contention that Parakramabahu and his successors paid tribute to Ciṅkaiyiriyam (I) cannot be accepted. The Kings of Jaffna may have claimed and even attempted to exact tribute from the successors of Parakramabahu (III) but there is hardly any evidence to show that they were able to enforce their claims during the early fourteenth century.

As the Tamil chronicles do not give any reliable chronological information the date of the foundation of the dynasty of Ciṅkaiyiriyar otherwise called Arya cakravarthi could only be fixed within rough limits. The sixth ruler in the list of the

---

The Vanni principalities of ‘Jaffnapatnam,’ seven in number in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, came to be referred to as Atankappāṟṟu, ‘the unsubdued principalities’ owing to the refractory and rebellious nature of the chieftains who governed them as autonomous ‘princes’. Before the Portuguese conquest of Jaffna the chieftains of these principalities owed allegiance to the kings of Jaffna to whom they paid annual tribute. The Portuguese historian de Queyroze and Van Genn, a Dutch Governor in the seventeenth century, assert, in no uncertain terms, that the Vanni principalities, which were locally referred to as Atankappāṟṟu, were included in the kingdom of Jaffna.

As regards the territorial extent of Jaffna de Queyroze observes:

‘This modest kingdom is not confined to the little district of Jaffnapatno because to it is added the neighbouring lands and those of the Vanni which is said to be the name of the lordship which they held before we obtained possession of them, separated from the preceding by a salty river, and connected only to the isthmus of Pachilapala, within which were the lands of Beligama (Valikāmam), Temararche, Badamararche and Pachilapala forming that peninsula, and outside it there stretch the lands of the Vanni crosswise, from the side of Mannar,
by the river Pataguli, which lands end in the river of the
Cross in the midst of the lands in the Vanni and of
others which stretch as far as Trinquelemafe.\footnote{1}

In his description of Jaffnapatnam the Governor Van
Goens writes:

"...These four provinces and the thirteen islands were
called the kingdom of Jaffnapatnam, to which also
belonged the district of the Wanni, called "the
Wanni". This latter is a large district, conquered by
the heathen kings of Jaffnapatnam and made tributary
to them, a position which had been main-
tained by the Portuguese... It commences with the
province of Cetikulampatree three or four miles
northward of Mantotte, continuing its circle to the
point of Calmony opposite Colombuter, where the
bay commences which separates the Wanni from
Jaffnapatnam, running eastward across the country
until it reaches the sea, forming the outer north-
east coast of Ceylon, a pass separating Jaffnapatnam
from the Wanni, then stretching south eastward to
Trincomaly, and westward through large and woody
lands again to Calpentyn, Mantotte and Mannar.
It was for more than 42 years ruled by a heathen
king by the name Siangery (Cañkili), who was
descended from an old royal and sovereign house.
His dominion and his descendants were rooted out
by the Portuguese..."\footnote{2}

The foregoing description presupposes that the seven
principalities of the Vanni which were collectively known, in
colonial times, as \textit{Añakkippattu}, were conquered by the

\footnote{1. de Queréon, P. 51.}
\footnote{2. Wyckhoff Van Goens, \textit{Instructions for the guidance for the Upper
Koargen Anthony Paviloon, Commander and Council of Jaffnapatnam},
1638, pp 84-86.}
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remote ancestors of Cañkili (1519-1560) and had been
autonomous provinces under the suzerainty and control of
the kings of Jaffna, until the Portuguese conquest. Apart
from these principalities the ones in the areas included within
the Trincomalee district were also under the suzerainty and
influence of the kings of Jaffna until the rise and development of the
kingdom of Kandy in the sixteenth century. The \textit{Nampota}, a Sinha-
lese text, believed to have been written in the fourteenth century,
includes Trincomalee (Gonagama) among the territories included
within the Tamil Kingdom which it refers to as Demalupatnam.\footnote{3}

The Vanni principalities which came under the suzerainty
of the kings of Jaffna had already developed as centres of
feudal power during the time of Māgha.\footnote{4} Some of these
principalities and the Jaffna peninsula had come under Jāvaka
rule after the demise of Māgha. The \textit{Culavamsa} testifies that
Kurumdi (Kurunam) and Padi (Padaviya) were under
Candrabhanu when he invaded the Sinhalese kingdom for the
second time.\footnote{5} The Jāvaka conquest, which was achieved main-
ly with the support of warriors recruited from South India
must have further contributed to the growth in the power
and influence of the Dravidian warrior chiefs in the northern
part of the island.

The rise to power of the Arya cakravartis in North
Ceylon must have contributed still further to the growth and
development of Tamil settlements in the Vanni principalities
as in the Jaffna peninsula. There is some epigraphic evidence
to show that the power and influence of the Arya cakravartis
had prevailed at Padaviya. A recently discovered Sanskrit

\footnote{3. The \textit{Nampota} states that Nāgar kovila, Kantajjai, Tollypalai,
Maliyakam, Kāratjuv, Muliyavalei, Trincomalee, Vellum Vēhera and
Hannigoda were among the localities situated within Demalupatnam
(The Tamil Kingdom), \textit{Nampota} pp. 5-6.}
\footnote{4. See Chapter IV.}
\footnote{5. See Chapter \textit{IV}.}
inscription at Padaviya, mentions the family or dynasty called Setukula. The inscription, which records the construction of a vihāra by a certain Lokanatha Daṇḍanāyaka, provides the information that this Vihāra was named after the Vēlajjāra regiment and that Lokanatha placed it under the protection of that regiment. The epigraph, although undated, has been assigned to the thirteenth century on palaeographical considerations. The text of the inscription begins with a brief eulogy of the Setukula the identification of which will be of crucial importance for the interpretation of the historical information found in it. Among the ruling families which held sway over any part of Sri Lanka only the Ārya cakravarttis of Jaffna are known to have had connections with Setu. But, as the Ārya cakravarttis were Sāvites and because Padaviya was not otherwise known to have been under their effective control Paranavitana argues that the Setukula mentioned in the inscription cannot be a reference to the Ārya cakravarttis of Jaffna. Moreover, he adds: 'we have, therefore, to look for the derivation of this Ārtu-kula to a quarter outside Ceylon as well as South India.' He further continues: 'Setu meaning causeway, is no doubt the name of a place, and not far from Jaiya, where the only known inscription of Candrabhānu has been discovered, and from Ligor with which Tambralinga has been identified, there was an ancient kingdom referred to as Ch'i'iu-tu in Chinese writings. It could very well be that a scion of the ancient royal family of this region was a companion of Candrabhānu in the latter's attempt to wrest for him the sovereignty over the island. It is also not impossible that Lokanatha Daṇḍanāyaka was a general of the Javaka's son who was installed as the ruler of a kingdom in North Ceylon by Jatāvarman Vira Pāṇḍya.

The ingenious arguments of Paranavitana are not convincing as they would seem to be. The argument that the Ārya Cakravarti I in Traditional History — I 207

Setukula mentioned in the inscription could not be a reference to the Ārya cakravarttis because they are not known to have controlled Padaviya at any time could be a valid one only if it could be established that the locality was under the control of Patakkramabha (1236—1271) and his successors at Dambadeniya. They could never have controlled that town as it was under Māgha (1215—1255) and later the Javakas. As the Ārya cakravarttis succeeded to power in the kingdom formerly ruled by the Javakas and because of the fact that Padaviya was included in that kingdom and also because of the further fact that the Pāṇḍya armies had entered the towns of Yāpākuwa and Trincomalee, it is not improbable that Padaviya came under the sway of the Ārya cakravarttis for some time during the late thirteenth century.

Paranavitana's assumption that Ch'i'iu-tu is a Chinese transcription of Setu is misleading. It is not a phonetic transcription of a Malay or Sāvki name. Ch'i'iu-tu means 'the red-earth land' and the Chinese texts give the following description of it:

'Vet kingdom of Ch'i'iu-tu, another part of Fu-Nan is situated in the South seas. By sea one reaches it in more than a hundred days. The colour of the soil of the capital is mostly red, whence is derived the name of the country...'

It is, therefore, quite clear that Paranavitana's identification of Ch'i'iu-tu as Setu is unacceptable. There is, therefore, no compelling necessity to look for the derivation of Setukula to a quarter outside Ceylon and South India.

Among the ruling families of South India and Ceylon only the Setupathis of Ramnad and the Ārya cakravarttis

7. ibid.
8. ibid.
9. CV, 83: 16; 83: 64
had connections with Setu. The island of Rāmēsvaram and several localities in its neighbourhood were known as Setu. It was on account of their close connections with Rāmēsvaram and other localities called Setu that the Arya cakravarttis and the Setupathis assumed the epithet Cetuvelakan, 'The guardian of Cetu'. The occurrence of the expression Cetu tirumukam in one of the inscriptions of the time of Māravaran Kulasekhara\(^{11}\) shows that the Arya cakravarttis of Cevuntakki Nātu, from whom the rulers of Jaffna were descended, had used the expression Cetu in their documents. The Setuvela referred to in the inscription at Padaviya may be identified as the Arya cakravartti family on account of the aforementioned consideration and because of the fact that no other ruling family in the island had ever claimed connections with Cetu or with any family which had come from a locality called Cetu. The fact that the Arya cakravarttis were Saivites cannot be a strong argument against such an identification. In an inscription recording the construction of a Buddhist monument the description of the Setuvela as devoted to the Buddha may not necessarily indicate that its members were Buddhists.\(^{12}\) Lokanātha who caused the Vihara to be constructed or the Veḷaiikkāra under his service may have followed Buddhism. The construction of a Buddhist monument at Padaviya, which had a composite population around this time, may have been a measure calculated to reconcile the Buddhist population to the conquerors. The panegyric description of the Setuvela in the initial portion of the inscription from Padaviya may be regarded as providing some evidence of the conquest of the localities around Padaviya by the Arya cakravarttiris or their agents during the late thirteenth century.

\(^{11}\) *S.lI., VIII, No. 40; ARE, 117 of 1963.*

\(^{12}\) The inscription could be translated as follows: The Setu family is established in the Buddha dhamma which is unshaken, exalted with many virtues and adorned with the triple gems (Buddha Dhamma and the Sangha). This Vilā is, glorious with beauty and splendour, with its spirit adorned with gems and caused to be built here at Sripatti (grāma) by the general named Lokanātha, has been named after the (regiment of) Veḷaiikkāra and placed under their protection. Prosperity.
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The inscription does not reveal the precise nature of the relationship that had existed between the Setuvela and the general Lokanātha. He could have been either a scion of the Setuvela or an agent of that family. He could also have been a warrior chief who became a local chief owing allegiance to the Setuvela which could be identified as the Arya cakravartti family.\(^{13}\)

The presence of a Viṣṇu army under the leadership of a general at Padaviya around the time the Arya cakravartti rose to power in Jaffna is significant. It may suggest that several groups of warriors who had come with the Pāṇḍya armies under the direction of Arya cakravartti and others occupied the principalities of the Vanūl in the Northern part of the island. The description of such a conquest forms the main theme of the Viṣṇupādā, which according to tradition was written by Viṣṇupāṇi Aiyar, the court poet of Cekaracakēkanār Canki (I), in the sixteenth century. The author of the Viṣṇupādā records the following tradition concerning the first king of Jaffna during whose reign the Vanūl are said to have conquered the principalities in the northern and eastern parts of the island.

After defeating Iravānan, Irānār freed his consort from captivity, crowned Viṭṭhaṇa as king of Ceylon and returned to his city. On his way he established a shrine of Śiva at Rāmēsvaram. Meanwhile, Viḷipattai who plays the yat at the court of Viṭṭhaṇa went to Madura and approached Kulakekāru Mahārāja to send one of his sons to rule the sand tract in North Ceylon where he had settled a thousand families after converting it into a fine and productive land teeming with groves of areca and coconut palms, jack, mango and other trees. King Kulakekāru acceded to this request and sent one of his sons who had a maimed arm with Viḷipattai. The latter, on his return named his territory as Viḷipattai.\(^{13}\)

\(^{13}\) S. Pathmanathan, *The Viṣṇukāra Inscription of Padaviya: Gnanapragasār Centenary Commemoration Volume,* Colombo 1975.
crowned the young prince whom he had brought from Madurai as its ruler and conferred on him the title of Vijaya Kujjanka cakkavartti.

Later, Ciṅkaketu and Mārutappuravika valli, the children of Tice ukkira cālan, came to Ilanikai. Mārutappuravikavalli who was born with the face of a horse, had her congenital deformity cured after ablutions at the springs at Kirimalai. Subsequently, while returning from her visit to the shrine at Kirimalai she gave birth to a child as the result of her union with Ukkirackiṣṇan. That child had a human form but his face was like that of a lion. While he was in his youth his parents had died. During the end of his reign Vipisayana placed the son of Mārutappuravikavalli on the throne, gave him the crown and the sacred sword which he had received from Irmar and conferred on him the title Ceyatukavira vararacakiniṣkan. Shortly after this event Vipisayana died.14

This confused account reveals that the author of the Vaiyāpāṭal had no clear idea about the identity of the first king of Jaffna. The traditions about the identity of the first king of the Arya cakkavartti dynasty have been confused with those relating to Vijaya and Valipīṇan. The inclusion of the Rāmāyana legends into the account was in all probability due to the influence of the traditions recorded in the Cekāraacakamālai which traces the descent of the kings of Jaffna from two Brahmins who are said to have received the insignia of royalty and the title of Arya Kings from Rama.

The story of Mārutappuravikavalli is reminiscent of the Vijaya legend. Ciṅkaketu and Mārutappuravikavalli figuring in this story, may correspond to Sihabahu and Sihavalli of the Vijaya legend. The confusion of the traditions relating to Ciṅkaketiyan with those relating to Vijaya, the first Sinhalese king, has resulted in a combination of the names of both rulers. The form Ceyatukavira Vararacakiniṣkan seems to be a combination of the names Ceyaviran and Vararacakiniṣkan. The Vaiyāpāṭal and its prose version, the Vaiyā, claim that Kujjanka cakkavartti, who became the first king of Jaffna, was sent from Madurai, the Pāṇḍya capital, by Kulaketo makāreca. Kulaketo may be a modified form of Kulasekhara, the name of the Pāṇḍya king during whose reign Arya cakkavartti invaded the island.15 It is significant that the account of the Vaiyāpāṭal, despite its confused nature, claims that the first king of Jaffna had come from Madurai. The Kālīyamālai claims that the first king was Ciṅkaketiyan. The two chronicles refer to the same person by different names: One claims that he had the name Kujjanka cakkavartti while the other states that he was Ceyaviran otherwise called Ciṅkaketiyan. The author of the Valipīṇan Vaiyamālai believed that the events described in the Kālīyamālai and the Vaiyāpāṭal occurred during the reign of the first king of Jaffna.16 Besides, he was of the opinion that the Vanniyar conquest of the prītiyalu in North Ceylon consisted of two distinct stages, one was under the leadership of Kulakkōṭī and the other was under the leadership of the Vanniyar who came from the Pāṇḍya kingdom.17 The second stage in the Vanniyar conquest, referred to by the Tamil chronicler, must have corresponded to the period of the establishment of the Arya cakkavartti dynasty of Jaffna.

In its account of the conquest of Atankkaputi by the Vanniyar the Vaiyāpāṭal seems to record traditions based on historical events.18 It gives the following account of their

---

14. VP, vv. 8-10.
15. Kēṭu and Sakkira are synonymous.
17. ibid., pp. 10-11.
18. The Vaiyāpāṭal mentions the names of chieftains and communities who occupied some of the divisions of Atankkaputtri. But it was conquered by the Vanniyar who came from the Pāṇḍya.
arrival and conquest of Atankāpparu, Ceyatuṅka vira Vararācacikaniṁ sent emissaries to Madurai to inform his uncle of his desire to marry his daughter. The ruler of Madurai summoned Vanniyar of 'royal lineage', and sent them with his daughter to Ilākkai. After having married the princes Camatūti the king told the Vanniyar to conquer the region of Atankāpparu and rule it. They were also instructed to pay annual tribute to the ruler of Jaffna.19

The Vanniyar came and encamped at Atankāpparu and thereafter, on realizing that they did not have adequate strength to conquer the country they sent emissaries to persuade Ilāniṁka māppānan, Nallavakutevān, Atimāppānan and others to come over to the island bringing with them as many persons as possible from the various castes in Madurai, Maruniṅkar, Kāraikkai, Kālicipuram, Tiruccirappalli, Tuluvai nāṭu, Toṇṭaimañ-ṭalam, Vaṭakiranāṭu and Kovαṟpati (Tirukkovalūṟ). In response to this invitation the Tirukkovaluravār, Triviracināṅka, Kutai kāṭān, Malaiṁnāṭu. Nallavakū, Cinakavakū, Cōtaivai Aniṁcaikāṅka Kattaiṅkāṅka Kāntiṁccakāṅka Kāntiātmakāṅka Kaṇakāṅkāṅka Kaṇakāṅkāṅkāṅka Mutiyā-ṇ, Cokkāṅkāṅka, Viraṅkā녕

Titiracikaniṁ became the chief of Karikāṭṭumulaiappāṟu Ilāniṁka māppānan, Nallavakū, Meiyṭevān, Kaṟṭutavān and Cinamapimān dislodged the cangār and valayiar and occu-

22. Cāṅkāmar may correspond to the Jangama of Vīra Sāvitē tradition. The traditions of the Cāṅkāmar of Batticaloa, who con-
duct religious services and ceremonies in Hindu temples, claim that their ancestors came from Malkikkirampuran in India dur-
ing the time of the Kalinga kings. In the light of this tradition the claim made in the Vaiyāpiṭa that there were Cāṅkāmar among
Cilliar of Accamalai, Ariya Vanniyar Maraiyavar Malavar, Oṭṭiyar, Toṭiyar women, sword-girt Vanniyar, Muvar, Vāiyar, powerful bowmen, Flutists and cymbal players, drummers, players on Vankka and others of reputed instruments, with splendour and pageantry resounding the seven seas, the ladies arrived.23

Moreover, three vanniyar settled at Mukamalai. Maluvira malavarāyan and Maluvārāyan ‘who administered the land’ lived with the king in the town of Yāḷppāṇam ‘which resembled the city of Kuparān’.

Pupāḷa Vanniyan and the Kōptar lived in contentment at Kattukkalam and Tiriyāy; Villavārāyan lived at Nallūr. The members of the Matappalli community lived at Manipay; Kavarar, the Kömaṭṭi people and the Tillaimaviyirarav lived at Varaśināu. Civatāntar and the people of Ijaikkatū settled at Varavēṭtumālai. Tāṅtibrāyar lived at Tiriyāy Thirty Cāṇkamār, forty members of the group of Virāmūṭti and eight Tāṭar settled at Kerūṭāvīl. People of the Pāḷuvīl vauṇām, Paravar, Kucciliyar, Cōṇakār Vaciyar, Matavar and Akampāṭiyar reached Nukkarai. Tēvārāyana of the Kōva- jār Vamiyun, the faultless Kilaṅkattān, Kōṭītēvan and Kāntuvanattān became the chiefs of Cēṭikālam. Uṭṭūnaṅkaram lived at Panikānum. Cīṅkavāku went to Tūṇkāy; Nīlayinār went to Merpāṭrū; Camuṇṭamuṇṭi and his retinue lived at Kattukkalam and ‘wielded great power’.24


24. V.P., vv. 72-82.

Unlike its account of the first ruler, the account of the Vanniyar, as given in the Valiyāpāṭal appears to record some reliable traditions. This text seems to have been based on some earlier work because the author mentions that he is composing in Tamil the story formerly related by a person called Cūpatīṭu who may be identified as the person bearing the same name and mentioned as one of those who lived in the Vanni region after its conquest by the Vanniyar. Either Cūpatīṭu or one of his descendants may have composed a ballad extolling the martial prowess and feats of the Vanniyar which probably became the source for the Valiyāpāṭal.

The fact that the author is giving a long list of names of chiefs who conquered the Vanni principalties and specifically mentions the places conquered by them may suggest that he is recording an authentic tradition. The Vanniyar and their retinue, according to this text, came from Madurāi, Marunțiṉ, Tirukkōvalur, Tūṽvṛi māṉ and many other places in the Tamil country in India. The account also presupposes that the Vanniyar conquest of Āṭañkapparāṭu and the Tamil settlements which followed it consisted of many stages spread over a considerably long period of time.

It is claimed that the Vanniyar came in two groups during the reign of the first king of Jaffna. The first group is said to have come with the princess from Madurāi and when the king ordered them to conquer and occupy Āṭañkapparāṭu the Vanniyar went and encamped there. On realizing that they did not have sufficient resources to subjugate the people living there, the Vanniyar ate said to have appealed to some of the Chieftains in the Tamil country for reinforcements. Tradition claims that another army led by Vanniyar chiefs came to the island in response to that appeal. Notable among those who came with this army were the Malavar chiefs. The Kaiṟiyamalai also testifies that there were many Malavar chiefs serving under Ceyavīran, the first king of the
Ārya cakravartti dynasty. In its list of chiefs who arrived from Madurai in the second group of Vanniyar, the Vaiyāpatāl mentions the heroic and powerful ruler of the region of Četu' who may be identified as an Ārya Čakravarti. The reference to the ruler of Četu, as found in the Vaiyāpatāl is of particular importance because it suggests that the traditions incorporated in the Vaiyāpatāl mostly relate to the period of the Ārya cakravarti's invasion(s) of the island. Such a conclusion seems to be reinforced by the consideration that the groups of Vanniyar chiefs are said to have come to Jaffna under the leadership of those who proudly proclaimed themselves to be of the Ārya vanicam, and who were of the royal family of Madurai. Moreover, the Vaiyāpatāl claims that Attimāppān, Maḷaṟuvariyān who became the lord of Yālppaṇam lived with King.26 Presumably this chief is identical with Pāntimālavan who, as attested by the combined testimony of the Kāliyāmālai and the Yālppaṇa Vaṁsamanalai was ruling in Jaffna before he invited Cinkaiyāriyān. Thus, in a few respects, the Kāliyāmālai and the Vaiyāpatāl are corroborative and in any reconstruction of the history of the foundation of the Ārya cakravarti dynasty, the traditions of the Vaiyāpatāl have to be regarded as supplementary to those of the Kāliyāmālai. While the latter has as its main theme the arrival of the Cinkaiyāriyān and his organization of the administration of the areas which were under his direct rule, the Vaiyāpatāl gives an account of the Vanni principalties by warrior chiefs who came from South India, under the leadership of the Pāṇḍya generals during the late thirteenth century.

The text also provides interesting information on the political conditions which prevailed in Atānikappuṟu before it was conquered by the warrior chiefs some of whom were of Vanniya descent, who had come from the lands subject to Pāṇḍyas in South India. The picture that emerges from the account is one of instability and a total absence of any central authority. The land was divided into a number of small principalties dominated by leaders of many military groups and other communities. The Vanniyar conquerors are said to have met with some resistance from local chieftains and military support had to be secured from the Tamil country to put down the resistance. The local chieftains whose resistance was sporadic and uncoordinated were eventually defeated and displaced by the warrior chiefs who came in substantial numbers from the Pāṇḍya kingdom and were under the guidance of the kings of Jaffna.

The Vanniyar conquest of Atānikappuṟu is said to have been followed by the settlement of a large number of Tamils and other Dravidians belonging to a number of functional castes. Large scale migrations from South India into the Vanni principalties around this time seems to have completed the process of the transformation of these principalties into predominantly Tamil speaking areas. It would appear that the social organization and cultural traditions characteristic of the Tamil society in the Vanni principalties had already developed by the fourteenth century. The warrior chiefs who acquired power and authority over the Vanni principalties held them in a sort of feudal tenure under the overlordship of the kings of Jaffna.

The Vanniyar conquest and the Tamil settlements which resulted from it, as described in the Vaiyāpatāl, were not confined only to Panākkāmam, Melpparru, Muliḷiyavaḷ, Cetikulam and Kārikʔaṃmunāḷ which were included within 'Jaffna pattanam' but had spread up to such divisions as Kantaḷay, Kōtiyāram, Tiriyay, Kattukkulam, Tampalakāmam and Tirukōnnumañē in the North eastern littoral. The Vaiyāpatāl account suggests that the Tamil settlements in the Vanni principalities of the northern and eastern parts of the island had developed as a homogeneous society bound together by common socio-economic and religious-cultural traditions after the rise of the Ārya cakravartti to power in Jaffna. The Tamil society in these regions had become an aggregate of agrarian and seafaring communities supported by a hierarchy of mercantile, artisan and service castes.
VAROTAYA CINKAIYARIYAN

The account of the successors of Cinkaiyariyan as recorded in the Yalpana Vaijyavatamai may be summarized here. Towards the end of his reign Cinkaiyariyan caused his son Kulacekkara Cinkaiyariyan to be crowned. This new king who had a peaceful reign reformed the administration and was liked by his subjects. He was succeeded by Kuloottunga, Cinkaiyariyan who increased the extent of arable lands and found new sources of revenue: the people lived with contentment during his benign and peaceful reign. In the reign of his successor, Vikkrama Cinkaiyariyan, there arose a great religious dispute between the Tamils and Sinhalese. The king is said to have imprisoned one Punchi Banda and seventeen others who had killed some persons and injured several others. In consequence the king was disliked by the Sinhalese on the ground of partiality towards his Tamil subjects. Varotaya Cinkaiyariyan, who succeeded him, promulgated certain edicts concerning religious observances, established amity between his Tamil and Sinhalese subjects and handed over the responsibilities of the administration to Marttanta Cinkaiyariyan towards the end of the reign. Marttanta made efforts to improve agriculture and contributed towards the advancement of learning; moreover, he suppressed the rebellions caused by the Vanniyar. As this king treated his subjects with generosity and showed great interest in their welfare his death was greatly bemoaned by his Tamil and Sinhalese subjects. On his death his son Kupapusana Cinkaiyariyan was consecrated as king. This ruler surpassed his father in benevolence, reformed the administration and made efforts to promote agriculture and learning. When he became very old he abdicated and died some years later. During the rule of his successor, Virotaya Cinkaiyariyan, there occurred rebellions caused by the Sinhalese. The king subdued the rebels and, on realizing that they had been instigated by the Vanniyar, raided the seven divisions of the Vanni and returned after completely subduing the chief tains. On his return, the Sinhalese who had revolted earlier submitted and the king pardoned them and extended favours.

At that time, the enemies of Cantiracekkara Panniyan had succeeded in driving him out of Madurai and wrested the government of his kingdom. The Paudyas king who had fled from his capital, Madurai, sought the help of Virotaya Cinkaiyariyan. The latter assembled the scattered Paudyas forces, placed them under the ruler of Cetti and other feudatories, and led them together with his own forces to Madurai. entered that city and restored the government to the Paudyas after dislodging his foes.

On the return of the king rumours abounded that he intended to raid the Vanni once again. The terrified Vanniyar approached the king of Kandy and asked for aid. That king, however, did not want to incur the hostility of the king of Jaffna and refrained from helping the Vanniyar. Therefore, the chiefs of the Vanni brought much treasure as presents to the king of Jaffna and returned after being assured of their safety. This king died young under suspicious circumstances. His successors were Ceyavira Cinkaiyariyan and Kupavira Cinkaiyariyan respectively. As the kings of Kandy ceased to pay tribute, Kupavira Cinkaiyariyan conquered parts of their kingdom and settled his subjects in the newly acquired territories. Moreover, he assisted the Nayakkars who were ruling Madurai. After having ruled with great renown like his father, he abdicated when he was enfeebled by age. His son Kanakactiriya Cinkaiyariyan succeeded him. 1

1. YVAF, pp. 35-40
The foregoing account of the dynastic history is extremely brief except in the case of Virōtaya Niṅkaīyariyana. In its brevity this account resembles those of the Rājvālīya and the Cikavamsa concerning the Sinhalese kings of the fourteenth century but unlike these chronicles the Viḷppvā Viṇipavamālai does not even say for how many years each Cikaiyariyana ruled. Adapting the Viḷppvā Viṇipavamālai account, Rasamayakam reconstructs the dynastic list of the Cikaiyariyana in the following manner.²

Vijaya Kulaṅkaic Cakkavaṛtta ace 1210 A.D.  
Kulaṅkaic Cikaiyariyana " 1256 A.D.  
Kikrīma Cikaiyariyana " 1279 A.D.  
Virōtaya Cikaiyariyana " 1302 A.D.  
Marṭṭanṭa Cikaiyariyana " 1325 A.D.  
Kanakamānva Cikaiyariyana " 1348 A.D.  
Virōtaya Cikaiyariyana " 1371 A.D.  
Ceyavīra Cikaiyariyana " 1394 A.D.  
Kugavīra Cikaiyariyana " 1380 A.D. or more probably 1417 A.D.  
Kanakacūriya Cikaiyariyana " 1410 A.D. or more probably 1440 A.D.

This list has to be revised on account of several reasons. Firstly, as seen earlier, the view that Kalinga Māgha was the first Arya Cakravarttī cannot be upheld.³ Moreover Cikaiyariyana I, presumably, ruled towards the end of the thirteenth century and not during the early part of that century. Secondly, as there is reason to believe that Ceyavīra Cikaiyariyana was the first and not the ninth king of the dynasty, it has to be assumed that there were only nine kings (not ten as stated in the chronicle), before Sapumal’s conquest. Furthermore, the accession of these kings does not seem to have taken place in the same order as found in the chronicle. In respect of these considerations it would appear that the chronicle has drawn the dynastic list without any regard to chronology. In the circumstances any attempt to fix the date of accession of each king on conjectural grounds will be futile.

Of the ten kings who are said to have ruled until A.D. 1450 only four are known from sources other than the Viḷppvā Viṇipavamālai, the Kaliyamalai attests that Cikaiyariyan I had the name Ceyavīra. In agreement with the Viḷppvā Viṇipavamālai, the Vaiṭṭapal mentions that Kanakacūriya Cikaiyariyana fled from the kingdom when it was invaded by the Sinhalese. The ruler named Varotaya Cikaiyariyana is known from the Cekara-Cekaramalai. As Marṭṭanṭa Cikaiyariyana of the Viḷppvā Viṇipavamālai has been identified with Marṭṭanṭa perumal of the Maṭṭalava inscription it may be concluded that Marṭṭanṭa Cikaiyariyana was a contemporary of Vikramabahu III (A.D. 1356-74).⁴ According to the Viḷppvā Viṇipavamālai the predecessor of Marṭṭanṭa Cikaiyariyana was Varotaya Cikaiyariyana. Since he is said to have been a contemporary of the Pāṇḍya king Varotaya Cikaiyariyana must have ruled during the early fourteenth century. As regards the other five kings who are known only from the Viḷppvā Viṇipavamālai even the approximate dates of their reigns cannot be determined particularly in view of the fact that the chronicle cannot be relied on.

The defects of the Viḷppvā Viṇipavamālai are not confined to chronology and genealogical details. Several kings are credited with having reformed the administration, improved agriculture and promoted learning but the specific contribution of no king in any of these fields is recorded in the chronicle; for instance during the reign of Marṭṭanṭa Cikaiyariyana the Sinhalese king ruling at Gampola was made tributary to the Arya Cakravarttī but the chronicle does not state any thing concerning the relations between this Arya Cakravarttī and the ruler of Gampola. However, the Viḷppvā

³. See Chapter VIII  
⁴. See chapter XI
Vaiapavamalai contends that Kunavira Chinkaiyariyan attacked the ruler of Kannji for having failed to send tribute, and conquered parts of his kingdom. Here it is not possible to ascertain whether the chronicle is recording a reliable tradition or whether it is attributing to the reign of Kunavira Chinkaiyariyan the events of another reign.

The history of the reign of Varotaya Chinkaiyariyan could be reconstructed in broad outline from the evidence of the two texts, namely, the Cekaracekaramalai and the Cekaracekaram which were written during his time. Although the references in these texts are casual they shed some light on both the internal conditions of the kingdom and its external relations. They are also of considerable importance for ascertaining the authenticity of the Yalppana Vaiapavamalai.

Much confusion has been created as to the identity of Varotaya Chinkaiyariyan by writers who depended primarily on the evidence of the Yalppana Vaiapavamalai. Although the author of the Cekaracekaramalai expressly states that his patron was the Chinkaiyariyan called Varotaya, Gnanapragasa who failed to notice this, has freely used the data of this work for elaborating his account of Ceyavira Chinkaiyariyan whom he erroneously calls Cekaracekaram V. Consequently most of his conclusions are untenable. According to the Yalppana Vaiapavamalai Varotaya Chinkaiyariyan was the fifth ruler of the dynasty and was the predecessor of Marriyaga Chinkaiyariyan. The Chronicle only mentions that Varotaya Chinkaiyariyan promulgated edicts concerning religious observances and established amity between his Tamil and Sinhalese subjects.

5. YVM, P. 43. The author of this Chronicle who lived in the 18th century seems to have assumed that the Sinhalese who ruled in the 14th and 15th centuries were also ruling from Kandy.


7. YVM, pp. 49, 95

8. YVM, p. 37.

9. ibid.

VAROTAYA CINKAIYARIYAN

After alluding to the achievements of his ancestors, the Cekaracekaramalai gives the following account of Varotayan. This king who was favoured by the Goddess of Victory and ruled the kingdom with a fame even greater than that of his predecessors, pursued with his army of swords-men and routed the victorious and spear-armed Vatakkar at the "harbour" of Kaceay. On seeing the king Mara (the Pandyaya ruler) losing his crown, he gave him herds of formidable elephants and much gold as aid. Moreover, he gave a principality to the king of the people of Emattai and also bestowed on him riches, a cavalry force and honoured him with a title. He received gold and elephants as tribute from other rulers.

The foregoing account refers to four distinct events of the reign. The first is the defeat of Cekaracekaram’s enemies at Kaceay. The second is the assistance he rendered to the Pandyaya king. The third is the payment of tribute to Varotayan by other kings. The last is the investiture of the ‘king’ of the people of Emattai as ruler of a new principality. Before examining the historical significance of these details, the account of Varotayan Chinkaiyariyan as found in the Yalppana Vaiapavamalai may be scrutinised as there is reason to believe that the Chronicler has confused events relating to the reign of Varotayan Chinkaiyariyan with those of the time of Virotayan Chinkaiyariyan. On the face of it the account of Virotayan Chinkaiyariyan as found in the chronicle does not contain any thing improbable. Nevertheless, a careful examination would reveal that in certain respects, the account is inaccurate. Inscriptions do not show that a king named Cantiracekara Paniyiam ever ruled the Pandyaya kingdom. However, the Madura statepurayan mentions Cantiracekaranpaniyiam among the last rulers in its list of Pandyaya kings. As he is mentioned in two independent traditions, Cantiracekara Paniyiam was in all probability a

10. CCM, rv. 7 - 9

historical figure. Cankaiyarayan may have been one of the titles of a Pandya monarch who lived in the early fourteenth century. However, if Varotaya Cinkaiyariyan was the ninth king as stated in the Yatippaya Vaipavanamalai he could not have been a contemporary of any Pandya king who ruled from Madurai. He must have ruled during the fourteenth century whereas the last Pandya king was ousted from Madurai around A.D. 1323/4. Thus it is clear that the chronicle is relating events without regard to chronology. Moreover, it has to be assumed that in this particular instance the author of the chronicle is attributing to Virotaya Cinkaiyariyan the achievements of Varotaya Cinkaiyariyan. However, the evidence of the Cekaraceekaramalai, a contemporary work, establishes that it was Varotaya Cinkaiyariyan who gave aid to the Pandya king. The details given in the chronicle concerning the Cinkaiyariyan may be regarded as an embellishment of the statements in the Cekaraceekaramalai. Nevertheless, the accounts of these sources have to be interpreted with caution because they are likely to exaggerate the achievements of the Arya Cakkavarti; the claim that the Pandya king came to Jaffna as a refugee and sought aid from the ruler there seems to be a fanciful one. It may perhaps be assumed that Varotaya Cinkaiyariyan went to Madurai with a view to provide support to his suzerain, the Pandya monarch, when his power and authority in the Pandya kingdom was undermined by his enemies.

Varotaya Cinkaiyariyan's involvement in the affairs of the Pandya kingdom must have taken place between A.D. 1310 and A.D. 1323. For it was during these years that the kingdom suffered political instability. Towards the end of his reign Maravarman Kulasekara chose as his successor Vira Pandya although he was a son not born of the principal queen. The legitimate heir Sundara Pandya, who

was a son of the king by the chief queen, was not reconciled to the loss of his throne; he revolted in about A.D. 1310 to vindicate his claims. In the fratricidal war which followed the kingdom was divided. Vira Pandya succeeded in maintaining his authority over the northern part of the kingdom from 'Birdhul' in Cola maqalal while Sundara Pandya occupied Madurai and brought under his power most of Panchamalal and other dependencies in the south.

In A.D. 1311, after effecting the submission of the Hoysala ruler Ballala III and taking advantage of the dissensions in the Pandya kingdom, Malik Kafur proceeded towards it with a desire to secure its wealth. But the Pandya Princes, unlike other kings, did not shut themselves in forts which might easily be captured. They avoided open battle with the superior forces of the enemy and resorted to a sort of guerrilla warfare. This strategy ultimately exhausted the invaders, and Malik Kafur failed to secure the submission of the Pandya princes. Vira Pandya left Birdhul before it fell into Muslim hands. After sacking Birdhul and burning the temples of Chidambaram and Srirangam, Malik Kafur made a sudden descent on Madurai, the main capital of the Pandyas, and the seat of Sundara Pandya but that prince had already fled with his treasures. Chagrined at finding nothing but a few elephants, the invaders set fire to the temple of Cakkamatha. Shortly afterwards Malik Kafur suffered a reverse at the hands of Vitrama Pandya, the uncle of Sundara Pandya. After the return of Malik Kafur, the two Pandya princes ruled independently of each other. In 1316 the Cera king Ravivarman Kulasekharar who

15. The Delhi Sultanate, p. 36.
17. Ravivarman Kulasekharar ruled in Travancore with Quilon as his capital. He came to power about A.D. 1311-1312 and was almost the only South Indian monarch left untouched by the storm of Malik Kafur's raid. This immunity left him at an advantage over his neighbours when Malik Kafur returned to Delhi. See K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, The Pandyan Kingdom, p. 211-212;
had a meteoric career of expansion reduced both Pāṇḍya rulers to the position of tributaries. Later around 1325 the Pāṇḍyas were ousted from Madurai which was occupied by the forces of the Delhi Sultan.

According to the Cekarācekkaramālai, this king conferred a title on the chief of the people of Ēmattai and gave him horses and a principality to rule. Gnanapragasār conjectures that the Ēmattaiyaṇiyan had supported the ruler of Madurai against the attacks of the Čera king. However, Sundara Pāṇḍya is not known to have been ousted from Madurai as a result of the Čera invasion. Furthermore, as there is no conclusive evidence to prove that the Ārya Cakravartti supported the Pāṇḍya against the Čera king the other possibilities need not be precluded. Sundara Pāṇḍya had recovered Madurai twice, once from his brother Vīra Pāṇḍya and again after the retreat of Malik Kafur. The civil war as well as the invasion from Delhi would have involved the Pāṇḍya feudatories. The Ārya Cakravartti who was one among them must have been required to assist his overlord. The statements in the Cekarācekkaramālai, concerning Varōtayan’s benefactions to king Māraṇ have to be regarded as an allusion to the part he played in some campaigns on the request of Sundara Pāṇḍya.

The account of the Cekarācekkaramālai concerning Varōtayan’s triumph over the army of the Vāṭakkar is corroborated by the testimony of another contemporary work, the Cekarācekkaram. The author of the text states that he dissected the bodies of the Vāṭakkar who were slain by the victorious Cekarācekkaram, and that he measured the nerves, veins, muscles, bones and other elements of anatomy, in order to clear his doubts. On the correlated testimony of these two contemporary sources, it may be concluded that Varōtaya Cinhaiyariyan routed an enemy force of Vāṭakkar at some stage of his reign. The Cekarācekkaramālai adds that this battle took place at the port of Kaccāy. As the port of Kaccāy was the scene of the conflict it is likely that the king had to face an invasion from outside.

According to the Cekarācekkaramālai, this king conferred a title on the chief of the people of Ēmattai and gave him horses and a principality to rule. Gnanapragasār suggests that Ēmattaiya is a textual corruption of Ēmattaiya; on the basis of this suggestion it has been assumed that the Cekarācekkaramālai account is a reference to the appointment of a chieftain for Ēmattaiya. In their lists of the Vanni Chieftaincies the Vaiyāpātā and the Vaiya do not mention Ēmattaiya. Nevertheless, there is a popular belief that it was once the centre of a chieftaincy. Yet, the identification of Ēmattaiya mentioned in this work with Ēmattaiya cannot be regarded as established. As the king gave the chief horses and a principality to govern and conferred on him a title, it is clear that the account refers to the creation of a feudatory chieftaincy. It is probable that this was intended as a measure of reward on the king’s part for a chief who had remained loyal and rendered assistance in some campaigns. Some of the chieftains of the Vanni were of a rebellious disposition and the Ārya Cakravarttis had, at times, elicited their submission by a show of strength. It is claimed that the Vanniyar chiefs rebelled against the king in the reign of Mārttaṇṭa Cinhaiyariyan but their power was crushed by the king’s forces. As seen earlier, Viroṭaya Cinhaiyariyan is said to have conducted campaigns in the Vanni and subdued the chieftains. It would appear that the Vanniyar made several attempts to defy the authority of the Ārya Cakravartti and refused the payment of tribute. Varōtaya Cinhaiyari-
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yan's creation of a new chieftaincy was in all probability connected to his activities against the rebellious chieftains.

The Cekarâcacakaramâlai, the Cekarâcacakaram and the Taksânakalâcacapurânam contain references that provide an insight into the power and personality of the king. The last of these texts states that Cekarâcacakaram vanquished the kings of other lands, defeated his enemies in various regions of 'South Ceylon' and 'brought the whole land under one umbrella.' The Cekarâcacakaramâlai mentions that other kings who wore crowns set with gems presented heaps of gold and elephants as tribute to the famous Cekarâcacakaram who rules the whole land surrounded by the roaring ocean.

In a similar vein, the Cekarâcacakaram in its section dealing with snake poisoning describes the king as: Cekarâcacakaram, the king of the Āriyar, to whom the crowned kings of Ceylon measure tribute of gold, rules with justice from Cînkai. Besides, all these texts refer to his victories over enemies. The medical work, Cekarâcacakaram, refers to the speedy dispersal of the enemies who opposed the Cînkaiyâriyan, Cekarâcacakaram. The Cekarâcacakaramâlai alludes to the king as the unique and victorious king of the Āriya dynasty and it proclaims that the enemies who were vanquished by the prowess of his arms pay tribute to

the king Cekarâcacakaram, the king of the people of Manava which is espoused by the roaring waves of the sea. Yet, in another context this text refers to the rapid defeat of the enemies of king Cekarâcacakaram. As three contemporary works refer almost in similar vein to the speedy victories of the Cînkaiyâriyan against his enemies it may be assumed that the king fought several wars during his reign and that he eventually succeeded in maintaining his authority within the kingdom and in the meanwhile enhanced his reputation. It may be recalled that the Cekarâcacakaramâlai alludes repeatedly to the increasing fame of the king as well as to his opulence and prosperity. Except in the case of the war against the Vatâkkar at the port of Kaceiy the contemporary texts do not specifically mention who the king's adversaries were. Probably some of them were local chieftains within the kingdom, who sought to repudiate their allegiance to the ruler of Cînkai.

The nature of the political conditions in the island during the early fourteenth century may perhaps suggest that the claim, made in contemporary Tamil works, that the crowned kings of Ceylon paid tribute to Cekarâcacakaram have some foundation. During this period when the Aryan cakravattis consolidated their power in North Ceylon, the descendants of Vijayabahu III who were ruling from Kurunagala could not retain what had been achieved by the first two rulers of Dambadeniya. Political instability within the kingdom and external invasions led to a further decline of the Sinhalese kingdom. Traditional Sinhalese history, however, does not throw light on the relations between the two principal kingdoms in the island during the first half of the fourteenth century.

At Kurunagala Bhuvenekabahu II (1291-1302) was succeeded by his son Parâkramabahu IV otherwise called Pangita Parâkramabahu who on the testimony of the Cârâcôttâmalai ascended the throne in A.D. 1302/3. As the Dalâda

22. ibid., p. 42
23. ibid., p. 43
24. CCP, V. 10
25. ibid., p. 48
26. CCM, V. 270
27. CCM, V. 269

This work was completed and recited at the court of Parâkramabahu in the year (Saka) 1232 (A.D. 1310) which was the seventh regnal year of the king,
Siriya, which was completed in A. D. 1326, refers to him as the reigning monarch, Parâkramabahú continued to rule at least until that year.29

The Culavamsa, the Dalada Siriya and the Caracettimâlaka eulogise him as a powerful monarch but none of these texts throws light on the political conditions of his time.30 Most of the activities of Parâkramabahû were confined to the southern and south western parts of the island.31 It may, however, be assumed that he exercised authority over most if not all of the territories that belonged to Parâkramabahû II.

The Kuruangâla vistara and the Maçavala copper plate of Saka 1677 contain information not found in other sources concerning this king. According to the former Anurâdhapura was laid desolate by the invasions of the people of Yâpâpattana and because of this reason Parâkramabahû shifted his residence to Kurunagala.32 It may be assumed, on the testimony of this work, that at sometime during Parâkramabahû’s reign the frontier provinces of his kingdom were attacked by the Arya Cakravarti’s forces. This may have been one of the wars fought by Varotaya Cinkaiyariyan.

The reverses of Parâkramabahû IV probably weakened his authority and set the stage for the rebellion of Bodâ Mappaçaundâ. The Maçavala copper plate mentions that the members of the Sangha fled in several directions when lord Parâkramabahû of the city of Kurunagala was treacherously murdered.33 This rebellion was presumably accompanied by violence which led to greater political instability. This event eliminated the Dambadeni dynasty founded by Vijayabahû III and also signalled the failure to consolidate royal authority in frontier provinces of the kingdom.

The Sinhalese kingdom continued to decline after Parâkramabahû IV and his two successors, Vanni Bhuvanekâ-bahû and Vijayabahû V, are mere names in traditional history. The fall of the Dambadeni dynasty and the decline of the Sinhalese kingdom coincided with the growth of Arya Cakravarti’s power and paved the way for his ascendency during the Gampola period. Moreover, it is not improbable that Varotaya Cinkaiyariyan exacted tribute, as claimed by

29. Dalada Siriya edited by Vajira Lelinkasuriya, Colombo, 1949, See Introduction, p. XL. The tradition that Parâkramabahû IV ruled for 20 years, as found in some versions of the Rajavaliya, is apparently an authentic one. Refer JRAAS, Vol. XXXII, No. 86, p. 200.
30. C.V., 90: 64–103; S.S., p. 47. The Caracettimâlaka mentions that he defeated the Cetan and obtained many victories in battles. It further claims: “the king who was the embodiment of valorance, courtly and justico possessed an army of a thousand formidable elephants and became the peer of Indra in consequence of the performance of devotional rites to the sage who is resplendent on account of his compassion.” See Rajýâram, vv. 3–4.
31. He renovated the building in the Vihâra at Tithâgâma (Tutangama); at Vâlapura (Devendara) he built a large temple consisting of two storeys. He constructed at Valligama (Weligama) a large arâkkhâ which was named after him. Moreover, he constructed a Vihâra at Rajâgrâma (Rajigama). Furthermore, he established a new town, Mâyiya, (Miyâvâka), surrounded with walls and gateways and in that town he caused to be built a lofty Vihâra temple. C.V., 90: 88–91, 94–96, 98–102.
32. British Museum Oriental Manuscript (Or) 5012, folio 10a.

The Nâranabaddha inscription of an unidentified Parâkramabahû indicates that there was an invasion of Mâyârâja by a Tuhul army. Bell identified the ruler referred to in this record with Parâkramabahû II on account of the fact that Parâkramabahû prithêva is mentioned in that record. However, an inscription of that name was established by Parâkramabahû IV also. Palaeographically the record can be of either king. See UCHC Vol. I, pt. II, p. 634
the Cekaraeekaram from either Parakramabahu IV or his successors. Indeed, the Yalppana Vaipavamalai contends that the successors of Parakramabahu (III) paid tribute to the ruler of Jaffna. 34

The Cekaraeekaramalai attests that Varotayan had borne the epithet Cetuvaavan. 35 He is described also as Manavai Ariya Varotayan and as the king of the people of Manavai jirdled by the white foams arising from the long and roaring waves of the ocean. 36 Manavai is a locality in Rammad and because the Arya Cakravartti has been described as 'the king of the people of Manavai' and as 'the guardian of Cetu', Gnanapragasar argues that Ramaseswara was under the rule of the kings of Jaffna. Yet, the use of such epithets and titles by the kings of Jaffna may not necessarily imply that they continued to exercise authority over the localities called Cetu and Manavai. It could also be argued that these epithets and titles were only indicative of their connections with such localities in the distant past. The kings of Jaffna could have continued to use epithets and titles which their ancestors had acquired while being local chieftains in the Pandy kingdom even after having lost all authority over their ancestral domain in the south-eastern corner of the Tamil country in India.

Some inscription recording the construction of the principal shrines at Ramaseswara by a king of Jaffna, Paramarajasekaran, in Saka 1336 (A.D. 1414) are said to have been found on the base of the chief shrine there. The stones used for this purpose are said to have been hewn at Trincomalee, numbered on the spot and then transported to Ramaseswara. Yet, the construction of buildings at Ramaseswara by a king of Jaffna may not conclusively prove that the Arya Cakravartti exercised political control over that region. In the early years of the fifteenth century, the kingdom of Jaffna was under Vijayanagara suzerainty and it would not have been difficult for the king of Jaffna to undertake works of piety at Ramaseswara. The evidence from these inscriptions may only show that even in the fifteenth century the Arya Cakravarttiis considered that they had an obligation for the maintenance of the shrines at Ramaseswara.

As regards the reign of Varotaya Chinikairyiyan it may be observed that it witnessed considerable literary and cultural activity in the kingdom. Moreover, his reign may be regarded as marking a distinct phase in the development of the kingdom. The achievements of Chinikairyiyan I were consolidated, the rebellious Vanni chieftains were subdued and the stage was set for the expansion of the kingdom. Varotaya Chinikairyiyan may be regarded as one of the great and powerful rulers of the dynasty.

According to the Yalppana Vaipavamalai, Varotaya Chinikairyiyan was the fifth ruler of the dynasty and was the predecessor of Maritita Chinikairyiyan, a contemporary of Vikramabahu III. The Cekaraeekaramalai testifies that he was a contemporary of a Pandy monarch. The last Pandy king who ruled from Madurai was ousted in A.D. 1323 by the forces of the Delhi Sultan. Therefore, Varotayan must have begun to rule in the second decade of the fourteenth century. In all probability he was the Arya Cakravartti described by Ibn Battuta. The disintegration of the Pandy kingdom particularly after the occupation of Madurai by the Muslims must have had repercussions on the power and position of the Arya Cakravartti. The fall of the suzerain power presumably relieved him of his obligations to his overlords and terminated his intimate political ties with South India and brought him to the threshold of independence and sovereignty. While most of the feudatories of the Pandy kingdom either perished or were obscured in the political turbulences that ensued the fall of the Pandy dynasty, the Arya Cakravartti firmly entrenched themselves in the newly found home in North Ceylon, consolidated their conquests and began to pursue a policy of commercial expansion.
The Arya cakravarttis and the kings of Gampola

On the decline and fall of the Pandyas in South India the Arya cakravarttis of Jaffna secured a mastery over the pearl fisheries in the Gulf of Mannar and the trade of the Indo-Ceylon straits both of which were in a very flourishing condition. They soon developed their power to its peak by exploiting the advantages they had thus gained and the kingdom of Jaffna developed into a maritime power of some importance. Besides, this kingdom enjoyed a great measure of security from external raids until the Vijayanagara conquest of the Tamil country around A.D. 1370.

In 1344 the ruler of Jaffna, unexpectedly, had a distinguished visitor to his court in the person of Ibn Battuta, one of the most accomplished and widely travelled men of the Islamic world. The vivid and interesting account about this king as found in the Rehla of Ibn Battuta throws some light on the power and personality of the Arya cakravarti of the time. Ibn Battuta, who had come to the island from South India by sea with the object of going on pilgrimage to Adam's Peak, had his journey interrupted by an outbreak of violent storms while his vessel was cruising along the west coast of the island. He was compelled to break journey and disembark at 'Baṭṭāḥah', a port town where the Tamil king was residing at that time. Before his disembarkation at Baṭṭāḥah, Ibn Battuta was told by the captain of his ship that the Arya cakravarti was a 'perverse' and 'unjust man, who owned a pirate fleet and that merchants cannot enter his lands in full security. Yet, the captain failed to dissuade Ibn Battuta from seeking shelter at Baṭṭāḥah. On being informed by his agents of the arrival of Ibn Battuta, the brother-in-law of the Sultan of Madura, the Arya cakravarti sent for him. When he reached Baṭṭāḥah Ibn Battuta was received by the king with honour worthy of his rank and the former found the Arya cakravarti to be of a friendly and hospitable disposition. The king is said to have understood Persian and enjoyed thoroughly all that his guest told him of foreign kings and countries.

One day when he interviewed the Arya cakravarti, the latter had near him a large quantity of pearls brought from the fisheries of his kingdom. The king's officers were sorting them according to variety. The king who was keen to know about the pearl fisheries in other parts of the world was much delighted when Ibn Battuta told him that the pearls he had seen in the islands of Qais, Kish and other places were of an inferior kind.

2. Different views have been expressed on the identification of Baṭṭāḥah. Tennant (Ceylon, Vol. I, p. 607) and Gnanapagaṇam identify it with Batticaloa and believes that Mannar-mondali was a fine town on the estuary of the Sultan's (Arya cakravarti's) dominion. As the Nīkāra Sāṅgahāya concludes its list of Mahā's fortifications with Mannar and Maṅgali, Paramanivana contends that Mannar Maṅgali of Rehla has to be identified with Mannar. On the basis of this assumption Paramanivana attempts to prove that Baṭṭāḥah mentioned in the Rehla is identical with yaḷḷipēḷappam. But, the Nīkāra Sāṅgahāya conveys the impression that Maṅgali and Maṅgali were two different Places. The island of Mannar is separated from the mainland. Paramanivana chooses to ignore the fact that Ibn Battuta reached Maṅg-mondali by land.

(Continued)
Ibn Battuta claims to have found the whole coast of Battalíah covered with trunks of cinnamon trees. These trees which were heaped on the shore are said to have resembled hillocks and the tracers of Mabar and Malabar took them and in return presented cloth and other commodities to the Arya cakravartti. On another occasion Ibn Battuta found a large bowl of rubies in the possession of this king and when he expressed his surprise at its size and quality the king told him that he had several such rubies even larger than the one he had shown him.9

The Arya cakravartti was powerful at sea. Ibn Battuta testifies that he had seen a hundred of the Arya cakravartti’s vessels of varying sizes on the Mabar coast. Once they had attempted to seize some vessels belonging to the Sultan of Madura; the attempt was foiled by the Sultan’s agents who took effective precautions to prevent their seizure. When the attempt failed the Arya cakravartti’s ships are said to have sailed in the direction of Yemen.

The Rehla of Ibn Battuta suggests that the Arya cakravartti endeavoured to promote commerce between his kingdom and foreign countries and had even made considerable progress in that direction. He maintained a fleet of trading vessels and presumably had direct dealings with foreign merchants. Besides, he was involved in the trade in cinnamon which had become one of his principal exports. Although cinnamon was not produced in the northern part of the island the ruler of Jaffna was in partial control of the island’s trade in cinnamon and one of the ports under his control Battalíah, was the centre of a flourishing trade in that commodity around 1344.

Marcus Polo found ‘Bastolar’ to be a centre where the divers assembled before they proceeded with the boats to gather the pearl oysters (The Book of Ser Marco Polo, Vol. II, p. 331). ‘Bastolar’ and Battalíah may be the corrupted forms of the name Battalíah.

6 In his letter to the Sultan Bhuvanakabahu said: “Ceylon is Egypt and Egypt is Ceylon. I desire that an Egyptian ambassador accompany me on my return and that another be sent to reside in the town of Aden. I possess a prodigious quantity of pearls and precious stones of every kind. I have vessels, elephants, mules, and other stuffs, wood of banyan (brazal wood) and cinnamon, and all the objects of commerce which are brought to you by the Indian merchants. My kingdom produces from the wood of which is fit for making spears. If the Sultan asks me for twenty vessels yearly, I shall be in a position to supply them. Further, the merchants of his dominions can with all freedom come to trade in my kingdom. I have received an ambassador of the province of Yemen who is come on the part of his master to make me proposals of alliance. But I have sent him away through my affection for the Sultan. I possess twenty-seven castles, of which the treasures are filled with precious stones of all kinds. The pearl fisheries are part of my dominions, and all that is taken therefore belongs to me.” JRAI, No. 72, pp. 82–85.

7. Foreign Notices of South India ed. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, Madras, p. 98.

A growing demand for cinnamon and other spices in West Asia and Europe around this time and the shifting of the centres of Sinhalese political power to localities in the wet-zone, where such spices were produced in large quantities, had led to a phenomenal growth of the island’s spice trade. It was but natural for the Sinhalese royalty to have moved into the spice producing regions in the hope of securing substantial revenue at a time when royal revenue from traditional sources, especially grain-tax, had become precariously low owing to the abandonment of most of the major irrigation works and depopulation in the once fertile and hospitable north-central plain. But the Sinhalese monarchy could not establish a centralised administration for a considerably long period of time. Nor did it produce princes endowed with qualities of leadership and ability for organization. Power was therefore exercised alternatively by dignitaries belonging to two influential families, the Alakesvaras and that of Senalankidhikara, who were of South Indian origin and had established matrimonial links with the Sinhalese royalty.

The transfer of the seat of royal authority was accompanied and even followed by dissolution at court as testified by Ibn Battuta: He claims that Kunakar was the residence of the principal sovereign of the country, the ‘Sultan’ Alkonar. Besides he provides the information which is not known from other sources, that the nobles of his kingdom rebelled against Alkonar, put out his eyes and elevated his son to kingship. But, the blinded ‘Sultan’ Alkonar continued to live in the same town. On the face of it Ibn Battuta’s description of Alkonar does not fit in with the facts concerning the Gampola rulers as recorded by the local chroniclers. Alkonar is described as emperor (Sultan ul kabir) of the country. Among the names of contemporary rulers and ministers as found in local sources—chronicles and inscriptions the one that bears closest resemblance to Alkonar is Alagakkoner.

A dignitary named Nissanka Alagakkonara is referred to in the Kit Sri Mevan Kelani inscription of the year 1887 of the (A.D. 1344) Buddhist era. He is described as Amayottama, ‘The best of Ministers’, and as a descendant in the tenth generation of Nissanka Alagakkonara who belonged to a family from Vaiicippula. The inscription which records the donations made by this dignitary to the Vihara does not mention the name or the regnal year of the reigning monarch. But, as it records that donations were received from the king also it is clear that a person other than Alagakkonara was the acknowledged king. Moreover, since Alagakkonara is described as a minister and not with any royal title in the inscription, it has to be assumed that he was functioning, theoretically, in the capacity of a chief minister. However, the emphasis on the genealogy of Alagakkonara and the absence of any reference to the name or regnal year of the king would suggest that as between the king and Alagakkonara the latter was the more dominant personality. It would appear that he exercised supreme power in the kingdom on behalf of the king who may have suffered from some physical debility or may have been a weak ruler incapable of discharging the responsibilities of office. Under such circumstances Ibn Battuta could have confused Alagakkonara with the monarch. Otherwise one has to assume that the king himself was an Alagakkonara by descent.

Inscriptions show that the regnal years of Bhuvenakabahu IV and Parakramabahu V were counted from 1344 when
Gampola became the residence of the principal king. It is possible that the inauguration of the rule of these two kings was connected with the rebellion against Alkonar. Under Bhuwanekabahu and Paranamaabahu V the dignitary called Samaelakadikara of the Megavara clan was raised to the rank of chief minister\(^{11}\) and it would appear that his authority and influence were the most decisive in matters regarding the administration of the kingdom.

Kunakar, the capital of the kingdom, is said to have been situated between two mountains on a large vale called the 'Vale of rubies'.\(^ {12}\) It cannot be identified with any degree of certainty owing to the unprecise nature of its description as found in the Rehla. Arguments adduced in support of identifying it with Kurunagala, Rayigama or Ratnapura are not convincing.\(^ {13}\) Even Gampola could have been referred to as Kunakar and the vague description of this town as found in the Rehla could be applicable to Gampola which had become the centre of Sinhalese political power in 1344. Ibn Battuta may not have remembered the exact name of the city where Alkonar was residing, when the Rehla was written. It is even probable that Ibn Juazzay who wrote the Rehla on the dictation of Ibn Battuta, misspelt or distorted the name and recorded it as Kunakar.

On account of internal dissensions and the weakness of its rulers the government at Gampola could not consolidate its power over the entire kingdom and especially over the western littoral, and at this time Colombo was occupied by a Muslim chieftain referred to by Ibn Battuta as 'Tabasti'. Taking advantage of such circumstances the Arya cakravartti


\(^{12}\) The Rehla .... pp. 219–220.


\(^{14}\) Foreign Notices on South India, ed. K. A. Nilakantha Sastri Madras 1939, pp. 276, 291.

was soon able to secure a controlling influence over the Gampola kingdom as testified by the Raja Valiya. As regards the political developments in Sri Lanka during the mid fourteenth century this text asserts: 'The nephew of Paranamaabahu was living at Gampola; the minister Alagakonara was living at Rayigama; the Arya cakravartti was at Yapaluna. Among them the Arya cakravartti was the foremost in wealth and military power and was (therefore) levying tribute from the hill country, the low country and the nine ports.'\(^ {15}\) This account of the Raja Valiya is, in its main points, corroborated by another Sinhalese text, the Nikaya Sangrahaya written in 1369.\(^ {16}\)

The claims made in the Sinhalese chronicles about the Arya cakravartti's supremacy in the island around this time are strikingly confirmed by the evidence from two inscriptions. The first of these inscriptions—the Tamil inscription from Kotagama—which records the victories of a king of Jaffna over the armies of his rivals runs: 'Cetu, The young and tender women of Anuradha, who did not submit to the Aryan of Cikainakar of foaming and resounding waters, shed tears from the pairs of their lance-shaped eyes and spread their fore-head marks on their beautiful bracelet hands that resemble lotuses.'\(^ {17}\)

The text of this inscription consists of a verse in four lines giving a poetic description of the victories of a ruler described therein as Cikaiyariyan of Cikainakar. That ruler was doubtless the Arya cakravarti of Jaffna because Cikaiyariyan was one of his epithets and Cikainakar as seen earlier, was one of the names by which the town of Jaffna was known in medieval times. As the women of Anuradha who did not submit to the Cikaiyariyan are said to have


\(^{16}\) See p.245

\(^{17}\) Ancient Jaffna, p. 304; Ceylon Tamil Inscriptions, pt. II, pp. 81–92.
shed tears and had their fore-head marks removed it may be inferred that the husbands or close kinsmen of these women were defeated in battle and were crest fallen. The inscription does not precisely state who the enemies vanquished by the Arya cakravarti were and the expression Anurācar could be interpreted in two ways. It could either denote the Sinhalese king or else it could be a reference to some princes who were sub-kings. Nevertheless, the provenance of the inscription would suggest that the princes who were defeated by the Arya cakravarti were from Gampola. The setting up of an inscription recording the victories of a ruler of Jaffna at a site in proximity to Gampola proves that the armies of the Arya cakravarti had penetrated into the central highlands and reached the vicinity of Gampola and defeated its ruler(s).

Commenting on the circumstances that led to the setting up of this inscription Codrington, who assigns it to the fifteenth century on his consideration that the stage of palaeographical development represented by this record was characteristic of the fifteenth century, remarks: 'All that can be said is that a Jaffnese invasion in the reign of Parākramabāhu VI, after the Vijayanagara expedition suits the date.' But, there are some strong grounds to refute Codrington's suggestion. The sources relating to the reign of Parākramabāhu VI do not make mention of any invasion of the Sinhalese kingdom by the Arya cakravarti during his reign. Besides, an invasion from Jaffna against Parākramabāhu VI would have been directed against Kotte which was the seat of his power and was in proximity to the ports on the littoral and

18. The word anurācar meaning sub-kings may have been changed into anurācar on account of poetic considerations. Besides, there is some evidence to show that the Tamils continued to describe the Sinhalese kings as the rulers of Anurā char although Anurācharapura was abandoned centuries earlier. An inscription of Parākrama Pāṇḍya Arakesari doya of the 15th century refers to the capital of the Sinhalese kingdom as Anurā. 8 EZ, Vol. III, p. 7.


commanded access to the hinterland where cinnamon and other spices which attracted the attention of the ruler of Jaffna were produced in substantial quantities.

It is only in connection with the king of Gampola that the Sinhalese chronicles, the Nikāya Sangrahāya and the Rajavaliya, refer to the Arya cakravarti's invasion. Therefore, the Kotagama inscription which records the victories achieved by a king of Jaffna over his rivals in the central part of the island should be assigned to the Gampola period. Palaeography cannot be a serious obstacle against such a conclusion especially when we consider that the stage of palaeographical development represented by the Kotagama inscription is basically similar to that of the Lankatilaka Tamil inscription of 1344.20 The letters in the Kotagama inscription are very clear on account of their large size and a greater degree of precision on the part of its engraver. It would appear that the position of supremacy which the Arya cakravarti attained in the island was a direct consequence of his successful expedition which had led to the setting up of the Kotagama inscription.

The Mādavala inscription and the Kotagama inscription were probably set up after the same campaign. The first of these epigraphs, which records a treaty concluded between a certain person named Mārttāñjam perumālun and Vikrama-bāhu III, states that in accordance with the treaty they had concluded the former entrusted to certain Brahmin dignitaries the customs posts (maṅgigaya) in (the districts of) Singuruvāna, Balaviya, Mātala, Durnaba and Sagama tunraja.21

Commenting on this inscription, Paranavitana observes: '... The Madigaya in this period, was the post at which dues to the government were collected on merchandise.'


brought from outside. The personage who appointed certain Brahmins (whose names are mostly illegible) for the collection of these dues could not have been a functionary of the Gampola king, for it is expressly stated that this was done in pursuance of a treaty (sandhāna). Now this document refers precisely to that period during which, according to the Rājavaliya, the Arśa cakravarti of Yāpāpatuna had stationed tax-collectors in the Gampola kingdom. The name “Mārttaṇḍam is in Tamil garb, and the title perumāḻun is Tamil. In the list of the Cinkaiyāriyans given in the YVM, there is one named Mārttaṇṭa (Mārttaṇḍa). There is therefore no doubt that we have in this inscription the only mention by his personal name of an Arśa cakravarti of Jaffna so far met with in a contemporary inscription. 22

In agreement with these apt remarks of Paranavitana it may be concluded that the Maḍavala inscription and the Yāppāṇa Vaipavamāḷai refer, to the same ruler, a king of Jaffna, as Mārttaṇḍam perumāḻ and Mārttaṇṭa Cinkaiyāriyan respectively. As the inscription does not refer to Mārttaṇḍam perumāḻ as king it may be inferred that he had not been consecrated as king when the text of the inscription was drafted. It would appear that he had led an expedition against the ruler of Gampola during the reign of his predecessor. According to the Yāppāṇa Vaipavamāḷai, the predecessor of Mārttaṇṭa Cinkaiyāriyan was his father, Varōtaya Cinkaiyāriyan. 23 If the relationship between these two rulers as given in the Tamil chronicle is correct, then it has to be assumed that Varōtaya's reign had continued until 1359. Such a conclusion gains further support from the claim made in contemporary Tamil texts that Varōtaya defeated the kings of Tenmilankai, 'South Ceylon', and levied tribute from them.

23. YVM, p. 37.

The terms of the treaty recorded in that inscription do not cover all the lands which the Rājavaliya claims were brought under the influence of the Arśa cakravarti. 24 All the territorial divisions, Siṅguravāṇa, Bālaviṭa, Māṭala, Dumbara and Sagama tunrata, where Mārttaṇṭan was to post his tax collectors according to the treaty could be identified with territorial divisions included within the Central and Uva Provinces in the hill country. 25 The Rājavaliya on the other hand claims that the northern ruler collected tribute from the low country and the nine ports as well.

This claim is supported by the evidence from the Nīkāya Sangrahāya which testifies that the Arśa cakravarti had established military outposts at Colombo, Wattala, Salāvata (Chiliw) and Migamuna (Negombo), and posted his agents in the low country. 26 The discrepancy between the chronicles and the Maḍavala inscription on this point may be due to the fact that while the chronicles refer to the political conditions in the island after the Arśa cakravarti had gained a sort of supremacy over the Gampola kingdom as a whole the Maḍavala inscription relates only to a particular phase, the final phase, of the expansion of Arśa cakravarti's power and influence. It could be postulated that the northern ruler extended his power over the Sinhalese kingdom in successive stages. As the Arśa cakravarti's activities on the littoral and other

26. NKS, p. 23
parts of the low country are not referred to in the Mañavala inscription it may be assumed that he had brought the low-country under his influence after a campaign he had conducted at an earlier date. Ibn Battuta's account of the Arya cakravarttī seems to suggest that the extension of his power and influence over the littoral part of the low country wet zone had already started by 1344. The process of such expansion was not completed around that date because Colombo was held in that year by a Muslim garrison. It seems to have been subsequently dislodged from Colombo which was occupied by the Arya cakravarttī's forces.

The evidence from the Mañavala inscription and the Sinhalese chronicles suggests that Arya cakravarttī's motives in invading the Gampola kingdom were economic rather than political. They were not aimed at territorial annexation and none of the sources concerned refer to the annexation of any territorial division by the Arya cakravarttī from the Gampola rulers. The ports on the littoral and the customs posts (Madigaya) are specifically mentioned as the areas that attracted the Arya cakravarttī's attention. These were the centres of commerce and the ruler of Jaffna had sought and obtained from the rulers of Gampola the right to post his agents and collect the taxes at such centres. Besides, it is also possible that the Arya cakravarttī wanted to secure for himself a monopoly of the island's cinnamon trade in addition to the revenues from other sources in Gampola.

Paranavitana, however, suggests that the invasion conducted by the ruler of Jaffna was connected with a feud between Vikramabāhu III and Parākramabāhu V and was in response to an appeal for aid from Vikramabāhu. As the last years of Parākramabāhu V (1344-59) overlapped with the initial years of Vikramabāhu (1254-1374) Paranavitana suggested the likelihood that the two kings ruled as rivals in different parts of the island. He further argues that this conclusion is supported by the evidence of the Magul-Mahāvihāra inscriptions and the Tirāṇa Sandesaya.

The undated Magul-mahā-vihāra inscriptions record donations by Vihāramādevi, the consort of the two brother kings named Parākramabāhu who vanquished the Soli forces and were ruling the Rāhu country. On the basis of the data found in these inscriptions and on palaeographic considerations Paranavitana identifies Parākramabāhu mentioned in these inscriptions with Parākramabāhu V and contends that this monarch was ruling over Rāhana after he was ousted by Vikramabāhu III. But, earlier Paranavitana adopted a totally different line of argument as regards the identity of the rulers mentioned in these epigraphs. He then observed that in one of the inscriptions the name of Bhuvanekahāhu does not occur at all, and the context does not leave any doubt that both brothers are described as ruling over Rāhana. Bhuvanekahāhu IV and Parākramabāhu V had their respective capitals in the Māya kingdom and claimed dominion over the whole of Ceylon though their actual authority did not probably extend to some parts of the Island. He further added: If her husbands had claimed dominion over the Island Vihāramādevi would not have been content with referring to them merely as rulers of Rāhana. It is therefore reasonable, to assume that the princes mentioned in these epigraphs are not identical with any of the kings mentioned in the chronicle.

These arguments of Paranavitana are quite convincing and he has not controverted them when he subsequently revised his views on the identity of the persons referred to in the inscription. Moreover, the Soli forces referred to in these inscriptions cannot be a reference to the armies of Jaffna. As the
Cóla country was at this time under Vijayanagara rule the plausible explanation would be that the epigraph refers to a Vijayanagara invasion. Thus, the Magul-Mahâ-Vihâra inscriptions cannot have any relevance for a study of the events connected with the Arya cakravartti's invasion. Even if we assume that one of the two brother kings referred to in these epigraphs was Parâkramabâhu V their contents cannot in any way prove that Parâkramabâhu V and Vikramabâhu were ruling independently of each other and as rivals.

The anxiety by the author of the Tisara Sândesa, a religieux of Devinuvara, about the imminent political dangers that faced King Parâkramabâhu and his kingdom cannot by any stretch of imagination be construed as providing evidence of dissections in the royal family which led Vikramabâhu to seek Arya cakravartti's intervention in the internal politics of the Gampola kingdom. Nor could the omission of any reference to Rayiyama in the poem prove that it had become an independent principality and that the Alakesvaras who held it were openly hostile to the king at Dadigama. 32 Therefore, Paranavitana's suggestion that 'Possibly, the Jaffna king was invited by Vikramabâhu III to oust his rival' is unfounded and unacceptable.

The overlapping of regnal years was not confined exclusively to the reigns of Parâkramabâhu V and Vikramabâhu III.

32. Paranavitana, however, observes: 'As the last named monarch as well as the Alakesvara brothers benefited from the Arya cakravartti's campaign, it may be legitimate to infer that the Jaffna ruler undertook his raid into the heart of the Sinhalese territory at the invitation of these parties for assistance against Parâkramabâhu V. Perhaps the dispossessed youths had already gone to the Arya cakravartti's court when the Tisara Sândesa was written, and it was the anxiety caused by this defection that cast a gloom over the political horizon at that time. The Arya cakravartti would not have sided the auspicious to power among the Sinhalese against their rivals without himself gaining some advantage thereby. It is not impossible that Vikramabâhu III as well as Alakesvara acknowledged the Arya cakravartti as their suzairin. See UCHE, Vol. I. pt. II, p. 643.


It occurred several times in the Gampola period. Most of the regnal years of Parâkramabâhu V (1344—1359) overlapped with those of Bhuvenakabâhu IV (1344—1354). Moreover the early years of the reign of Bhuvenakabâhu V (1372—1408) overlapped with the last years of Vikramabâhu III. 33 In the case of the first two among these rulers Paranavitana asserts that Parâkramabâhu V functioned as the Apa of Bhuvenakabâhu IV and that after his accession he calculated his regnal years from the time he became Yuvaraja. 34 The overlapping of the regnal years of Parâkramabâhu V and Vikramabâhu III could be explained in the same manner and in the case of these two rulers there is no justification to assume that the overlapping of their regnal years was due to a division of the kingdom into two separate units. Besides, traditional history claims that all these kings ruled one after another in succession from Gampola. The Nikâya Sangrahâya categorically states that Parâkramabâhu V succeeded Bhuvenakabâhu IV at Gampola and that Vikramabâhu III became king after the death of Parâkramabâhu V at Gampola'. 35 Thus, there is no valid foundation for the belief that the Gampola kingdom was divided between two rival princes.

There is some further evidence to show that Vikramabâhu III and Parâkramabâhu V, far from being rivals, were associated with each other in the government of the Gampola kingdom. The ministers Senâ Lankadhâkika and Sivakolu Lukdivu Adhikara served under both Parâkramabâhu V and Vikramabâhu III. 36 If these two kings were rivals and if the latter had dislodged Parâkramabâhu V with the support of the Arya cakravartti, as Paranavitana assumes, it is unlikely that Vikramabâhu retained two leading ministers of a rival king. In the light of the foregoing considerations

34. Ibid. p. 638.
35. NAS. p 22.
Paranavitana's conclusion that Parākramabāhu V and Vikramabāhu III ruled different portions of the Gampola kingdom independently of each other and as rivals cannot be accepted. Therefore, Paranavitana's explanation that the Ārya cakravartti's invasion of the Gampola kingdom was in response to an appeal from one of the princes of Gampola has to be considered as one without any valid foundation. It would rather appear that the Ārya cakravartti, as mentioned earlier, took advantage of the weakness of the Gampola rulers and sought to assert his supremacy over the Sinhalese kingdom with a view to secure for himself a share of its revenues, especially from the ports and other trading centres.

The establishment of the Ārya cakravartti's supremacy over the Gampola kingdom seems to have coincided with the inauguration of Vikramabāhu's reign. It may even be surmised that the invasion organized by the northern ruler had contributed to the termination of the career and reign of Parākramabāhu V. One of the immediate results of the triumph of the Ārya cakravartti's armies in the hill country seems to have been the decline of the power and influence of the minister Senālāṅkādhikāra. The latter's native place, the district of Singuruvāna, also came under the influence of the northern ruler.

Vikramabāhu III, like his two predecessors, does not seem to have been endowed with qualities of leadership and organization and hence, as in the previous reigns, the direction of affairs had to devolve on one of his ministers. Thus, Alagakkonāra, who belonged to one of the most influential families in the kingdom was raised to the rank of chief minister, previously held by Senālāṅkādhikāra of the Mēnavarā clan. Alagakkonāra whose position in the kingdom was analogous to that of the Peshwas in the Maratha state

soon proved his abilities and through his efforts succeeded in extending and consolidating governmental authority in the outlying provinces of the kingdom.

His main achievement which made him one of the most celebrated personalities in medieval Sinhalese history was the organization of the military effort which culminated in the defeat of the Ārya cakravartti's armies in the hill country and the low country wet- zone. Alagakkonāra came to be depicted as a hero in Sinhalese tradition; the Niyamampaya inscription and some of the chronicles give an eulogistic description of his exploits. The Niyamampaya inscription, for instance, mentions that Alakesvara became the favourite of the goddess of victory and that he obtained the assistance of Virū. Moreover, he is said to have defeated the army of the Ārya cakravartti and protected the kingdom with the assistance of the Brahmin minister, Bhāskara otherwise called Jayamahārāna. The two chronicles, Nikiya Anngrahaya and the Rājāvallīya confirm and elucidate the statements in the inscription.

Alagakkonāra had to raise a large force and construct fortifications before he could commence hostilities against the Ārya cakravartti. The most important fortress constructed by Alagakkonāra and the only one about which some details have been preserved in traditional history was what later came to be known as Kotte. It was sited at the village of Dārugāma surrounded by a stream and was within a short distance from Colombo which had become the chief emporium of the island. He is credited with the construction of a deep moat around the village; the moat was surrounded by a massive wall of stone masonry. The fortress was named abhinava Jāvavardhana and was provided with iron spikes (idangini 'tiger faced traps'), (Pulimukam) caltrops (bhāmivantattu), watch towers (attāla) and vijayattam of architectural devices of a circular design meant for military uses.

37. 'Niyamampaya Sāl Lipiya,' Ithisaya p.17
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Moreover, shrines were constructed for the guardian deities of the four quarters on the tops of the rampart of the fortress, perhaps in conformity with local tradition. Alagakkonāra is said to have stored large quantities of grain and other provisions inside the fort and assembled a large army consisting of Sinhalese and Tamils. These efforts of Alagakkonāra may suggest that he expected some sort of siege warfare. The location of the fortress at Dārugāma was also of some significance. It would appear that the western littoral and the adjoining hinterland were expected to be the areas of military operations.

After having effectively mobilised the resources of the kingdom under his stewardship Alagakkonāra defied the power of the Arya cakravartti and committed some acts of hostility. The tax-collectors posted by the Arya cakravartti at several key points in the Gampola kingdom are said to have been seized and killed on the orders of Alagakkonāra. Such measures had the effect of provoking the Tamil ruler who retaliated by sending large armies by land and sea. Alagakkonāra, however, caused the ships of the Arya cakravartti that anchored at Panadura to be destroyed and burnt; besides, he defeated the armies of the Jaffna ruler in various engagements and captured his military outposts at Colombo, Wattala, Chilaw and Negombo.40

In consequence of these reverses the Arya cakravartti lost the advantages which he had secured earlier in the Gampola kingdom and his suzerainty over that kingdom was terminated. Alagakkonāra must have concluded his successful campaigns against the Arya cakravartti's armies before the Niyamgampaya document was drafted in 1372/3.

The success achieved through Alagakkonāra's efforts had enhanced his prestige and helped him to consolidate further his power and authority in the kingdom while the king

40. N.A.S. pp.22 23.
Vikramabahu III, like his two predecessors, remained in the background. The Niyamgampaya inscription even asserts that Alagakkonara 'received the government of Sri Lanka' from Vikramabahu. He is said to have been conferred the title 'Lankadhiisvara, and to have been admitted into 'the circle, of five ranks of princes known as Dipadhija Maadalika raja, Anuvasakaraja, Antarbhogikaraja and Pradesaraja.' Alagakkonara acquired the substance of all power within the kingdom and his prestige and power which he enjoyed among the traditional ranks must have contributed to the ascendancy of his family in the politics of the Gampola kingdom. His descendants continued to wield supreme power for two more generations although the king continued to retain all the outward trappings of regal splendour and authority.

After the defeat and expulsion of the armies of the Arya cakravarti the Gampola kingdom gained control of the littoral and the ports. The rise of Kotte initially as a military stronghold and subsequently as the major centre of administration may be said to have been a legacy of the struggle between the the Arya cakravarti and the rulers of Gampola.

The Rajavaliya account of the Arya cakravarti's invasion seems to suggest that the king of Jaffna organised another major invasion of the Gampola kingdom some years later. The details of this invasion as recorded in that chronicle differs in some important details from the one found in the Nikaya Sangrahaya. The latter work asserts that the Arya cakravarti,

41. These epithets appear to be conventional eulogic expressions which were recorded indiscriminately by the author of the chronicle without any consideration for their exact meanings. They do not seem to have any functional significance. Besides, there is a basic inconsistency in some of these epithets. For instance, one who enjoyed the epithet Pradeskaraja 'provincial chiefman' and Maadalikaraja 'chief of feudatories' cannot be described as Dipadhijaraja 'supreme king of the island.'

invaded the sinhalese kingdom during the reign of Vikramabahu while the Rajavaliya states that Bhuvanekabahu was ruling from Gampola at the time of that invasion.42 The claim made in the Nikaya Sangrahaya is confirmed by the evidence from the Niyamgampaya document which mentions that Alagakkonara had achieved great fame by vanquishing the forces of the Arya cakravarti. As this document was issued in A.D. 1372 during the reign of Vikramabahu Alagakkonara must have concluded his successful campaigns against the armies of the king of Jaffna before the document was issued.

The contradiction between the two chronicles as regards the name of the king in whose reign the invasion took place could be explained by assuming that the Rajavaliya has confused the details of two different invasions of the Arya cakravarti and as Paranavitana suggests, has narrated in relation to an invasion of the reign of Bhuvanekabahu V some of the details of the invasion that had taken place in the reign of Vikramabahu III. It may therefore be inferred that the Arya cakravarti's armies invaded the Gampola kingdom twice, once in the reign of Vikramabahu III and again in the reign of Bhuvanekabahu V. The Rajavaliya claims that the Arya cakravarti, who had obtained assistance from the Cola country, sent his armies by land and sea. The army which came by sea landed at Panadura, advanced to Colombo and encamped at Dematagoda, Gorakana and Godabasa. The army which came by the land route advanced up to Matale where they encamped.43 Under such circumstances Bhuvanekabahu V is said to have fled from Gampola and the task of planning military operations against the invading armies was left to the military leaders of the hill country. The latter organised a night attack against the invading army which resulted in its defeat and retreat. It would also appear that the Alakessara who led the Sinhalese resistance against the armies of Jaffna on

42. Rjv trans., p.67.
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this occasion was Virabāhu, the nephew of Alagakkonāra referred to in the Niyamgampaya inscription. That Virabāhu had fought a war against a Tamil army is suggested by the Nikāya Sangrahaya which states that Virabāhu who was endowed with noble qualities had enjoyed great fame, and achieved great distinction and by employing various devices had defeated the Tamils, Malayālis and Muslims.45

Although the armies of the Arya cakravartti were repulsed the impact of his invasion on the politics of the Sinhalese kingdom was considerable. Bhuvanekabāhu's flight from Gampola was an indication of his incompetence. The prestige and power of the king suffered irretrievably in consequence of his flight and he probably lost control over the official hierarchy at Gampola. The successful efforts of Virabāhu in organizing the defence and thwarting the designs of the invading forces seem to have enhanced his position and whetted his ambition. Taking advantage of the situation that had arisen at Gampola owing to the king's weakness, Virabāhu assumed royal power. Besides, his elder brother, Vira Alakesvara, who contested him, was defeated and was compelled by circumstances to seek refuge in India. Thus Virabāhu secured supreme power in the kingdom while the king, Bhuvanekabāhu who retained his crown and royal title lost all effective authority and eventually moved into Kotte.

45. NKS p. 24
XII

Jaffna, Vijayanagara and Kotte

The development of Vijayanagara power in South India during the last quarter of the fourteenth century and the rise of the kingdom of Kotte under Parākramabāhu VI (1412-67) led to a corresponding decline in the power and influence of the Arya cakravartis. Their control of the Indo-Ceylon trade through the palk-strait and their monopoly over the pearl fisheries and the pearl trade were seriously threatened after the Vijayanagara conquest of the Tamil country around 1370 by Kampaṇa. The Vijayanagara rulers, through their Viceroyals in the Tamil country, sought to establish their suzerainty over Jaffna and exact tribute from her rulers. The Arya cakravartis who could not resist the power of their overmighty neighbour in South India had to recognise Vijayanagara claims for overlordship and tribute.

This subordinate relationship which the Arya cakravarti had with Vijayanagara was not entirely disadvantageous to him. As is usual, the suzerain power had to discharge its own obligations towards its subordinate allies and vassals and the Arya cakravarti could seek and obtain aid from Vijayanagara dominions whenever he was attacked by others. But the nature of such a relationship depended to a large extent on the political conditions in Vijayanagara. The south Indian empire which was held together by a system of overlordship was often weakened by wars of succession and the rebellions caused by provincial governors. Whenever the central government lost hold over the southern provinces the ruler of Jaffna could withhold tribute to Vijayanagara but ironically, at such times, he was in a weak position in relation to his neighbours within the island as he could not secure effective support from Vijayanagara when attacked by them. In fact such a situation arose when Parākramabāhu was ruling over the kingdom of Kotte.

The nature of the relationship between Vijayanagara and the kingdoms of Ceylon during Kampaṇa's viceroyalty in the Tamil country is not clear. The Madhuravijayam, a panegyrical text extolling the achievements of Kampaṇa, claims that the messengers of the kings of the Keralas and the Sinhalas came to his court and paid obeisance to him. This claim cannot, however, be regarded as evidence to show that Kampaṇa had brought Keralas and Ceylon under his control. Referring to the Vijayanagara empire in about A.D. 1378 Ferishta says that the kings of Malabar, Ceylon and other countries kept ambassadors at the Raya's court and sent rich presents to him annually. Although the sending of presents to Vijayanagara by a ruler of Ceylon need not necessarily imply that he was tributary to that empire the evidence from the inscriptions of Virūpākṣa suggests that the island or a part of it had been brought under the influence of Vijayanagara towards the end of the fourteenth century.

From the time of Harīhara II Vijayanagara inscriptions refer to Ceylon. The Alampūr inscription of saka 1305 (A.D. 1383/4) states that having conquered, the kings of

1. For a history of Vijayanagara see K. A. Nilkkanta Sastri and N. Venkataraghavan, Further Sources of Vijayanagara History, pp. 26-27.
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Tundira, Cōla and the Pāṇḍya countries and the Sinhalese, he presented crystals and other jewels to his father. His Aryan plates mention that he planted a pillar of victory in Sinhala. The Nārāyana Vilāsam also refers to the planting of the pillar of victory in Sinhala by Virūpākṣa. Virūpākṣa's claim that he conquered the Tundira, Cōla and Pāṇḍya countries suggests that Vijayanagara authority had to be re-established in the Tamil country during the reign of Harishara II. The conquest of Ceylon claimed by Virūpākṣa seems to have been connected with his re-establishment of Vijayanagara power in the Tamil country. From the evidence of Virūpākṣa's inscriptions Nilakanta Sastri surmises that the claim made by Virūpākṣa refer to the 'reconquest of only the northern part of the island, including the Jaffna peninsula'. Moreover he contends that the island that was thus reconquered was under the control of Vijayanagara at least throughout the reign of Harishara II.

The Vijayanagara government lost its control over the southern provinces, once again, on the death of Harishara II. Harishara's reign was followed by a period of struggle for the throne among his sons. Virūpākṣa seized the throne at first, but later he was ousted by Bukkha who ruled for about two years (1404–1406). In connection with the events of this period the Portuguese chronicler Nuniz says: 'Ajārao took Goa and Chaul, and Dabull, and Caillao (Ceylon) and all the country of the Choramadell, which had all rebelled after the first destruction of the kingdom'. This evidence from Nuniz is interesting in that it includes Ceylon among the countries which had rebelled against the Vijayanagara government when central control became ineffective owing to the dissensions at the imperial court. It presupposes that one of the kingdoms in Ceylon, Jaffna, was under Vijayanagara suzerainty earlier. The Arya cakravartti took advantage of the political instability in Vijayanagara and on this occasion as on several others, ignored the claims for tribute and suzerainty made by the Vijayanagara government.

If as Nilakanta Sastri suggests, the name Ajārao referred to by Nuniz is a corruption of that of Virūpākṣa, it may be assumed that Virūpākṣa once again brought under his control the kingdom of Jaffna which had along with other dependencies slipped out of the control of Vijayanagara. But the Arya cakravartti appears to have asserted his independence once again in the interlude between the reigns of Virūpākṣa and Devaraya II because a Vijayanagara expedition had to be sent against the ruler of Jaffna under Lakṣmaṇa Daṇḍyaka during the reign of Devaraya.

Since the accession of Devaraya I (1422–1446) Vijayanagara regained much of its power that was lost after the reign of Harishara II. Devaraya II set the stage for further expansion and made some conquests in the Eastern Deccan. Some time before 1342 he occupied the Reddi kingdom of Koṇḍavidu and succeeded in pushing the eastern frontier of his kingdom up to the Krishna. Besides, he successfully defended the kingdom of Rājamunḍry from the

---
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attacks of Kapileswara Gajapati. Despite his preoccupation in the eastern Deccan, Devaraya was resourceful enough to direct his energies in the southern provinces as well. During his reign the Tamil country was governed by the great general and administrator Lakkanya Damayyaka. The Tirumangikulki inscription engraved on his orders testifies that he had sent a cavalry force across the sea (samudra yatra) for the conquest of Yalippinappattinam and Ilam. The expedition was directed against Jaffna and another kingdom in the island referred to in the inscription as Ilam. Ilam in this instance, as will be seen later, was a reference to the kingdom of Kotte. This expedition seems to have met with some success because in another inscription, of Saka 1363 (A.D. 1441/42) Devaraya is described as Ilam tirai koda, 'the one who levied tribute from Ceylon.' The expedition sent out by Lakkanya had presumably the effect of re-imposing Vijayanagara overlordship over the Kingdom of Jaffna. Such a conclusion is supported by the claim made by Nunnis that the kings of Quilon and Ceylon paid tribute to Devaraya. The Vijayanagara army sent by Lakkanya seems to have attacked Parakramabahu VI after successfully inducing the Arya cakravarti to acknowledge Vijayanagara claims for overlordship and tribute. The expedition against Ilam referred to in the Tirumangikulki inscription seems to be the one described as the Canarese invasion in the Sinhalese sources relating to the reign of Parakramabahu VI of Kotte.

Kotte, originally intended to be a bastion of defence against the armies of the Arya cakravarti became the principal seat of administration in the Sinhalese kingdom by the beginning of the fifteenth century. Vira Alakesvara was ruling from there when the Chinese admiral Cheng-Ho attacked and captured him in 1411. The shifting of the capital from Campola to Kotte was largely due to the economic potentialities of the South-Western lowlands. In the south western plains fed by heavy rains during two monsoons two crops could be raised annually and agricultural production could sustain a greater concentration of population and yield much more revenue to the royal treasury than the central highlands where agricultural land was limited. Another factor which favoured agricultural production was the possibility of artificial irrigation by the diversion of natural streams by means of channels. Another consideration, perhaps the more important one was the development of foreign trade chiefly in spice produced in the lowlands. The cultural achievements of the reign of Parakramabahu VI were largely due to the effective mobilization of these resources.

Parakramabahu VI who came to the direction of affairs in the Sinhalese kingdom around 1415 had considerable ability for leadership and organization and under him the Sinhalese monarchy revived after a long period of decline. Not content with what he had acquired at his accession he made efforts to become the master of the whole island. The resources at his disposal being substantially greater than those of any other contemporary ruler in Sri Lanka he was able to reduce one after another the other kingdoms and principalities to varying degrees of subjection.

The Canarese invasion, the rebellion and defeat of Joti Sitan in the hill country, the conquest of the eighteen Vannis and Jaffna, the war against Malavaraya of Adhiraraimattiyanam are the main political events of Parakramabahu's reign that are mentioned in the versions of the Rajavaliya and contemporary poetical works which constitute the principal body of literature sources for his reign. But these events are not mentioned.
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In any chronological order or historical sequence. Nor could such order he expected in chronicles and poetical works of this nature.

Two contemporary Sinhalese texts, the Girā Sandesaya and Parakumba Siriḥa, which contain eulogistic descriptions of Parākramabāhu's exploits, briefly refer to the war he fought against the Karnātas. The Girā Sandesaya states that he subdued the (armies of) the irresistible Kannādi king while the other text claims that Parākramabāhu 'destroyed the gate of the city of the Karnātas'. The Alaksesvarayuddhaya, a later Sinhalese text, records some details of the Canarese war referred to in these contemporary texts. It states: ‘The armies of the Kannādi king who had borne the epithet “The Lord of the four oceans”, came in ships and entered the kingdom with the object of making war. They were defeated by the army sent by the king and in consequence of this victory the fame of Parākramabāhu extended all over Jambudvīpa.' This account suggests that the Kingdom of Kotte, under Parākramabāhu, was attacked by an army sent by a Ceylonese king and that the army had come by sea. That this was a Vijayanagara army is clear from the claim made in the chronicle that the Kannādi king had the epithet, ‘The Lord of the four oceans’. The epithet Catus-sammuccādi-pati meaning ‘The Lord of the four oceans’ was assumed by many successive rulers of Vijayanagara and the account of the chronicle shows that some of the Sinhalese literati were aware of the Vijayanagara practice of using this epithet.

The details of a Vijayanagara invasion as found in the Alaksesvarayuddhaya seem to have been preserved in the source that were available to Valentijn who says: ‘Not long after

wards (after the birth of the king's daughter Ulukudaya devi) the emperor (Parākramabāhu) was unexpectedly attacked by a large army, which had been sent to Ceylon with a numerous fleet by the king of Canara. But this prince having speedily gathered together some troops defeated that army, which act gave him throughout the whole east a formidable name and made him much beloved by his people.'

In its order of narration the Alaksesvarayuddhaya places the Canarese invasion before Sapumal's conquest of Jaffna which was accomplished around 1450. According to Venuleţin that event occurred not long after the birth of the king's daughter Ulukudaya devi. In the thirtieth year of the king, corresponding to A.D. 1448, the princess was already married and had even produced an offspring. II, as Codrington assumes, she was sixteen years of age by then, she would have been born approximately around A.D. 1432. Valentijn states, as seen earlier, that the Canarese invasion took place shortly after her birth.

The Canarese invasion referred to by the Sinhalese sources and Valentijn must be the same as the one against Iam mentioned in the Tirumānikkuḷ inscription. The text of this inscription suggests that by about 1435 the expedition had already been sent against the two kingdoms in Ceylon. All the Sinhalese sources assert in no uncertain terms that Parākramabāhu won a great victory over the Canarese armies and it may therefore be assumed that the Canarese armies were ultimately defeated after they had gained some initial success in their invasion of the kingdom of Kotte. Parākramabāhu acquired great prestige after this triumph and
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was subsequently able to consolidate his power effectively in Kotte and was able to embark on a career of conquest and expansion.

The contemporary literary works and the Sinhalese chronicles mention the conquest of the Vanni principalities as one of the major achievements of Parakramabahu’s reign. In most of these texts the principalities conquered by the king are said to have been eighteen.

The number eighteen as applied to the Vanni principalities in the Sinhalese texts seems to be a conventional one derived from an Indian tradition.20 The exact number of such principalities in the island during this period cannot be determined with the evidence available at present. The sources, however, as seen earlier, are not consistent in placing the conquest of the Vannis in their order of narration. The Rājāvaliyā version and the Parakumha stīrtā refer to the conquest of the Vanni before relating the account of the war with Jaffna.21 The Girā sandesaya relates these two events in the reverse order. As historical sequence cannot be expected in poetical works Codrington suggests that the order of the Rājāvaliyā has to be preferred to that of the Girā sandesaya and adds that the conquest of the Vannis surely preceded that of Jaffna. Such a conclusion seems to be supported by the account of the Yāppāna Vaipāva-malai which asserts that Kanakadeviya ehi-dakṣīnyiyān fled to India in consequence of a Sinhalese insurrection supported by the Vanniyar.22 The Sinhalese insurrection referred to in this chronicle is doubtless a veiled allusion to Sappanil’s invasion and the claim that this was supported by the Vanniyar could imply that the rulers of the Vanni had come under the invaders. It may be assumed that Sappanil received the submission of the Vanni chiefs before he invaded Jaffna and induced them to support him in his expedition against the king of Jaffna.

The claim made in the Girā sandesaya that, Parakramabahu conquered the eighteen Vannis which did not submit to any previous king is significant.23 The author of this poem was of the belief that this achievement of Parakramabahu was one which could not be realized under any of his predecessors. The Vannis were for the most part situated at considerable distance from the centres of Sinhalese political power and sheltered by the stretches of jungle-covered territory the chieftains of these principalities could develop and sustain a spirit of independence. The decline in the power and influence of the Sinhalese monarchy saw a corresponding rise in the power of these chieftains since the reign of Parakramabahu II, who is said to have received homage and tribute from some of the Vanni chiefs of Rajārata and Rohana.

Theoretically the Vanniyars derived their power and authority from the king. The ceremony of investiture helped to reinforce the monarch’s claim of supremacy. Whenever a chieftain attained the rank of a Vanniyar or Vamiraja he was expected to receive his investiture and the insignia of his rank from the king. Generally, the chiefs were bound

20. The South Indian inscriptions also refer to eighteen vanniyars. Some Vijnâyanagara inscriptions show that the Rāja had such epithets as uJēkâvējē kēvatâna jētâlē. The destroyer of the eighteen Vanniyya and uJēkâvējē kēvatâna jētâlē. The one who defeated the eighteen Vanniyars. See IPS, No. 732, 738.

21. Some Rājāvaliyā versions refer to the conquest of the Vannis while others do not refer to it. The versions that refer to it are (1) Br. Museum Ms. Or.4971 folio 6a and (2) Rjav od Watuwatta Ponnanda Bikkhu.
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to pay homage and tribute annually and had to appear at
the court on ceremonial occasions and also whenever sum-
moned by the king. The tribute which consisted mainly of
elephants, elephant tusks, wax, honey and perhaps also
timber was a source of substantial income for the court. The
failure on the part of the chieftains to send the annual
tribute and appear before the king could generally be
viewed by the court circles as an act of disloyalty and
hostility.

The annual tribute and the ceremony of investiture which
were the two vital links in the relationship between the
suzerain power and the chieftains of the Vanni were often
matters of dispute. The maintenance of these links de-
pended on the relative strength and influence of the king and
his feudatories. Only a ruler who had adequate resources and
remarkable qualities of leadership and organization could
elicit submission and homage from the chieftains in the out-
lying provinces of the kingdom. The progressive decline in
the power and influence of the Sinhalese monarchy in the
long period that intervened the reigns of Parâkramabâhu II
and the sixth ruler of that name had led in some measure
to the growth of Vanniya power. The chieftains of the
Vanni principalities ignored the claims of their suzerain and
exercised unfettered authority in almost all the regions beyond
the Arya cakravarti's sphere of influence and authority.

The rank of Vanniya was mostly held on a hereditary
basis and was confined to the most influential family among
the aristocracy of landholders in the locality. The power and
authority exercised by the Vanniya was in most cases similar
to that of a king and therefore some European writers of
the colonial period refer to some of the chieftains of the Vanni
as princes. The Vanniya made all appointments in the
administration of their respective principalities and collected
all taxes due to the lord of the land. Besides, they ad-

ministered justice and mobilised the labour resources and
the compulsory services which the people had to render to
the lord of the land. When they exercised unfettered author-
ity the Vanniya had the power to impose capital punish-
ment for heinous crimes committed by their subjects. They
maintained their own armies and some of them were quite
powerful.

The principalities under the control of chieftains styled
Vanniya were spread over an area comprising large stretches
of territory in the north central, northeastern and eastern portions
of the island. Besides there were a few such principalities in and around Puttalam on the western littoral. The history of
these chieftains during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries remains largely obscure except in the case of those in Puttalam and Trincomalee. The only stone inscriptions recording the transactions of Vanniya chiefs in the island brought to light hitherto are in the Trincomalee
district.

24. See Chapter V, pp. 122-125
25. K. Indrapala, 'Kankuvëlikkalvejju,' Cintanal vol II, Nos. 2-3
   pp. 37-40, A. Velupillai, 'A. Neto on the Vorugal Inscription,'
   CTF pt. I, pp. 9-11
vanniyanar of Malai. Malai in this instance has to be taken as a reference to Tirukkoamalai, especially in view of the fact that no other locality in the Trincomalee district could be referred to as Malai. The provenance of the inscription also suggests that the chiefstain referred to in this Tamil inscription was one who was ruling over the principality of Trincomalee. The grant of land by the Vanniyanar and the absence of any reference to any suzerain in the epigraph suggest that he was in fact ‘the lord of the land’ and in that capacity exercised unfettered authority within his principality. The Atappar or Headmen of villages were under his direct authority and were associated with him in matters of government. There is no evidence to suggest that Trincomalee and other principalities of the Vanni in the eastern littoral were reduced to submission by Parâkramabâhu VI.

The so-called eighteen Vannis which he is said to have conquered must have been confined to the Vanni areas outside the eastern littoral. There is some indication in contemporary sources about the campaigns conducted by Parâkramabâhu against local chiefstains. The Parâkumbâ sirîta for instance makes mention of this reduction from Dambadeniya of the strongholds of local rulers. It may be assumed that the king proceeded to Dambadeniya with the object of securing the submission of the local rulers in the Mahavanni.

Another campaign fought by the ruler of Kotte is said to have been directed against ‘the Mukara king’. The Parâkumbâ sirîta claims that Parâkramabâhu destroyed the race of ‘the Mukara king’. The expression which translates ‘the Mukara king’ cannot make any sense unless it is assumed that Mukara is a textual corruption of Mukkara which is the Sinhalese form of Mukkuvar. Therefore, the ‘Mukara king’ overthrown in battle by Parâkramabâhu must have been a chief of the Mukkuvar. Mukkuvar settlements organized under chiefstains styled Vanniyar were to be found only in Puttalam and Batticaloa. As there is no tradition of a conflict between the Mukkuvar of Batticaloa and this king and because Parâkramabâhu is known to have waged a war against the Mukkuvar of Puttalam it may be concluded that the Mukara king referred to in the Parâkumbâ sirîta was the Vanniyar chief of Puttalam.

The origins of the Mukkuvar settlements in and around Puttalam are obscure. The growth of Mukkuvar settlements in the Western littoral was presumably the result of periodic migrations from Kerala. But the development of a principality dominated by the Mukkuvar chiefs was probably connected with the settlement of mercenaries who were granted by kings lands for settlement and cultivation. It is even probable that Mukkuvar chiefs were raised to the rank of Vanniyar in Puttalam as in Batticaloa by Mâgha. Some sannasas issued in later times show that the social and political organization of the Mukkuvar settled in Puttalam were basically similar to those of the Mukkuvar of Malabar. They maintained a jûdicial tribunal called Muttirai kutam or Muttirai mag’apam which had as its counterpart, the Rajiam in Malabar. This tribunal consisted of eighteen members all of whom were styled Vanniyar and were endowed with lands and certain special privileges. In later times there were two divisions in Puttalam, Rajavannipattu and Kumara vannipattu; which were under the authority of chiefstains styled Vanniyar. In the early fifteenth century the Mukkuvar chiefstains of Puttalam were found to be quite powerful and tradition claims that Parâkrama-

27. Atappar or Atappanâr was the designation of headmen of villages inhabited by sea-faring communities.

28. PKS.

29. PKS.

bahu’s armies were strongly resisted by the Mukkuvar. The Mukkara haṭana an eighteenth century Sinhalese text, records some details of the campaign which Parākramabāhu waged against the Mukkuvar chief of Puttalam. The account of Parākramabāhu’s war as recorded in this text may briefly be summarized as follows:31

In the reign of Parākramabāhu of Kotte the Mukkuvar launched a struggle against the king from their strongholds at Puttalam, Punnala and Nagapattīnām. As they proved to be very formidable the king had to raise a large army. After consulting his ministers the king bought a large number of mercenaries from Kālicipuram, Kilakkarai and Kāveripattinam. They were sent under the leadership of their chief Mānīkka talaivan to subdue the Mukkuvar. They fought heroically against the king’s enemies and in the encounter they sustained heavy losses; even their leader Manikka talaivan fell in battle. Despite heavy losses they ultimately succeeded in occupying the strongholds of the Mukkuvar. The king who was gratified with their services settled them at Migamowa and granted them lands at Anaulundava, Munnasaram, Migamuva and other localities. He issued also proclamation exempting them from all port-dues and taxes.

The foregoing account suggests that Parākramabāhu VI raised a large army which included a large number of mercenaries from South India. As they belonged to a community of intrepid seamen it may be assumed that the employment of such mercenaries contributed in some way to the creation of a fleet that is known to have existed in his reign. On the combined testimony of the Parakumba sīrita and Mukkara haṭana it may be concluded that the chiefdoms of Puttalam were reduced to submission and brought under the suzerainty of Kotte. There is no evidence to suggest that the conquest led to any territorial annexation. As there is clear evidence to show that local chiefdoms were ruling over Puttalam in the later period it has to be assumed that Parākramabāhu’s campaigns against the chiefdoms of Puttalam and other principalities were undertaken with a view to establish the king’s claim of supremacy and suzerainty over them.32

As the Kokila tandesaya asserts that Prince Sapumal was placed in authority over the eighteen principalities after the conquest of Jaffna it may be assumed that most of these principalities were previously tributary to the ruler of Jaffna.33 In this connection it should be noted that Queyrroz asserts that the Vanni principalities which were tributary to the king of Jaffnapatnam extended up to Chilaw.34

Parākramabāhu’s conquest of the Vanni principalities was followed by invasions against Jaffna. In the early fifteenth century the economic and military power of the Arya cakravarti was considerably reduced as a result of the political changes that took place in South India and in the Sinhalese kingdom. His power and influence in the region declined in consequence of the establishment of Vijayanagara power in the Tamil country. The Arya cakravarti lost the commanding position he once held over the Indo-Ceylon straits and thereby he was deprived of the opportunity of securing for himself a considerable share of the profits of the lucrative Indo-Ceylon trade. The Vijayanagara rulers claimed overlordship over him and exacted tribute whenever possible and this tribute must have amounted to a considerable portion of the Arya cakravartti’s revenues. Besides, the agricultural resources of his modest kingdom were

31. M. D. Raghavan, The Kaṭāra of Ceylon, pp 16–19

32. The Ceylon Gazetteer, pp 190–191
33. JRASCB, vol. XXII, No. 63, 1910, pp. 28–29
34. Queyrroz, p. 47
limited and could not have yielded large amounts of revenue. Under such circumstances the king of Jaffna was no longer capable of raising and maintaining a large army. The decline of the Aryan cakravarti’s power and influence corresponded with the revival of Sinhalese political power under Parakramabahu VI. The Sinhalese kingdom, around this time, had as its nucleus the fertile and extensive south-western plain and therefore the manpower and material resources of Parakramabahu VI were much greater than those of any other ruler in the island. Parakramabahu had embarked on a career of expansion after consolidating his power within Kotte and since his subjugation of the principalities of the Vanni his attack on Jaffna was almost inevitable.

The conquest of Jaffna accomplished by Sapumal was one of the main events of Parakramabahu’s reign which attracted the attention of the contemporary authors of Sinhalese poems and chroniclers of later periods. The conquest of Jaffna aroused great jubilation among court circles within Kotte and the Kukila sandesaya was composed in honour of the conqueror Sapumal. This text throws some light on Sapumal’s activities in Jaffna but the data found in texts of this nature have to be used with great caution as they are prone to exaggerate out of proportion the achievements and the great qualities of their heroes.

The Rājāvaliya and the two Portuguese historians de Couto and de Queiros who derived their information from local traditions, record some details of Sapumal’s conquest of Jaffna. The Rājāvaliya gives the following account of Sapumal’s invasion:

The king thought that it was not proper that there should be two kingdoms in Lanka and sent Senamayaka Sapumal Kumara with an army to Yapapatuna. The prince attacked several villages in that kingdom, brought prisoners to the city of Kotte and delivered them to the king, Parakramabahu. He was sent once again by the king to invade Jaffna and on this occasion Sapumal took several military outposts which had been erected at different places and entered the town of Yapapatuna where he encountered the Tuliva troops. Sapumal created such a carnage that the streets of Yapapatuna were filled with blood. He slew the Aryan cakravarti took his consort and children prisoners, brought them to Kotte and presented himself before Parakramabahu. The king conferred on him many favours and sent him to rule the kingdom of Yapapatuna.35

De Couto gives a slightly different version of Sapumal and his conquest of Jaffna. He states: ‘In the time of this king (Parakramabahu VI) there arrived at the city of Kotte from the opposite coast a Panical of the caste of those kings, a man of great activity and sagacity whom the king welcomed, and married him to a woman of rank, by whom he had two sons and a daughter. When these lads grew up and came to have such power in the kingdom, that the king noticed in them a change of disposition from which he feared that on his death they would murder his grandson. And dissembling with regard to this, he resolved to separate them which he did, commanding the two brothers to go and subject for him the kingdom of Jafanapata which had rebelled against him, conferring on the elder one, who was Qubba Perumal, the title of king of that dominion with the obligation of Vassalage. This man who was a very great horseman, in a few days made himself master of that dominion.’36

De Couto’s account is basically in agreement with the Rājāvaliya in stating that Sapumal conquered Jaffna and

35. Rja transl., pp. 68–69
36. JRASCB XX, No 60, 1908, pp. 68–69
was appointed ruler of that Kingdom by Parākramabāhu. In all other respects the two accounts differ from one another. The invasion and conquest of Jaffna claimed in the literary sources is confirmed by the evidence from two Tamil inscriptions set up in the reign of Parākramabāhu. One of them, the Munnesvaram inscription of the thirty-eighth year of Parākramabāhu testifies that Parākramabāhu had borne the epithet Parājāsekhara-vaījana, 'A serpent to king Parājāsekhara(n).’ 33 Parājāsekhara was one of the two alternate consecration names assumed by the Arya cakka-vaśītīs of Jaffna and it may be inferred that the ruler of Jaffna who was the contemporary of Parākramabāhu had the consecration name Parājāsekhara. The assumption of the epithet Parājāsekhara-vaījana by Parākramabāhu suggests that he had vanquished the King of Jaffna. Incontrovertible evidence for the conquest of Jaffna is to be found in the fragmentary Tamil inscription at the entrance of a building at Main Street, Jaffna. The inscription runs:

Sri Caṅkapatīva(r) marāṇa Tiṟtu puvaṉācē cakka (ra) Vattika (l) Cira Parākkiramāpāku. tēva (rk u) yāṇītu..... (ā) vatu (kk u) e ti rāvatu..... 38

The ruler mentioned in this inscription has to be identified as Parākramabāhu VI on account of several considerations. Among the rūpers who had the name Parākramabāhu, only two kings, Parākramabāhu I and Parākramabāhu VI are known to have held sway over Jaffna. The letters of the epigraph are far more developed than those found in the Naimātīvu inscription of Parākramabāhu I and they are re-

---
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markably similar to those of the Tamil inscriptions at Munnesvaram and Naimātīvu both of which were engraved in the reign of Parākramabāhu VI. On palaeographic considerations the epigraph has to be assigned to the fifteenth century. Moreover, the ruler is described in the inscription as Sri Caṅkhabādhivarmar and Tirippavuncakkāravatī. Parākramabāhu VI is so described in his two other Tamil inscriptions from Munnesvaram and Naimātīvu.39 The manner of describing the King’s regnal year as yāntu... āvatukku etiravatu, ‘In the year...... opposite to that of...’, is peculiar to the Tamil inscriptions of Parākramabāhu VI.40 The only other inscription wherein such a usage is to be found is the Naimātīvu inscription. From the provenance of the Jaffna Main Street inscription of Parākramabāhu it may be concluded that the kingdom of Jaffna was conquered and brought under the rule of Parākramabāhu VI at some stage during his reign.

The reason given by de Couto for Parākramabāhu’s invasion of Jaffna is an incredible one. Sapumal’s conquest of Jaffna was accomplished before the birth of the king’s grandson. The king could not have by any means anticipated any threats from Sapumal and his brother against a grandson who was yet to be born. De Couto’s anachronistic explanation was the result of some confusion either on his part or in his sources. The explanation given by the author of the Rājāvallīya about this matter is that the king thought that it was not proper that there should be two kingdoms in the island. The chronicle is in this instance, attributing to Parākramabāhu his own commitment to the time-honoured ideal that the whole island should be under ‘one umbrella’. This ideal was cherished

---
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by the Sangha and the court purely on account of economic and political considerations. Nevertheless, it was always used to justify expansionist policies pursued by the court. In the case of Parākramabāhu’s invasion of Jaffna there is no need to look for any special causes. No dynastic state was ever averse to territorial expansion and annexation. The pursuit of expansionist policies and their success depended on the circumstances. As pointed out earlier Parākramabāhu’s thrust against Jaffna was inevitable owing to the changes that were taking place in the island. Under circumstances which were very favourable to him Parākramabāhu naturally sought to establish his supremacy over the whole island and secure for his court the revenues of the entire island.

The account of the Rājāvaliya suggests that there were two invasions against Jaffna during the reign of Parākramabāhu. On the first occasion Sāpumal is said to have taken prisoners after attacking the frontiers of the Kingdom. It may be inferred that the first expedition led by Sāpumal against Jaffna was unsuccessful and the chronicle seems to omit details that were unfavourable to the King of Kotte. The Ārya cakravarthti was able to resist successfully, presumably with Vijayanagara support, the first invasion launched by Sāpumal. Abdur-Razzāq who visited the court of Devarāya II in A.D. 1443 mentions that Dannāyaka had on the previous year gone on a voyage to Ceylon.41 Dannayaka had gone to the island presumably because some fresh troubles had started there which required his personal intervention. It may be surmised that this dignitary undertook his voyage to Ceylon with a view to relieve the Ārya cakravarthti of the pressure exerted by Kotte. It was perhaps on account of the support that the Ārya cakravarthti received from Vijayanagara that Sāpumal’s first invasion against Jaffna was unsuccessful.

The Rājāvaliya records that Sāpumal was sent again with an army by the king to invade Jaffna. Sāpumal’s second expedition against Jaffna was successful but the Sinhalese chronicles and contemporary Sinhalese texts have not recorded many details concerning his campaigns. The evidence from the Rājāvaliya and the Kokila Sandesaya suggests that his armies met with stubborn resistance at various places on their route to the Ārya cakravarthti’s capital. The transfer of allegiance on the part of the Vanni chiefs may have depleted the military potential of the king of Jaffna and demoralised his forces. Although stubbornly resisted by Kannada troops at Jivakakotte, a military outpost on the mainland which commanded access into the Jaffna peninsula, Sāpumal’s army is said to have pressed towards the capital of Jaffna. The Ārya cakravarthti, in a desperate bid to save his capital, is said to have posted regiments at several entrances to the city, which became scenes of a bitterly fought battle. In order to intercept the advance of the invading forces he had sent detachments of ‘spear-armed Tamils,’ Vanniyar leaders and Indian Muslims. Nevertheless they were all defeated and the Ārya cakravarthti, realizing the futility of any further resistance fled to South India.

The claim made in the Rājāvaliya that Sāpumal slew the Ārya cakravarthti and took his consort and children as captives to Kotte is unfounded. The Yālppapa Vaipava

41. Sewall, A Forgotten Empire, London 1900, p. 74
malai asserts that the king of Jaffna, Kanakacurriya Chik
kaiyarian went to India taking with him, his consort and
children after having been defeated in battle by the Sinhalese.42

This claim made in the Tamil chronicle receives con-
formation from the Kokila Sandesaya, which asserts: 'The
Arya Cakravarti, having brought great, misery on himself,
leaving his country fled across the sea.

The Vaippa Vaiparamalai does not mention Parakram-
abahu(VI) or Sapumal by name. Nor does it say that
it was on account of an invasion from Kotte that the
king of Jaffna had to leave his kingdom. It only records
that Kanakacurriya Chikkaiyarian had to leave the kingdom
in consequence of an insurrection created by the Sinhalese
who had secured the assistance of the Vanniyar.43 It also
adds that during the period of the king's rule which lasted
seventeen years the kingdom was administrated by a certain
Vijayabahu.44 The mention of Vijayabahu in this context
seems to be due to a confusion on the part of the author
between Sapumal and one of his lieutenants whom he left
behind to administer Jaffna when he left for Kotte after
Parakramabahu's death around 1467. The author of the
Tamil chronicle apparently had no reliable information about
Sapumal's invasion and conquest of Jaffna. Besides he was
unable to use the information about Sapumal's rule in
Jaffna as found in local traditions.

The claim made in the Tamil Chronicles that Sinhalese
rule over Jaffna was of seventeen years' duration presupposes
that Kanakacurriya Chikkaiyarian was dislodged from power
around 1450. None of our sources specifically mentions the
date when Jaffna was conquered by Sapumal. As the

Munneswaran inscription of the thirty-eight years of Parakrama-
bahu describes him as Pararajasekhara bhujaga. 'The setpant
to king Pararajasekaram' it may be inferred that the conquest
of Jaffna was already accomplished by the king's thirty eighth regnal year which would correspond to
A.D. 1450 if we assume that the regnal years of the
king were counted from the time he seized power in Kotte
in 1412. Some light is thrown on this matter by the
Salathiniya sandsesaya, which is believed to have been writ-
ten in A.D. 1449. In this poem, the messenger bird,
on the journey from Kotte to Kalani, is asked to wit-
ness the triumphant return of Sapumal from Jaffna within
a short distance after he had left the Capital.45 This
implies that Sapumal had conquered Jaffna when the poem
was being written.

Sapumal's conquest of Jaffna coincided with the decline
of Vijayanagara power in South India. Since the accession
of Mallikarjuna (1447-1465) Vijayanagara power began to
decline. Mallikarjuna was attacked by the Bahmani Sultan
Ala ud-din II (1435-61) and the Gajapati king of
Orissa almost at the same time immediately after his
accession. Although the Raya is known to have repulsed
his invaders, Mallikarjuna proved himself incapable of
sustaining what was achieved for the empire during the
reign of Devaraya. The nobles of the kingdom took advan-
tage of the weakness of the central authority and local
governors became increasingly defiant of the Raya and the
Gajapati invaded the eastern province of his empire. His
steady advance into Telengana greatly weakened the Vijaya-
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Vipukonda and Kondavudu by about 1445 and later he took Udayagiri and raided into the interior of the Tamil country. During these years of the Gajapati’s triumph Vijayanagara power was rudely shaken. In the south there was none of the calibre of Lakkanna Damayakka to sustain the authority of the Vijayanagara government.

These developments in South India were to the immense advantage of Parākramabahu and the Aryan cakravartti who was tributary to Vijayanagara did not get any aid from the South Indian rulers at this time and therefore could not maintain his power against the superior strength of the ruler of Kotte.

Once he was appointed ruler of Jaffna by the king of Kotte as claimed by de Couto and the Rājivāliya Sapumal seems to have consolidated his position there. He seems to have continued the traditional system of administration and received the co-operation of local chieftains and the army which was previously under the Aryan cakravartti. His army in Jaffna is said to have been a composite one consisting of Tamils, Malayalis, Tuluvar and Sinhalese. As the Kokila sandesaya, a contemporary poem, asserts that he occupied a throne in Jaffna and held council with dignitaries it may be assumed that he ruled over Jaffna with the title and paraphernalia of royalty.

The assertion made by the author of the Yāḷppaanā Vaḷpavamāḷai that alien customs were imposed on the people during the period of seventeen years of Sinhalese rule has no valid foundation. As testified by de Couto Sapumal himself was of Dravidian extraction, being the son of a

nobleman who had come to Kotte from Malabar. Tamil and Hindu influences on Sinhalese society during this period were perhaps greater than ever. The king’s daughter, who had a Tamil name Ulakudāya devi, was married to a South Indian Tamil prince called Nāḻūr Ṭunaiyār. Parākramabahu himself had patronized Hindus and Hindu institutions and had issued charters in the Tamil language to Tamil subjects living in the kingdom of Kotte. On account of these considerations the denunciation of Parākramabahu’s rule in Jaffna by the Tamil chronicler would seem to be unjustified.

Tradition as embodied in a verse appended to the Kāḷāyāmāḷai attributes the construction of the Kandaswamy temple to Bhuvanekabahu. It states: “Bhuvanekabahu whose chests were adorned with the garlands of fragrant flowers constructed the city of Yāḷppāguṇam and the temple of Skanda in the year 870.” This verse had existed before the Kāḷāyāmāḷai was written but the author of this chronicle who presumably had no clear idea about Bhuvanekabahu has confused the traditions concerning Bhuvanekabahu with those relating to Cīṅkaiyāriyan I. As he was unaware that Bhuvanekabahu and Cīṅkaiyāriyan I were two different kings who had ruled over Jaffna at different periods, and that the Cīṅkaiyāriyan and Bhuvanekabahu were credited with either the construction or the renovation of the town of Jaffna and temples, the chronicler has harmonized the traditions by making Bhuvanekabahu a minister of the Cīṅkaiyāriyan.

The claim that Bhuvanekabahu constructed the town of Jaffna is inconsistent with other traditions concerning the town of Jaffna. The Kāḷāyāmāḷai asserts that Cīṅkaiyāriyan established
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the royal residence at Nallur. The Rājāvaliya and other Sinhalese sources also assert that the Ārya cakravarthīs were ruling from Jaffna before Sapumal’s conquest. The Kokila sandesaya incidentally mentions that Sapumal was also ruling from the same town—Yāpāpātuna. It cannot therefore be held that the town of Jaffna was founded by Sapumal. The tradition that Bhuvanekabahu established the town of Jaffna could be explained only by assuming that Sapumal had enlarged the old town by constructing additional fortifications and buildings besides older ones.

The claim made in the verse which is appended to the Kailiyamalai that Sapumal constructed the Kandacuvāni temple at Nallur is supported by the kaṭṭiyam a short text recited daily at this temple. This Sanskrit text refers to Soḷasa mahādānāh sīrāṇa vamsodhāvah śrīnāt Sanghabodhi Bhuvanekabahu and Sivagotrodibhavah Raṅgūnātha māppānā.

The temple must have been constructed before Sapumal proceeded to Kottle after the death of Parākramabahu VI and it may be inferred from the evidence of the kaṭṭiyam that Sapumal had assumed the title Sanghabodhi while he was in Jaffna. Sri Sanghabodhi was one of the alternate titles assumed by the Sinhalese kings on their consecration and Sapumal could not have assumed that title before the abdication or death of Parākramabahu. It may therefore be assumed that Sapumal had proclaimed himself king of Kottle soon after the abdication or death of the old king and while he was living in Jaffna. On the basis of this assumption it may be inferred that the temple at Nallur was constructed towards the end of his rule in Jaffna.

Despite his failure to defend his Kingdom, Kannakārīya ciṅkaiyariya does not seem to have been a weak ruler. The Sinhalese sources convey the impression that he had taken steps to meet the invading forces. The suzerainty of the ruler of Kottle over Jaffna could not be maintained after the demise of Parākramabahu.

The old monarch nominated as his successor, his favourite grandson, the son of Ulakudayadevi and died soon after his abdication. Sapumal who claimed for himself the throne of Kottle left Jaffna with an army and waged war against the late king’s grandson and his supporters. Sapumal, however, defeated his enemies and seized the throne of Kottle. The supporters of Vīra Parākramabahu organized a widespread rebellion, the Sihala Samgha, against the new ruler and it took some time for Sapumal who had assumed the name Bhuvanekabahu to consolidate his position within Kottle: His withdrawal of the armies from Jaffna and his preoccupation with the rebellions that followed his accession in Kottle enabled Kannakārīya Ciṅkaiyariya to regain his kingdom around this time. Thus Bhuvanekabahu gained one kingdom but lost another.

50. The assertion of S. Paranavitana and G.P.V. Samarathne that Sapumal had two consorts named Gajavalli and Mahāvalli is wrong. It arises from a misunderstanding of the meaning of the text of the Kaṭṭiyam and an ignorance of Hindu mythology. Gajavalli and Mahāvalli referred to in this text are doubtless the consorts of Subramanya in Hindu mythology.
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