

22 Jan. 1974

C7

SOA

To be returned to the
~~ACADEMIC REGISTRAR,~~
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON,
~~SENATE HOUSE, W.C.1.~~
with the Examiners Reports

Ph.D. (Oriental + African lang. + lit.) 1974

ProQuest Number: 10672824

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10672824

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SINHALESE LITERATURE
IN THE ELEVENTH AND TWELFTH CENTURIES

by

Gatare Dhammapala

Thesis submitted for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
University of London

1973



Abstract

The thesis consists of six chapters.

The first chapter deals with the historical background of the period (eleventh and twelfth centuries A.D.). It sums up the results of the Cōla invasion and examines the nature and the functions of intellectual awakening after the re-establishment of Sinhalese rule with special reference to the age of Parākramabāhu I.

The second chapter treats briefly almost all the works of the period with their respective authors. It includes various categories of works, literary and otherwise, written in Sinhalese, Pali and Sanskrit.

The third chapter concerns the concept of bhakti and its special significance in the context of devotional literature. It also shows how this concept was transferred to the Buddha by later Buddhist devotee writers.

The fourth chapter makes a comparative study of the works of Gurulugomi and Vidyācakravartī. It

examines their inspirations and influences from such Buddhist works as Avadānas as well as Sanskrit poetic traditions and some Sanskrit prose works. It also assesses the literary quality of each work.

The fifth chapter contains a comparative study of the Sasadāvata and the Muvadevdāvata. It deals with the concept of poetry with special reference to the Siyabaslakara, and examines the inspiration of these Sinhalese poems from Buddhist literary traditions in addition to their influence from Sanskrit poetic traditions. It also approaches each work aesthetically following the rasa theory as postulated by Ānandavardhana and Viśvanātha.

The sixth chapter deals with the problem of literary translation. It examines the translating processes put into practice by Ceylonese writers from early times. It pays special attention to the translating processes practised by Gurulugomi and Vidyācakravartī in their renderings of verse and prose.

Acknowledgements

This thesis brings the result of my research work under the supervision of Mr. C.H.B. Reynolds of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.

I express my deep and sincere sense of gratitude for his help, guidance and illuminating comments during the preparation of this thesis.

It was Professor W.G. Balagalla who first awakened my interest in this subject. I am indebted to him for his valuable suggestion.

I also wish to acknowledge my debt to the University of Sri Lankā, Vidyodaya Campus for financing me during my course of studies in London and meeting the expenses of travelling to and from the United Kingdom.

Finally I am grateful to the library staff of the School of Oriental and African Studies and to Dr. H. Saddhattissa and Dr. Ananda Kulasuriya for their help.

Contents

	Page
Abstract	2 - 3
Acknowledgements	4
Abbreviations	7
Introduction	8 - 21
Chapter I	
<u>Historical Background</u>	22 - 72
(a) The invasion of Cōlas and expansion of Hinduism	
(b) The intellectual awakening during the period	
Chapter II	
<u>On Scholars and Their Works</u>	73 - 151
Kassapa ^m , Ānanda ^m , Buddhappiya and Vedeha ^m , Anuruddha ^m , Moggallāna ^m , Buddharakkhita ^m , Sāriputta and his disciples: Saṅgharakkhita ^m , Sumaṅgala ^m , Vācissra ^m , Dhammakitti ^m , Author of the Mahābodhivaṃsa-granthipadaya ^m , Author of the Jātaka-atuva-gāṭapadaya ^m , Atthadassi ^m , Authors of the Sasadāvata and the Muvadevdāvata ^m , Guruḷugomi, Vidyācakravarti. A perspective on authors and their works	

Chapter III

The Devotional Literature

152 - 205

- (a) Bhakti cult
- (b) A note on the historical development of devotional literature
- (c) Some aspects of Ceylonese devotional works
- (d) Some devotional aspects of the Butsarana

Chapter IV

A Comparative Study of the Prose Works ofGurulugomi and Vidyācakravartī

206 - 273

Dharmapradīpikāva, Amāvatura,
Butsarana.

Chapter V

A Comparative Study of the Sasadāvata and
the Muvadevdāvata

274 - 359

- (a) An observation on the concept of poetry
- (b) A general consideration of the Sasadāvata and the Muvadevdāvata
- (c) A comparison between the Sasadāvata and the Muvadevdāvata

Chapter VI

A Study of the Art of Translation

360 - 408

- (a) Some aspects of literary translation
- (b) Some distinctive features inherent in the renderings of Gurulugomi and Vidyācakravartī

Conclusion

409 - 413

Bibliography

414 - 429

Abbreviations

<u>Cat. Sinhalese MSS.</u>	<u>Catalogue of the Sinhalese Manuscripts in the British Museum</u>
<u>CHJ.</u>	<u>Ceylon Historical Journal</u>
<u>Cv.</u>	<u>Cūlavamsa</u>
<u>EZ.</u>	<u>Epigraphia Zeylanica</u>
<u>Fn.</u>	Foot note
<u>Govt. ed.</u>	Government edition
<u>IHQ.</u>	<u>Indian Historical Quarterly</u>
<u>JCBRAS.</u>	<u>Journal of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society</u>
<u>JCBRAS. (NS)</u>	<u>Journal of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society (New Series)</u>
<u>JPTS.</u>	<u>Journal of the Pali Text Society</u>
<u>MMS. Nevill</u>	<u>List of Pali, Sinhalese, Sanskrit and other Manuscripts formerly in the possession of Hugh Nevill</u>
<u>P.</u>	Pali
<u>PTS.</u>	Pali Text Society
<u>SHB.</u>	Simon Hewavitarane Bequest
<u>Sin.</u>	Sinhalese
<u>Sk.</u>	Sanskrit
<u>UC.</u>	University of Ceylon
<u>UCR.</u>	<u>University of Ceylon Review</u>

Introduction

This study involves an ancient period of Sinhalese literature, which falls between the eleventh and twelfth centuries. For many reasons this period bears special significance for the nation as a whole, especially its religious and cultural movements. This age begins with the invasion of Cōlas, which brought about immense humiliation to the nation, and it ends with the rise of many severe problems, internal and external, that affected the native people very widely, and finally resulted in another foreign invasion. Despite the foreign attacks and internal discord among royal princes who claimed the throne, the two regimes of Vijayabāhu I and Parākramabāhu I brought back peace and prosperity to the Island of Lankā. Under the leaderships of these two great rulers who strove to build an independent and united nation, the surviving religious and cultural institutions of the Sinhalese, which had severely suffered during the foreign rule and internal unrest, flourished anew and the Island was so fortunate as to regain its past splendour.

It is certain that almost every national movement of the Sinhalese ceased to function in the reign of the Cōlas owing to their destructive policy and negligence

towards the heritage of the native people. Accordingly, constructive pursuits in the literary, cultural or religious fields cannot be expected from them. But their rule, which lasted more than seven decades, no doubt must have paved the way for a convergence of the thoughts and concepts of the new ruling class with those of the inhabitants. At first, the impact between the views of two nations belonging to two different religious and cultural heritages might have caused upheaval in that society. In the same way the reaction that might come from the native people, especially from intellectual circles, to these new thoughts and concepts must have yielded various results in the national life. Though many features of this are hidden in the past we cannot ignore the significance of this impact of thoughts between two national groups. We need therefore, to examine how far the results of this impact influenced the subsequent literature of Ceylon written in Sinhalese, Pali and Sanskrit.

According to the chronicle the regimes of the two above-mentioned monarchs opened the way to international relationships between Ceylon and the countries of South and South-East Asia. Learned theras and many scholars

from abroad are reported to have come to the Island on several occasions for various purposes at the personal request of these kings, or of their own accord. Those scholars, who were welcomed cordially by the munificence of the monarchs, no doubt must have played an important role in religious as well as literary fields. And such relationships will have brought about a great confrontation between the intellectual faculties of native people and those of foreigners. Thus, we may also need to make an enquiry into the effective influence of these relationships on the national literature. It must be noted that Pali and Sanskrit seem to be the main vehicle of international communication and the main media through which one nation's intellectual treasure came to be known to the other. Pali as the language of the Theravāda Buddhism wielded its predominance over many learned faculties of religious studies, while Sanskrit as a language of art and science did the same or more over almost every faculty of studies during this period. The authoritative power of these two languages and the potent influence of their literatures on Sinhalese are unmistakable. The relationship of these literatures with Sinhalese, which inspired native writers by providing themes, plots, modes and so

forth, should be studied for the evaluation of its effectiveness on the one hand, and the appreciation of the literary merits of each work in Sinhalese on the other.

Accordingly, this study should partly concern itself with the various significant features of the selected literary period, including religious or cultural movements and intellectual pursuits with their contributions, and partly with the selected literary works themselves. While the study of the particular literary works occupies the main part of our research it will also touch on the field of literary relationship, or more specifically, literary indebtedness, which features as an important branch of literary research within particular literatures, and especially in comparative literature.¹

It has been pointed out that any serious study or analysis of any author includes consideration of the component parts of his work, their meaning and relationship, how they are suggested to the author, what they meant to him and to his work. Some scholars and critics

1. Comparative Literature, (Method and Perspective), ed. Newton P. Stalknecht and Horst Frenz, Literary Indebtedness and Comparative Literary Studies, by J.T. Shaw (Carbondale, 1971), pp. 84, ff.

who have studied literary indebtedness, seem to feel that to suggest an author's literary debts diminishes his originality. But it appears that many great authors who admitted their indebtedness to others felt that originality consists not in materials or in style and manner, but in the genuineness and effectiveness of the artistic moving power of the creative work. In their opinion, what genuinely moves the reader aesthetically and produces an independent artistic effect has artistic originality, whatever its debts.¹ We may also agree that the original author is not necessarily the innovator or the most inventive, but rather the one who succeeds in making all his own, in subordinating what he takes from others to the new complex of his own artistic work.²

It is of note in this respect that some protagonists of Sanskrit poetics who dealt with the subject of literary borrowing were of the view that literary borrowings do not always blur the originality of a poet, but sometimes bring a charming beauty to the work instead, according to the skill of the borrower. A poet who is influenced by earlier poets and their works creates certain compositions which bear resemblance to the

1. Comparative Literature, pp. 85-86.

2. Ibid., pp. 85-86.

original works where they are borrowed from. Ānandavardhana divides such works into three categories, namely, those reflecting the same image, those like a painted picture and those like two living persons resembling each other. Of these, the first and the second should, he says, be rejected for they are devoid of their own souls. The third, according to him, acquires exceeding beauty and should be practised. According to this formulation, though its subject matter is drawn from an earlier work of art, it bears charming beauty and brings credit to the borrower.¹ The indebtedness in such a case is no cause for reproach.

Further, Ānandavardhana laid down: 'Even trite subjects in poetry will put on a new freshness if they get touched with sentiment, just as the same trees appear quite new with the advent of new spring.'² It is apparent from this formulation and his illustration of this idea by comparing some verses — old and new — that Ānandavardhana holds firmly that even in a literary borrowing could be manifested the creative skill or originality of a poet if it is saturated with poetic sentiment.³

1. Dhvanyāloka, pp. 594-595.

2. Ibid., ch.4, v.4, p.567.

3. Ānandavardhana quotes some pairs of verses in order to illustrate his idea; in such cases he tries to show the charming beauty inherent in the new verse in spite of its close resemblance to the earlier verse. See Dhvanyāloka, pp.567-568.

Rājasekhara, the author of the Kāvya-mīmāṃsā, who handled the question of borrowing or plagiarism in detail, laid down that there is no poet that is not a thief, but he who knows how to hide his theft flourishes without reproach.¹ He deals with two kinds of borrowing, namely, that which should be avoided and that which should be adopted. In his view, a poet may be a creator (utpādaka), or an adopter (parivartaka), one who covers up (ācchādaka), or a collector (saṅgrāhaka). He who sees something new in word and sense writes up something old but in a different way may also be accounted a great poet.² Ksemendra, the author of the Sarasvatī-kanthābharana, also deals with this sort of literary borrowing. To his mind, a poet while composing may thrive in the shadow of another poet, or on his words (pada), or on his metrical line (pāda), or on his entire composition. Or he may thrive on his own faculty acquired by effort.³

All this shows how far earlier poets and their works are effective on later writers. And at the same time it reveals that the creative power of a poet could be manifested even in something borrowed from the work

1. Kāvya-mīmāṃsā, ed. Ganga Sangara Rai (Varanasi, 1964), ch. 11, p. 158.

2. Ibid., ch. 11, pp. 144, 158.

3. Suryakanta, Ksemendra Studies, Sarasvatī-kanthābharana (Poona, 1954), pp. 97. ff.

of an earlier poet. Though our critics of Sanskrit poetics sometimes discussed the question of novelty in poetry none of them postulated entire newness of poetic themes, plots and so forth,¹ for they perceived that almost every poet has had some sort of relationship, in one way or another, with previous poets. In spite of such relations, direct or indirect, to earlier poetical works, the problem of novelty in new creative writings exercised the attention of those critics. Certain attempts were made by some of them to find ways and means by which novelty should be achieved. Ānandavardhana, one of the foremost in that rank, laid down certain formulations regarding the matter, that is to say, how novelty should be achieved in poetry when a poet deals with a trite subject from an earlier poem. He tried to tackle this problem by paying special attention to his theory of suggestive power. Thus, at the outset of the fourth chapter, he formulates: 'By a mere touch of even a single variety of suggestion, the poet's expression will acquire novelty though it might embody only a trite idea.' He illustrates this conception with examples quoted from old and new works, by throwing light on how each new verse acquires novelty through the variety of suggestion despite

1. See Dhvanyāloka, ch. 4, v. 15 and its commentary pp. 597 - 598.

the existence of an earlier verse embodying the same idea. At the close of his discussion he concludes:

'Novelty is produced in poetic themes not only by their union with the varieties of suggested content, but also by their contact with the varieties of suggestive elements.'¹

It is apparent from the foregoing discussion, that these critics of Sanskrit poetics paid great attention to the problem of novelty in poetry in parallel to originality or the imaginative power of a poet, by treating the literary relationship or indebtedness to earlier poets and their works. It seems that in their view the critical reader needs to have a knowledge of the literary relationship of a work to earlier works; in other words, he must be conversant with the source of each work which he is dealing with. Accordingly, they seem to have felt that any literary study of a work without such critical knowledge is not perfect and is not sufficient to meet the demands of literary appreciation.

In this respect, it seems necessary to add some annotation to such terms as imitation, borrowing, source, influence and translation which are too often met with in the study of literary relationship.

1. Dhvanyāloka, ch. 4, pp. 558-569.

In the case of imitation the author is obliged to give up his creative personality to that of another author. In Ānandavardhana's view imitations retain the same essence as that of the earlier work; they do not possess their own souls. He uses the term 'pratibimbakalpa-kāvya' (a poem like a reflected image) to mean a composition which is exactly the same as an earlier work.¹ Rājasekhara also uses this term in the same sense as Ānandavardhana. He gives more details regarding the characteristics of such a composition. They are outlined by these words: 'A poem (kāvya) which conveys entirely the same meaning (as that of an earlier work) though in a different syntactic manner and does not differ (from the earlier work) in purpose is called a 'pratibimbakalpa'.² This kind of 'poetic reflection' is not appreciated by those ancient critics.

In the case of borrowings, the writer helps himself to materials or methods, especially to aphorisms, images, figures of speech, motifs, plot elements. A borrowing, according to a modern literary critic, is an allusion, more or less clearly pointing to the literary sources.³ In Rājasekhara the term harana which is

1. Dhvanyāloka, ch. 4, p. 595.

2. arthaḥ sa eva sarvo - vākyāntaraviracanaṅparam yatra, tadaparamārtthavibhedam kāvyam - pratibimbakalpaṁ syāt. Kāvyaṁimānsā, ch. 12, p. 161.

3. Comparative Literature, p. 89.

equivalent to borrowing, is defined in these words: 'parayuktayoh sabdārthayorupanibandhah' i.e. to use words and meanings (in a poetical composition) that had been employed by others.¹ Rājasekhara details five kinds of borrowings, namely, borrowing of words (pada), borrowing of metrical line (pāda), borrowing of meaning (artha), borrowing of metre (vṛtta) and borrowing of entire composition (prabandha). This sort of borrowing from earlier works of art seems to have been one of the main subjects of some critics in the field of Sanskrit poetics at one time, especially in the days of Rājasekhara.² The matter is discussed by them in detail, paying special attention to the problem of how to turn those borrowings skillfully to advantage in a poetical composition. In general, the task of critics and scholars with literary borrowings is to discover the relationships of the use of the material in the new work to that of the old - the artistic use to which the borrowing is put.

1. Kāvyamīmāṃsā, ch. 12, p. 144.

2. See also History of Sanskrit Poetics, II, pp. 287-288, 296-298.

It is of note that some Sinhalese authors who wrote paraphrases or such works considered the search for sources where borrowings are taken from as an essential factor in the study of literature.

See Mahābodhivamsagranthipada-vivaranaya, Dharmapradīpikāva and Sasadāvata-purāna-sanne.

The term source is most frequently used to indicate the place from which a borrowing is taken. But for a modern critic of literary indebtedness this use of 'source' seems to be different from the 'source' in the sense of a work providing the materials or the basic part of the materials - especially the plot - for a particular work. The source in this sense may or may not provide or even suggest the form for a particular work.¹ For the Sanskrit literary critics we have mentioned above, the source seems to provide not only the materials but also the form or the artistic use of materials. It is not clear from their formulations whether they meant that the source provides simultaneously both the materials and the artistic use of materials for a particular work. Nevertheless, those formulations do not deny that a particular work, or at least a part of it, can be the source for a work of a later writer while the artistic use of materials in his work came from elsewhere.

An author may be considered to have been influenced by an earlier writer, native or foreign, when his new literary work shows something of an extraordinary effect that cannot be explained by his personal development.

1. Comparative Literature, p. 90.

In contrast to imitation, influence seems to show the influenced author producing work which is essentially his own. Influence is not confined to individual details or images or borrowings or even sources, though it may include them, but is defined as something pervasive, something organically involved in and presented through artistic works.¹ Influence, to be meaningful, is required to be manifested in an intrinsic form, upon or within the literary works themselves.¹ Thus, influence may be shown in style, images, characters, themes, mannerisms, as well as in content and ideas presented by particular works. We may further note that influence may accompany or follow social or political movements or, especially, upheavals.² The source of influence might not necessarily be a literary one; it could be religious or otherwise. For instance, at a time when a new religious concept or similar influential view had been introduced to a certain society it might cause upheaval and pave the way to radical change of direction of a particular literary tradition, and perhaps make writers produce new literary works.

1. Comparative Literature, p. 92.

Also see Claudio Guillen, Literature as System (Princeton, New Jersey, 1971), pp. 18, 28-41. Haskell M. Block, The Concept of Influence in Comparative Literature, The Year Book of Comparative and General Literature, 1958, Vol. VII, pp. 34-35.

2. Ibid., p. 93.

Translations, whether they are counted as creative acts or not, bring into the contemporary native literary tradition works written in another language. Despite the fact that the translator gives himself up entirely or partly to the form and the matter of the original work when he reproduces it in the new language many literary critics tend to categorize them as creative art.¹ A modern critic of translation who seeks to compare the task of translation with the universally acknowledged arts of painting and drawing mentions that the contention that translation is an art would be admitted without hesitation by all who have ever had much experience of the work of translation.² Another critic, by name Renato Poggioli, who sees the translator stand at the opposite pole from the performing artist, musician, singer, or actor, claims that the translator is the only interpretative artist.³ Translations, whether they deserve to claim artistic status or not, provide another subject of interest and value to the field of literary relationship.

-
1. Comparative Literature, p.88.
 2. Theodore Savory, The Art of Translation (London, 1968), pp. 30-31.
 3. Renato Poggioli, The Added Artificer, On Translation, ed. R.A. Brower (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1959), p.138.

Chapter I

Historical Background

(a) The Invasion of the Cōlas and the Expansion of Hinduism

The later years of the Anurādhapura period furnish neither stability in the state nor unity among the royal princes who claimed the throne. Much discord and unrest broke out through the country due to the incompetence of the rulers. The first of the last two Anurādhapura kings, Sena V (A.D. 972-982), whose political power was much weakened early in his reign by the revolt of the general Sena, ended his short life in debauchery at Polonnaruva.¹ His successor Mahinda V (A.D. 982-1029) fled to Ruhuna because of his failure to pay the Malabar mercenaries, who came out on strike demanding arrears of pay and besieged the king in the royal palace.² The events that occurred after his flight indicated that the Island was faced with imminent invasion from a neighbouring country. The Cūlavamsa refers to the situation immediately before the invasion;

1. The Cūlavamsa, ed. Wilhelm Geiger (London, 1925), ch. 54, vv. 57-72.

2. Ibid., ch. 55, vv. 1-12.

' In the remaining parts of the country, Keralas, Sīhalas, and Kaṇṇāṭas carried on the government as they pleased'.¹

The machinery of government ceased to function. Law and order in the land were interrupted. Rājarāja I (A.D. 985-1016), the Cōla king, hearing of the situation in the island dispatched his army to invade Ceylon. In A.D. 993 his forces captured Anurādhapura and annexed the principality of Rajarāṭa as a province of the Cōla empire.²

The kingdom was moved to Polonnaruva and Anurādhapura ceased to be of political significance for ever. The Cōla viceroy governed Rajarāṭa in the name of the Cōla king. In A.D. 1017, just twenty four years after their first invasion, the Cōla army conquered Rōhaṇa and captured the Sinhalese king alive and deported him to the Cōla kingdom where he died in captivity in A.D. 1029. Thus the great kingdom of the Sinhalese became a territory of the Cōla empire; the glory of Anurādhapura that had flourished for twelve centuries came to an end. Irreparable damage caused by the Cōla invasion is portrayed by the chronicler in these words: 'In the three fraternities and in all Laṅkā, breaking open the relic chambers, (they carried away) many

1. Cv. ch. 55, v.12.

2. C.W.Nicolas and S.Paranavitana, A Concise History of Ceylon (Colombo, 1961), p.158.

See also University of Ceylon, History of Ceylon, Vol.I, Pt. I (Colombo, 1959), pp. 348-351.

costly images of gold, and while they violently destroyed here and there all the monasteries like blood sucking yakkhas, they took all the treasures of Lañkā for themselves'.¹ Although the brave Sinhalese soldiers and royal princes in Rōhana broke out in revolt for sovereignty, none of them other than Prince Kittī (Vijayabāhu I) was able to lead the Sinhalese force successfully against the Cōla power to clear it out from the land. The Cōla regime therefore, lasted for seventy seven years until Vijayabāhu I liberated the island of Lañkā in A.D.1070. He celebrated his ceremonial of kingly consecration three years later in A.D.1073.²

It is clear that the Cōlas' religion and culture occupied a commanding position during the period of their occupation of Ceylon. Under such circumstances the religious and cultural activities of the indigenous people received a rude set back for more than seven decades. The destruction wrought by the Cōlas to Buddhism was enormous. As is pointed out by Paranavitana, institutional Buddhism was on the point of disappearing; apart from acts of repression and pillage by the Cōlas, the decay of temples and the diminution by neglect or lapse of the temple revenues, the sangha had

1. Cv. ch. 55, vv. 20-21.

2. History of Ceylon (UC) (Colombo, 1960), Vol.I, pt.II, p.427.

suffered severely in its membership.¹ Soon after his enthronement Vijayabāhu I made a request to the king of Burma to send pious and learned theras to Ceylon, due to the lack of bhikkhus who were competent to perform the ordination ceremony.² While Buddhism and Sinhalese culture suffered from lack of strength, Hinduism and its culture were reinforced with the extended support of Cōla imperialism and they flourished in some parts of the country. Temples were built for Hindu deities.³ No doubt Brahmanical rituals and customary Hindu ceremonies of various types must have been performed in these temples. Certain archaeological discoveries and ruins which belong to this period exhibit how far they affected society. The Śiva Dēvāle No. 2 at Polonnaruva which is regarded as one of the masterpieces of the Dravidian architecture was built by the Cōlas. It is mentioned that the Dēvāle named Vānavan Mādēvī Īsvaraṃ had been erected not long after the Cōlas had settled there.⁴ Śiva Dēvāle No. I is also believed to have been erected between twelfth and thirteenth centuries.⁵ Such shrines were consecrated to the god Śiva,

-
1. History of Ceylon (UC), p.562. See also W.M.K.Wijetunga, The Rise and Decline of Cola Power in Ceylon, unpublished Ph.D thesis, University of London, 1962. pp.323 ff.
 2. Cv. ch.60, vv.4-5.
 3. History of Ceylon (UC), p.413.
 4. Ibid. p.590.
 5. S.Paranavitana, 'The Art and Architecture of the Polonnaruva Period', Ceylon Historical Journal, IV, (Colombo, 1954-55), p.82.

one of the most esteemed deities of the Hindu trinity in South India. Some bronze images which are considered to have been made in South India were found at these Śiva Dēvāles. Among the images preserved in the Colombo museum there are specimens of Naṭarāja, Śaiva saints and Śiva and Pārvati.¹ It is also recorded in a slab inscription from Pāla Mōttai that donations to the god Śiva had been made by a Brahmin lady, in memory of her husband.² As is evident by these facts, it is justifiable to conclude that Śaivism was the predominant religion under the Cōḷa power, and it might have been popular not only among the Tamils but also among some other people in the Island. The religious foundation of the Cōḷas was so firmly established that even Vijayabāhu I continued and extended his support to it. He not only permitted the religious foundations established by the Cōḷas but also patronized new Śaiva shrines founded in his reign.³

As a matter of fact, many gods belonging to the circle of the Hindu pantheon such as Viṣṇu, Skanda, Gaṇeśa and

-
1. S. Paranavitana, 'The Art and Architecture of the Polonnaruva Period', Ceylon Historical Journal, IV (Colombo, 1954-55), p.71.
 2. Epigraphia Zeylanica, Vol. IV (London, 1943), pp.193-194.
 3. History of Ceylon, (UC), p.434; EZ., pp. 193-194; Wijetunga is of the opinion that the progress made by Hinduism in the Rajarata during the occupation of the Cōḷas would have led to a closer contact with Buddhism after its revival in the time of Vijayabāhu I. The Rise and Decline of Cōḷa Power in Ceylon, p.340.

many others were held in high esteem during this period. Some of them were assimilated in the faiths of the people and in their culture, while others were identified with Buddhist devatās. According to the literary sources it seems that the god Viṣṇu who was regarded as the protector of the world came into prominence during this time in parallel with the god Śiva. The Sasadāvata, belonging to the twelfth century, gives some evidence regarding these gods. The author mentions that Śiva and Viṣṇu were among the gods who came to venerate the Buddha.¹ The popularity of Hindu gods in medieval Ceylon is discussed in detail with much literary evidence by Ariyapala,² which we need not repeat. We may however, refer to some evidence which needs our attention.

The god Skanda who is also called Murugan and Kārtikeya was worshipped during this period. In the relic-chamber painting at Mahiyaṅgana executed in Vijayabāhu's time, Śiva, Viṣṇu and Kārtikeya are represented in the company of the divinities who came to laud the Buddha.³ His name

-
1. Sasadāvata, ed. A. Dhammapala, (Vālitara, 1934), v.181.
 2. M.B. Ariyapala, Society in Mediaeval Ceylon (Colombo, 1956), p. 185.
 3. History of Ceylon, p. 578.

was included in a legend which reveals his mysterious appearance in divine form and is related in the Cūlavamsa written during the Polonnaruva period. According to the story there was a prince called Mānavamma, heir to the throne of Lankā. At one time he seated himself on the bank of the river in the neighbourhood of Gokaṇṇa and made full preparations according to custom, for an incantation. He began, after taking the rosary in his hand, to murmur the magic verse. To him there appeared Kumāra (Skanda) and his riding bird, the peacock. The bird pecked with its beak at the plate with the offerings. But finding no drink in the old coconut shell with its holes, out of which the water had run, he flew at the prince's face. Thinking only of his future success (bhāvinim siddhim apekkham) the prince offered him his eye. The peacock slit it open and drank thereout violently. Kumāra was pleased, granted the prince his prayed-for wish and departed, brightly gleaming through the air.¹ This story, although it is not connected with a contemporary event, furnishes us with evidence to the belief in Skanda during this time. Such Pali works as the Rasavāhinī of Vedeha and the Dāthāvamsa of Dhammakitti which are ascribed to this period also give some details

1. Cv. ch. 57, vv. 4-11.

regarding these gods. Though such details are removed in time and space, they appear to bear a certain relation to society which we are dealing with.¹

Brahmins appear to have come to Ceylon in considerable numbers during the Cōḷa regime. There is no doubt that they performed religious rites for devotees as practised in their own country. Though the insufficient evidence does not allow us to conclude that the Brahmins had attempted to convert the native people to their religion, under these circumstances it is inevitable that their religious rites and ceremonies must have received much attention from the inhabitants. As Ariyapala has suggested, the native people might have included them in their own faiths.² Not only during the Cōḷa occupation, but after Vijayabāhu's enthronement as well, the Brahmins had a close relationship with kings and high officials of the state. It is pointed out that the king Vijayabāhu I had not discriminated against the Brahmanical forms of worship.³ An inscription, dated in the forty second year of Vijayabāhu I, from Kantalay - a village which was inhabited by Brahmins at that time

-
1. Rasavāhini, ed. Saranatisa (Colombo, 1928), pp. 56-58; 163-165. Dāthāvamsa, ed. Silalankara (Alutgama, 1914), vv. 155, 205, 206, 207, 209.
 2. Society in Mediaeval Ceylon, p. 180.
 3. History of Ceylon, p.180; EZ., Vol. IV, pp. 193-194.

and for a century later - records that the charitable bequest made to a Saiva temple there was to be maintained and protected by the Velaikkaras. Referring to this inscription, Parnavitana suggests that Kantalay probably became a centre of Hindu influence during the period of Cōla rule in the eleventh century, and the Sinhalese kings who succeeded the Cōlas maintained the Brahmins and patronised their shrines. Further, he points out that the Saiva shrine at Kantalay, since it was called Vijayarāja Īsvaram, must have been founded by Vijayabāhu I or at least under his patronage.¹

The Cūlavamsa refers to occasions when the Sinhalese kings and princes performed Brahmanical rites apart from their observance of Buddhist precepts. It is recorded that Mānābharana had rites like 'homa' sacrifice performed by the house priest and other Brahmins versed in the Veda and Vedāngas, in order to be blessed with a son.² The episode says that the king once made over the whole administration to his ministers and while he himself sojourned nearby for seven or eight months, he camped one

1. History of Ceylon, (UC), p. 134.

2. Cv. ch. 62, v. 33.

night in the temple of the king of gods, observing the precept of discipline.¹ The king of gods in this context is identified with Indra or Śakra by Geiger.² This identification, though possible, suffers from insufficient evidence. No other evidence is available to support any idea of a shrine dedicated to Indra or Śakra. It is interesting to surmise that this specific religious rite may have some sort of connexion with the Devarāja cult which flourished in some parts of Asia during the medieval times. This was probably a form of a Śaivism centred on the worship of the linga. According to this supposition, the property of the kingdom was considered to be bound up with the welfare of the royal linga.³ It may be of significance to observe that even in the reign of Parakramabāhu I a special house called Dhāraṇīghara was built for Brahmins to recite magic verses.⁴ From all this it is apparent that during the eleventh and the twelfth centuries many features of Hinduism

1. Cv. ch. 62, v. 11.

2. Culavamsa (PTS) translation, Wilhelm Geiger (London, 1928), pt. I, ch. 62, v. 11 fn.

3. D.G.E. Hall, A History of South-East Asia (New York, 1970), p. 102.

4. Cv. ch. 73, v. 71.

have influenced Sinhalese Buddhists as well as their culture.

It is likely under such circumstances that the Indian Bhakti cult must have been held in high esteem among Hindu communities in Ceylon who came here as immigrants and invaders and that it had some influence on the tenets and practices of the native population. During this time when the Dravidian culture had reached its peak, Saivism and Vaisnavism had a great revival in India, especially in the South. It is believed that the Bhāgavata Purāna which sums up the tenets and the outlook of the neo-bhakti cult was composed about the beginning of the tenth century. The Saiva canon which was enriched with the hymns of such well-known Saiva poets as Sambandar, Appar and Sundarar, is said to have been arranged in the first instance in the reign of Rājarāja I by Nambi Andar Nambi. In the same way the Vaiṣṇava canon was given definitive shape by Nāthamuni during that time.¹ The theory of spiritual non-dualism (advaita) and world illusion (māyā) promulgated by the great Saṅkarācārya and his followers seems to have led to a vigorous revival of Vaisnavism in the subsequent centuries and about the twelfth century.²

1. K.A. Nilakanta Sastri, A History of South India (London, 1958, p. 418).

2. Susil Kumar De, Early History of Vaisnava Faith and Movements in Bengal (Calcutta, 1942), p.2.

Saṅkara's extreme idealistic monism, postulating the sole reality of an attributeless and unconditional Brahman, hardly leaves any scope for a dualistic conception of an individual soul's longing devotion for a personal deity. According to him, the soul is really a part of Brahman individualised by association with māyā. And when released from māyā, the soul is again merged in Brahman and loses its identity. This monistic theory of non-duality paved the way for controversial speculations among some intellectual circles. There were four sampradāyas or schools of thought, namely Śrī, Brahma, Rudra and Sanakādi which were engaged in expounding new theories intended to refute Saṅkara's theory. These sampradāyas associated respectively with the names of Rāmānuja, Madhva, Viṣṇuvāmin and Nimbārka played a very important part in the later development of the Vaiṣṇava faith which expounded new theories known as Qualified non-duality (visistādvaita-vāda), Duality (dvaita-vāda), Pure non-duality (suddhādvaita-vāda), and Dualistic Non-duality (dvaitādvaita-vāda). Each of these schools wrote a fresh commentary on the Vedāntasūtra, in which an attempt was made to establish a theory which would permit the individual exercise of love and piety in a world of reality, some of them maintaining a frankly dualistic position, and others

expounding various degrees of qualified dualistic views. These sampradāyas (except Rudra which is considered as more modern) played a vital part in the propagation of Vaisnava faith during the medieval times. It is not unlikely that the devotional faith inspired by these movements might have become known to Ceylon in various ways and affected the contemporary mind of the Ceylonese in general.

(b) The Intellectual Awakening During the Period

As is described in the Cūlavamsa, Vijayabāhu I when he had driven out his enemies completely and freed the country from the mighty Cōla power, turned his mind to the task of repairing the damage that had been inflicted upon the national life by foreign invasion. Religious and social activities that had been neglected for more than half a century were begun throughout the country. Finding that there had been no higher ordination for many years due to the lack of ordained monks in the Island, caused by the internal disturbances during the foreign rule, the king invited learned theras from Burma through the king Anuruddha to establish the ordination in Ceylon. The theras who came to Ceylon were no doubt masters of the three pitakas and helped in the resuscitation of learning by instructing a large number of bhikkhus in the three pitakas and the commentaries.¹ The king himself and Yasodharā, the king's daughter, are said to have built monasteries for the bhikkhus of the three fraternities.² He caused the three pitakas to be written out and given to the monks who desired copies. It is undisputed that

1. G.P. Malalasekara, The Pali Literature of Ceylon (London, 1928), p. 166.

2. Cv. ch. 60, vv. 13, 83, 84.

Buddhism which was in decline during the Cōḷa period revived under the generous patronage of the royalty.

This religious revival, as Malalasekara has remarked, was accompanied by a great intellectual reawakening.¹ According to the Cūlavamsa the king himself was a scholar and a poet who was described as the master of poets (kavissara).² Literary activities had a great attraction for him. It is said that amidst his kingly duties he found time every morning to seclude himself for a few hours in his library where he translated Dhammasaṅgani into Sinhalese. This translation and poems ascribed to his authorship are lost forever. Being a generous patron of learning, the king encouraged poets by giving them great possessions with heritable villages.³ The young noble sons of royal rank in his court who composed verses were awarded suitable presents by the king, who listened carefully and appreciated them.⁴ It is also mentioned that the mighty monarch gladdened many scholars who had come from India with gifts of money.⁵

1. Malalasekara, op. cit., p. 166.

2. Cv. ch. 60, v. 76.

3. Cv. ch. 60, v. 75.

4. Cv. ch. 60, v. 76.

5. Cv. ch. 60, v. 19.

Nothing has been said to identify these scholars in the chronicle, yet it reveals that men of great learning in arts and science who came from abroad were cordially welcomed. Intellectuals either from outside or within are indeed an essential feature in reviving a nation. This was an important incident in our history which provided us once more with a better opportunity to make contact with the culture and the intellectual movements of other lands.¹ Among these learned men who received a welcome from the royalty, there would have been well versed Sanskrit and Tamil scholars including Mahāyānist teachers.² It is recorded that Vijayabāhu I on several occasions sent costly offerings to the Mahābodhi at Bodhgaya in India.³ These religious missions as Paranavitana has suggested must have been instrumental in establishing contacts with the various schools of Buddhism.⁴ It is certain that the Buddhist communities at Kāñci and Nāgapaṭṭanaṃ in South India had frequent intercourse with Buddhists in Ceylon.⁵ These confrontations of various scholars with the native intellectual

1. Malalasekara, op. cit., p. 167.

2. History of Ceylon (UC), Vol. II, p. 565.

3. Cv. ch. 60, v. 23.

4. History of Ceylon (UC), Vol. II, p. 564.

5. History of Ceylon (UC), Vol. II, p. 565.

faculties in Ceylon no doubt must have brought about a great revival in the contemporary society, especially in educational circles. It is not surprising in such an atmosphere that Sanskrit scholarship, which was not acknowledged by the early exponents of the Mahāvihāra school as an important part of clerical education, seems to have received great attention in every faculty of learning without any discrimination. The importance of Sanskrit both as a medium of scholarly knowledge, especially in secular subjects, and as potent influence on the native languages, especially in the development of their vocabularies and literary styles, must have met with general acceptance during this time. It is pointed out that the heyday of Sanskrit studies in Ceylon commences from A.D. 1058.¹ As is evident from the Culavamsa and other historical sources, the relationship of Sanskrit with Sinhalese culture goes back to earlier times, but as a whole its influence began to affect the minds of the people somewhere between the ninth and the tenth centuries. It is believed that Siyabaslakara, the

1. O.H.De A. Wijesekara, Ceylon Historical Journal, Vol.IV, (Polonnaruva Period), (1954-55), p. 85.

extant earliest Sinhalese work on poetics based on the Kāvya-darsa of Daṇḍin, was written in the latter part of the tenth century.¹ In such Pali poems (kāvya) as Mahābodhivamsa and Telakatahagāthā, both probably belonging to the last quarter of the tenth century, the influence of Sanskrit is unmistakable.² The language of these works may be described as some kind of Sanskritised Pali; sometimes Pali words are used in their Sanskrit sense, sometimes Sanskrit words which are unfamiliar to old Pali works; and long compounds are often employed in this new kāvya style. Malalasekara is of the opinion that the beginning of the period of Sanskritized Pali is marked by the Mahābodhivamsa.³

Though we hardly find Sanskrit works written during the reign of Vijayabāhu I, the great attention paid to the development of such studies is certainly evident by celebrated scholars and their works (as well as some inscriptions) of the second half of the Polonnaruva period that followed nearly four decades of internal discord. Vijayabāhu's long reign of peace and prosperity

-
1. S. Paranavitana, JCBRAS (NS) (Colombo, 1960), Vol. VII, pt. I, pp. 23-24; some scholars are of the opinion that it was written by Sena I (826-846); see P.B. Sannasgala, Simhala-Sāhitya-Vamsaya (Colombo, 1961), p. 62.
 2. History of Ceylon (UC), p. 588.
 3. Malalasekara, op. cit., p. 159.

was succeeded by an internecine strife among his heirs. The princes who came to power during this time paid no attention either to Buddhism or Sinhalese institutions and their traditions. Due to their negligence and deliberate destructions all Vijayabāhu's attempts to revive Sinhalese art and culture received a rude set back. Vikramabāhu I (1116-1137) who succeeded in Polonnaruva after a heavy fight with his rivals is said to have ejected monks from their vihāras in the city and turned the buildings into barracks for foreign mercenary soldiers.¹ Theras in the eight chief vihāras secretly took the Tooth and Alms Bowl Relics away from the capital and hid them in Rōhana. During this time several inscriptions were published in Tamil by those rulers, which shows their ill-treatment and negligence towards their own heritage.²

It is certain that the learned pursuits of the religious institutions which had been originated and supported by Vijayabāhu I were thoroughly interrupted or ceased to function for a while due to this civil discord; however, they were not subjected to such severe destruction as in the Cōla regime where scholars and artists

1. Cy. ch. 61, v.55.

2. S. Paranavitana, Art and Architecture of Ceylon. (Colombo, 1954), p. 23.

had no opportunity to carry on their educational activities and to practice their arts because the royalty, nobility and the Buddhist church had ceased to exist.¹ Religious and cultural activities, which found no shelter in Polonnaruva itself, were more or less preserved unimpaired amidst the hundred and one interruptions of opponents in the areas which were governed by provincial rulers who did not accept Vikramabāhu's regime. Undoubtedly they must have received necessary protection and patronage of some of these rulers and nobles. The Cūlavamsa describing the childhood of Parākramabāhu the Great, mentions that the prince was given an education which comprised every science and accomplishment of the age in which he lived, including Buddhism, medicine, politics, logic, grammar, lexicography, poetry, music and the training of elephants and the management of horses.² As is evident from this description, there must have existed at least certain studies of religious and secular subjects which remained as fragments of the heritage that Vijayabāhu I had bestowed during the forty years until the emergence of

1. S. Paranavitana, Art and Architecture of Ceylon (Colombo, 1954), p.22.

2. Cv. ch. 64, vv. 2-5.

Parākramabāhu I (1158-1186). Better times for such activities dawned with his ascending the throne.

Parākramabāhu the Great, according to the Cūlavamsa, succeeded in making himself the master of the whole Island and was not only a mere war champion but also a creator of a new era. He was endowed both with scholarly knowledge and intelligence, and at the same time he was gifted with unsurpassed courage and valour. The chronicle speaks of his fourfold kingly aspiration which was put into effective practice soon after his enthronement, namely for the happiness of the mass of the people, the stability of the Buddha's Order, the protection of the nobility and the support of those in want.¹ These aspirations, especially the first two, necessarily include his desire to protect and improve the intellectual and cultural heritage of the nation. Even though his reconstruction activities have been elaborately detailed by many hands, his endeavours in respect to the religious and educational reformation may well need some explanation. Among his royal pursuits the unification of the Saṅgha was highly praised by many later writers in Pali and Sinhalese.² The endeavour to

1. Cv. ch. 73, vv. 1-10.

2. Almost all the Pali works during the Polonnaruva period highly praise the king's assistance in the reconciliation. Also see Pūjāvaliya, ed. Medhankara, (Colombo, 1932), ch. 34, p. 23.

accomplish this great task was described as an effort to lift Mount Meru.¹ There is no doubt that his intention to see the Sangha purged of undesirable elements and united must have brought the expected results, yet it seems difficult to surmise owing to the lack of evidence, how far the reaction to the unification influenced contemporary society, especially its intellectuals. It is certain that there were some dissentient groups who disagreed with the reconciliation on both sides, the Mahāvihāra and the other two nikāyas. The Cūlavamsa mentions that at the very outset of the reconciliation some monks left the Island for foreign lands; others left the Order; and still others wished not even to appear before the judicial court.² Further, the chronicle speaking of the monks of Abhayagiri and Jetavana vihāras states: 'He (the king) caused many monks to be degraded as sāmaneras or novices and those who were steeped in wrong to disrobe, and gave them high posts.'³ As a result of this unification, the Abhayagiri and the Jetavana fraternities are said to have ceased for ever.⁴ However,

1. Cv., ch. 78, v. 14.

2. Cv., ch. 78, v. 13.

3. Cv., ch. 78, v. 26.

4. History of Ceylon (UC), pt. II, p. 568.

no evidence is available to show how those who belonged to the dissentient groups or schools reacted after the reconciliation or to assess the dissenting action taken by them.

It is possible that many events concerning the unification may have ended in favour of the Mahāvihāra, with the resistance of dissentient groups presumably subdued before the supreme power of the monarch.¹ On the other hand, it is still difficult to determine whether there was any such strong opposition at all to the act of unification as indicated by the author of the chronicle, for all the differences between the various sects, according to some historians, were gradually disappearing and the Order in Lankā was heading towards a unity.²

-
1. The account of the Nikāyaśaṅgrahaya suggests that the purification amounted to the suppression of the Abhayagiri and the Jetavana Nikāyas. See Nikāyaśaṅgrahaya, Government edition (Colombo, 1907), p. 19.
 2. Gunawardhana supposes that the members of the clergy had come to realize, by that time, the desirability of reforms and the need for unity, though formally the initiative was taken by the king. R.A.L.H. Gunawardhana, The History of the Buddhist Saṅgha in Ceylon, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1965, p. 468. See also Vincent Pandita, CHJ, IV, p. 129.

Though the chronicle and some later sources speak of the resistance of some monks who belonged to the dissentient groups and of the king's reaction to it, all of them are silent about the situation of laymen who supported those dissentient groups. It is again, a matter of conjecture whether the royalty did impose some restrictions on them too so as to prevent anti-Mahāvihāra thoughts. If any attempt at confining intellectuals of either side, monks or laymen, to only a single way of thinking had happened, it would have been harmful to the intellectual pursuits of the age. But no evidence can be found from our sources in support of such an implementation of intellectual obstructionism. Nothing also can be traced that indicates restriction meant to control the free thinking of the people either in literary or other artistic fields. As is apparent from the Galvihāra Rock Inscription, what the king had really done was to furnish the Elders of the Buddhist church with the necessary assistance so as to purge the Order of undesirable elements and to put an end to the disharmonies within it. The inscription containing the Polonnaruwakatikāvata highly praises the king's endeavour

in respect of the unification of the Order at its outset.¹ It then mainly deals with three problems concerning the maintenance of that unity, namely (a) scriptural study, (b) the places and times within which monks are permitted to go out and (c) the care necessary when admitting a disciple to the Order.²

It may be significant to observe that even these ordinances too were framed by the saṅgha headed by the Elder Kassapa.³ The king is said to have only lent his support in promulgating and enforcing them.⁴ Besides, it is interesting to note that in comparison with the later Dambadeni-katikāvata, containing two clauses that prevented monks from versifying eulogies for laymen and studying poetry and drama,⁵ there is no such impediment at all to the

1. EZ. Vol. II, no. 41 (London, 1928), pp. 263-268.

2. Vincent Pandita, CHJ, IV, p. 122.

3. 'Mahākāśyapa mahāsthavirapramukha sthavira varayan ma visin... ādurol novihida kala katikāvati', Katikāvat Saṅgarā, ed. D.B. Jayatilaka (Kālanīya, 1955), p. 2.

4. History of Ceylon (UC), p. 570.

5. a) 'gṛhasthayaṅṅa solō ādiya bāṇḍa no kiya yutu.
b) kāvyanātakadi garhita vidyā tamā nūgata yutu, anumut nūgānviya yutu.' op. cit., p. 15.

subjects of monks' education in the Polonnaru-katikāvata. One might incline to think that the monastic education at that time would have been entirely confined to religious studies because the prelate Mahākassapa of Udumbaragiri who presided over the council of Elders belonged to the forest-dwellers' fraternity. But as far as our knowledge goes, no evidence would allow us to reach such a conclusion, for the Buddhist church, after its reformation as previously, engaged in its former intellectual pursuits without facing any significant restrictions. As Paranavitana has pointed out, when Parākramabāhu ascended the throne there was no dearth of learned and saintly mahā-theras who not only gave the monarch all encouragement and guidance in his religious undertakings but also shed luster on his reign by their literary labours.¹

It is of note that many of these learned theras who dealt with literary activities were great scholars in secular as well as religious subjects. Unlike the Mahāvihāra monks of the Anurādhapura period, almost all the prominent members of the Mahāvihāra during this period were well versed Sanskrit scholars. Their scholarship in

1. History of Ceylon (UC), p. 566.

Sanskrit must have covered various fields of study including grammar, Hindu and Buddhist scriptures, logic, poetics and literature and so forth. Mahākassapa of Udumbaragiri, a scholar of no mean repute and a man distinguished for his piety, was the author of a Sanskrit grammar called Bālāvabodhana. The grammarian (elder) Moggallāna was hailed as an embodiment of the abilities of Pāṇinī, Candra, Kātyāyana and the like who were well known grammarians.¹ And also he was called the royal preceptor who was endowed with a knowledge of all the śāstras and āgamas.² The great subcommentator Sāriputta, also called Sāgaramati, like to the ocean in wisdom, was a clever Sanskrit scholar whose authorship was assigned to a grammatical work called the Ratnamati Pañcikālaṅkāra-tīkā.³ Though no poem is ascribed to his name, he was compared to Kālidāsa in poetical skill; his knowledge in grammar and logic is also highly praised.⁴ Sāriputta's pupil and successor Saṅgharakkhita was the author of two works on Pali poetics and prosody, the Subodhālaṅkāra and the Vuttodaya. In the same way there is no dearth of examples that exhibit the influence of Sanskrit

-
1. Pañcikāpradīpaya, ed. Dharmarama (Colombo, 1896), p. 3.
 2. EZ., Vol. II, no. 40, p. 254.
 3. Malalasekara, op.cit., p. 190.
 4. Abhidharmārthasaṅgrahasannaya, ed. Pannamoli-tissa (Ambalamgoda, 1926), p. 190.

poetics and prosody in Pali works like the Samantakūṭa-vannana of Vedeha, the Jinālaṅkāra of Buddharakkhita and the Dāthāvamsa of Dhammakitti. It is interesting to note in this respect that the author of the chronicle speaks of the Arthasāstra of Kautilya, a work on politics written by Cāṅakya,¹ the Rāmāyana and the Mahābhārata,² the famous Indian epics, when he is dealing with the studies of Prince Parākramabāhu. It can also be judged by such Sinhalese works as the Mahābodhivamsagranthipada, Abhidharmārthasaṅgrahasanna and the Dharmapradīpikāva what a great number of Pali and Sanskrit works had been studied by their authors in order to draw materials for their discussions. The last of these, the Dharmapradīpikāva of Gurulugomi, is outstanding as a collection of much knowledge that had been accumulated for many years by reading a large number of works on various subjects. It must be noted that the sources of some Sanskrit passages cited by Gurulugomi which appear to be from Buddhist writers are yet to be traced.³ Among the Sanskrit writers whom he quoted, Candragomi,⁴ Āryasūra,⁵

1. Cv. ch. 64, vv. 2-5.

2. Cv. ch. 64, vv. 41-45.

3. C.E. Godakumbura, Sinhalese Literature (Colombo, 1955), p. 48.

4. Dharmapradīpikā, ed. Dharmarama (Colombo, 1951), pp. 157-8.

5. Ibid., p. 175.

Sāntideva,¹ Dharmakīrti,² and Harṣa³ are so far traced.

In the Dharmapradīpikāva there can be found more than five hundred quotations from religious and secular works, apart from some poetical descriptions translated directly from Sanskrit verses. Likewise, there are nearly one

hundred and five quotations in the Mahābodhivamsā-granthipada.⁴

Among the Sanskrit works cited there, the Raguvamśa,⁵

Meghadūta,⁶ Jānakīharana,⁷ Kādambarī,⁸ Nāgānanda,⁹

Sisya-lekha,¹⁰ Amarakosa,¹¹ and Vākya-padiya¹² can

easily be traced. It also mentions the names of Daṇḍi and Jayadeva, well known Indian writers.¹³

1. Dharmapradīpikāva, p. 172.

2. Ibid., p. 2.

3. Ibid., p. 300.

4. Mahābodhivamsā-granthipadaya, ed. G. Dhammapala, unpublished dissertation for M.A. Vidyodaya University, 1967, Introduction, p. 25.

5. Mahābodhivamsā-granthipada-vivarana, ed. Dharmarama (Colombo, 1910), pp. 29, 32, 33.

6. Ibid., p. 127.

7. Ibid., p. 127.

8. Ibid., p. 11.

9. Ibid., p. 129.

10. Ibid., p. 63.

11. Ibid., p. 37.

12. Ibid., p. 35.

13. Ibid., p. 116.

From all this it is clear that scholarship during the period was by no means confined to a few subjects or a handful of books. It appears to have widened very considerably. Laymen as well as monks who were endowed with sufficient abilities might have enjoyed educational opportunities provided by the royalty or nobility and acquired much learning. Though these opportunities for learning were no doubt not so extensive as to meet all the requirements, the scholars begotten by that education were highly advanced in the knowledge of the age in which they lived. Many works written during this time, as we have shown, exhibit how widely extended the author's field of study was and how well organised the educational system which led up to their formal recognition as scholars.

The scholarship of this period produced a considerable quantity of books which can be divided into two main categories, namely works of exegetical or analytical character in grammar and philosophy, and works of poetical and creative activity.¹ It has been pointed out that critical analysis was more prominent than creative literary effort and may be considered a characteristic of the thought

1. History of Ceylon. (UC), p. 588.

of the period.¹ Among the subjects to which many scholars devoted their attention, Abhidhamma² and grammar had a prominent place. As we have seen above, much care was bestowed on the study of Abhidhamma by the king Vijayabāhu I. He himself is said to have translated the Dhammasaṅgani, the first treatise of the Abhidhammapitaka, into Sinhalese. The Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha of Anuruddha which presumably falls within this period had a great effect on a considerable number of subsequent works.³ Two commentaries were written to this work in Pali and a third in Sinhalese; the latter was written by Sāriputta, the great Pali sub-commentator. To the name of Anuruddha are also ascribed another two works on Abhidhamma, viz. Nāmarūpapariccheda and Paramatthavinicchaya.⁴ This series of compilations on the Abhidhamma reveals one phase of the thought of the period that tended to philosophical analysis. Another phase of the same thought can be judged from the great enthusiasm showed by some distinguished

-
1. O.H.De A. Wijesekara, Pali and Sanskrit in the Polonnaruva Period, CHJ, IV, p. 91.
 2. Malalasekara, op.cit., p. 167.
 3. It is believed that this work (Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha) was compiled before the accession of Parakramabahu I. See Malalasekara, op.cit., p. 168, and CHJ, IV, p. 91.
 4. Malalasekara, op.cit., p. 169.

scholars for grammatical analysis.

Of the grammatical works, the Moggallāna Vyākaraṇa of Moggallāna (elder) and the Bālāvabodhana of Kassapa deserve special mention. The first of these was actually an attempt to start a new school of Pali grammar in Ceylon. Up to that time the Kaccāyana Vyākaraṇa had been in use among the scholars of Mahāvihāra. It is also pointed out that this grammar had been held in high esteem by the Pali scholars of Ceylon from about the seventh century.¹ Malalasekara merely says that the Kaccāyana Vyākaraṇa came to be recognised in Ceylon as an authority on Pali grammar somewhere between the century after Buddhaghosa and the eleventh century.² It is certain that the theories of Kaccāyana grammar had been established and expounded in various treatises among the Theravādins before Moggallāna tried his hand at producing his new grammar. However, Moggallāna's work was able to win the attention of many prominent scholars of the Polonnaruva period by surpassing the older grammatical system of Kaccāyana.³ It is likely that the inspiration to undertake such a task of recodifying Pali grammatical science came to Moggallāna from his intimate acquaintance with Sanskrit.

1. O.H.De A. Wijesekara, CHJ, IV, p. 92.

2. Malalasekara, op.cit., p. 184.

3. CHJ, IV, p. 92.

grammatical authorities. Nevertheless, it seems difficult to deny that the work as a whole is a result of a new way of revolutionary thinking as against the tradition or well established theories.

The Bālāvabodhana of Kassapa on the other hand, which also was held in high esteem among the Sanskrit scholars of Ceylon, resulted in popularising another grammatical system, viz. the Cāndra school. Kassapa's work, intended as an introduction to the Cāndra system, functions to this day as a useful hand-book. It seems that the Cāndra system had been in use among Ceylonese Sanskrit scholars in parallel to the Pānini and Kātantra schools. Ratnaśrījñāna or Ratnamati, a Mahāyānist scholar who is said to have lived somewhere about the tenth or eleventh century, wrote a commentary to the Cāndra called the Cāndragomi-vyākaraṇa-pañcika.¹ Śāriputta, Kassapa's most illustrious pupil, is said to have written a tīkā on this Pañcika entitled Pañcikālakāra.²

Similarly on the creative side, this period may be credited with the production of a good number of literary works in Sinhalese, Pali and Sanskrit. For the first time in the history of surviving Sinhalese literature there emerged

1. Malalasekara, op.cit., p. 168.

2. Abhidharmārtahasānīyā, ed. Pannamolitissa (Ambalangoda, 1926), p. 257.

two poems, namely the Sasadāvata, and Muvadevdāvata, which were thoroughly influenced by Sanskrit poetics during this time. The Amāvatura and the Butsarana stand as testimonies of contemporary Sinhalese prose. This period is also adorned with a number of poetical contributions by distinguished poets in Pali and Sanskrit like Buddhappiya, Vedeha, Anuruddha and such others, whom we shall deal with in detail later on.

As is apparent from the preceding discussion, monastic education during the Polonnaruva period was in no way confined to religious studies. The education in which Buddhism had been the central pivot must have covered certain secular subjects and had a great effect on society. Undoubtedly this influence must have varied in accordance with the support it received from the royalty and the nobility. Since the regimes of the great monarchs, Vijayabāhu I and Parākramabāhu I, lavishly patronized religious institutions with munificent gifts, the education given in them flourished freely, and resulted in great intellectual awakening during the period. In this respect we may need to make an inquiry into these religious institutions, especially the role played by them in the educational field.

The Cūlavamsa attests the existence of eight āyatanas during this period. It is said in the Cūlavamsa that the monks of eight āyatanas served on the panel of judges, who assembled on the demise of Vijayabāhu I to select a successor to the throne.¹ A later account in the same chapter alludes to eight mūla vihāras.² The chronicle refers to āyatanavāsī in the account dealing with the royal pursuits of Parākrāmabāhu I. It records that the king built mansions at Jetavana vihāra in Polonnaruva each with three storeys for the monks of eight āyatanas.³ The term āyatana in this connexion is used as equivalent to mūla, mūla, mūla-vihāra, āyatān, mulu-ayatān and⁴ samūha in the sense of institution.⁵ Though the sources refer to the eight āyatanas, none of them either enumerates them by name or gives details of their particular functions and individual significance within the nikāyas. However, in the sources we find nine names of such āyatanas which read as: the Selantara-samūha,⁶ the Kappūra-mūlāyatana,⁷

1. Cv. ch. 61, vv. 1-4.

2. Cv. ch. 78, v. 59.

3. Cv. ch. 78, v. 35.

4. Pūjāvaliya, ed. Medhankara (Colombo, 1932), ch. 34, p. 23.

5. R.A.L.H. Gunawardhana, The History of the Buddhist Saṅgha, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1965, p. 415.

6. Cv. ch. 57, v. 37.

7. Cv. ch. 60, v. 83.

the Uttaromūla,¹ the Vāha-dīpa,² the Mahānettādīpādīka,³ the Dakkhina,⁴ the Senāpatirāja,⁵ the Saraggāma-samūha⁶ and the Pāncaparivena-samūha.⁷ On the matter of the enumeration of the eight āyatanas, all the scholars are not of the same opinion. Many of them incline to exclude the Pāncaparivena-samūha from the octad of āyatanas.⁸ The latter occurs in the Cūlavamsa for the first time in the account of the prince Parākramabāhu. According to the chronicle, when the prince reached Saraggāma his uncle Kittissirimegha sent the great sage Abhaya of the Pāncaparivena to persuade the prince to come back to the capital.⁹ Another reference to that āyatana can be found in the Bhesajjamanjūsā¹⁰ and the Sikkhāpadavalañjana¹¹ which are ascribed to the Dāmbadeni period. The author of these works is described as the head of the Pāncaparivena-samūha.

-
1. Cv. ch. 57, v. 20.
 2. Cv. ch. 48, v. 65.
 3. Cv. ch. 48, v. 2.
 4. Cv. ch. 42, v. 14.
 5. Cv. ch. 51, v. 88.
 6. Abhidhānappadīpikā, ed. Waskaduve Subhuti (Colombo, 1924), Colophon, v. 8.
 7. Cv. ch. 67, v. 61.
 8. Y. Dhammavisuddhi, Buddhist Saṅgha in Ceylon, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1970, p. 92.
 9. Cv. ch. 67, vv. 59-61.
 10. Bhesajja Manjūsā, with Sarma, K.D. Kulatialaka (Nugegodā, 1962), Colophon, p. 872.
 11. Sikkhāpadavalañjana, ed. W. Pannansanda (Colombo, 1907).

It is difficult to find any reference to this āyatana in the Anurādhapura period. Likewise the history of the Sarogāma-samūha also does not go back to the Anurādhapura period. Hence we agree with Dhammavisuddhi when he suggests that the Vilgammula (Sarogāma) and the Pañcaparivenamūla had originated during the Polonnaruva period.¹ Direct or indirect mentions of the other āyatanas can be traced in the sources of the Anurādhapura period.

Of these āyatanas the Kappūra-mūlāyatana, the Uttaro-mūla, the Vāhadīpa and Mahānettādīpādīka are considered to have belonged to the Abhayagiri fraternity.² In an inscription ascribed to Mahinda IV (956-972) which is located within the precincts of the Abhayagiri monastery, the four mūlas of the monastery are compared to four divine abodes.³ Though the inscription does not furnish us with the names of the mūlas it reveals definitely that the Abhayagiri fraternity contained four institutions (satarmul). The Dakkhina and Senāpatirāja mūlas are said to have belonged to the Sāgalika or Jetavana fraternity.⁴ The Selantara-samūha, which is considered the most senior institution according

1. Y. Dhammavisuddhi, op.cit., p. 114.

2. M. Vimalakitti, Sāsanavamsapradīpaya, (Colombo, 1954), pp. 117-119.

3. EZ. I (London, 1912), p. 218.

4. Sāsanavamsapradīpaya, p. 129.

to the Cūlavamsa, possibly belonged to the Mahāvihāra.¹ Of these āyatanas the Dakkhina and Vāhadīpaka seem not to be mentioned in our sources after the Anurādhapura period. Nor is the Kappūra-mūlāyatana referred to after the time of Vijayabāhu I. It occurs for the last time in the Cūlavamsa in the account of Vijayabāhu I.

Yasodharā, the king's daughter, was reported to have built a large image house for the mūlāyatana.² This institution, which developed on the basis of the Mahākāpārā pirivena built by Dāṭhapatissa (642-651), appears to have flourished during the latter part of the Anurādhapura period by attracting the indulgence of a considerable number of patrons. However, it is not clear from our sources why this institution does not occur by name after the time of Vijayabāhu I.

Though some āyatanas like Dakkhina and Vāhadīpaka are not referred to by their names at this time, it is evident from the sources that there existed eight āyatanas till the end of the twelfth century. From the available data it is difficult to decide which āyatanas that had existed until then completed the octet. Nevertheless, it does

1. P.B. Samasgala, Simhala-Sāhitya-Vamsaya, (Colombo, 1961), p. 29; S. Paranavitana suggested that this āyatana belonged to the Abhayagiri nikāya (History of Ceylon, UC, II, p. 568; R.A.L.H. Gunawardhana who denied Paranavitana's suggestion, argues that there is no evidence at all on the sectarian affiliations of this fraternity, op.cit., p. 447.

2. CV, ch.60, v.84.

not seem plausible to surmise that there were only six or seven āyatanas in all during this period and that when speaking of āyatanas as a group it was customary to mention the group of eight as it was a usage of long standing.¹ No reason arises for any doubt about the terms atthāyatanavāsi² and atthapāsāde³ occurring in the chronicle. The second of these terms directly refers to eight mansions probably built separately for the heads of each institution and actually visible to the author of the chronicle. It is likely that the mansions were built for monks of the eight āyatanas in the new city when the kingdom moved its seat from one place to another. Accordingly, in spite of the lack of evidence we can feel confident of the existence of eight āyatanas during the period.

In this connexion it seems necessary to deal in more detail with these institutions which played an important role in the field of education during the time. Since Gunawardhana and Dhammavisuddhi have discussed many historical facts connected with these institutions we do

1. Y. Dhammavisuddhi, op.cit., p. 115.

2. Cv. ch. 61, v. 1.

3. Cv. ch. 78, v. 33.

not need to repeat them. Our attempt is to make a survey of the services rendered by these institutions to the process of intellectual, or, more precisely, literary pursuits. We shall begin our discussion from the Selantara-samūha which enjoys a longer history than the other āyatanas. According to the chronicle, the origin of the āyatana may be dated from the seventh century.¹ But the first direct reference to the āyatana appears from the reign of Vijayabāhu I. The chronicle says that Yasodharā, the king's daughter, erected a mansion for this āyatana.² The Selantara-samūha, as suggested by Gunawardhana, seems to be located in Rōhana.³ It is recorded in the Cūlavamsa that the sage Nanda of the Selantara-samūha led the monks of all three nikāyas in Rōhana to take part in the deliberations leading to the unification of the saṅgha.⁴

From this evidence it is clear that the Selantara-samūha was held in high esteem by all the monks of Rōhana, without sectarian discrimination. There is no doubt that the āyatana must have been accepted by all

1. Daṭṭhopatissa (642-651) is mentioned as the founder of this institution, see Cv. ch. 57, vv. 31-37.

2. Cv. ch. 60, v. 84.

3. R.A.L.H. Gunawardhana, op.cit., p. 445.

4. Cv. ch. 78, v. 10.

the monks in Rohaṇa not only as a religious centre but also as an educational institution. Otherwise, Nanda's leadership would have been refused by others. No evidence is available from our sources which shows the scholarship or any other literary activities of Nanda, but he was undoubtedly a scholarly monk. A mention of another monk of great learning of the same institution called Sīla occurs in contemporary literature. Saṅgharakkhita, who succeeded Sāriputta Saṅgharāja, mentions in the Vuttodaya, the only work on prosody in Pali, that his teacher was the thera Sīla of the Selantarāyatana.¹ He states in the colophon that he wrote the book under the inspiration gained from his teacher. The term 'Selantarāyatanaṅgavāsika' which means dwelling in the Selantarāyatana denotes nothing specifically concerning any office in the āyatana held by him. But, if we consider the term to denote the head of the āyatana, then it would not be unreasonable to surmise that Sīla was the successor of thera Nanda whom we have already referred to. No doubt, as is revealed by the colophon, the thera Sīla must have been a well learned teacher, specially well versed in prosody.²

1. Vuttodaya, ed. B. Jinananda (Patna, 1960), Colophon.

2. yenantatantaratanākaramanthanena
manthāvalollasitaṅgavāreṇa laddhā
sāramatātisukhitaṅgavāreṇa
te me jayantu guravo guravo gūṇehi, Vuttodaya, Colophon.

Probably Saṅgharakkhita studied prosody from him. As there is a lack of sufficient evidence, it is difficult to infer whether he was the teacher who had introduced him to the Order, or the one who taught him prosody. Saṅgharakkhita elsewhere describes as his teacher the distinguished Saṅgharāja Sāriputta whom he mentions in his works with great respect. If the sage Sīla was also the teacher who introduced Saṅgharakkhita to the Order then Saṅgharakkhita's relation with the Selantarāyatana would be clear. And since the name of Sāriputta has been mentioned as a teacher of Saṅgharakkhita, it is not unjustifiable to surmise that there was some sort of fraternal relationship between Sāriputta and the contemporaneous Sīla. If this was so, the importance of the role played by the Selantarāyatana would certainly be great.

The Uttara-mūla is also considered as one of the most important institutions, for it had been vested with the charge of the Bowl and Tooth Relics. The āyatana, which had close relations with royalty from the very beginning, played its part very successfully not only as a religious centre but also as an effective body of learning. The great sage Moggallāna, who is described in the Vēlaikkāra inscription as a man of good conduct and behaviour, versed in the sāstras and āgamas in addition to being the royal

preceptor,¹ was the head of the āyatana at the time when it was inscribed. The term vyāriṇī used as an epithet in the inscription denotes that the thera was a grammarian.² Wickremasinghe identifies him with the hierarch Moggallāna, the author of the Moggallāna-Vyākaraṇa who lived during the reign of Parākramabāhu I.³ Dhammavisuddhi who argues that Mugalan of the Vēlaikkāra inscription was not identical with the author of the Moggallāna-Vyākaraṇa has pointed out that the latter is not known to have held the office of head of the Uttara-mūla.⁴ Piyadassi, the author of the Padasādhana, who described himself as a pupil of Moggallāna, the author of Vyākaraṇa, mentions that his teacher dwelt in Anurādhapura.⁵ The Cūlavamsa also refers to a Moggallāna who was said to have led the monks of Yuvarājarattha to the council summoned by Parākramabāhu I.⁶ The identity of these three Moggallānas is still a matter of conjecture. However, if the author of the Moggallāna-Vyākaraṇa belonged

1. EZ. Vol. II, (London, 1928), no. 40, p. 254.

2. The Tamil word for grammarian is 'veiyākaraṇin'. See Tamil Lexicon, VI, Madras, 1934, p. 3856.

3. EZ. II, p. 249.

4. Y. Dhammavisuddhi, op. cit., p. 104.

5. Padasādhana with sanne, ed. Dhammananda (Colombo, 1932) Colophon.

6. Cv. ch. 78, v. 9.

to the Uttara-mūla then it will provide us with important evidence to distinguish the service rendered by this institution. If so, it is not unreasonable to describe this āyatana as an institution which paved a new way of thought. As we have mentioned elsewhere the Moggallāna Vyākaraṇa started a new school of Pali grammar. The upasthavira (the second thera in rank) named Anuruddha to whose authorship is credited the Anuruddha-Sataka, a eulogy of the Buddha written in Sanskrit, can also be introduced as a notable product of the Uttara-mūla.¹

The Mahānettādipādika of which the history goes back to the time of Aggabodhi (713-724) also played an active part in religious and literary fields in and after the Polonnaruva period. This institution is referred to as mūla in the Pūjāvaliya of Mayūrapāda Buddhaputra which was compiled in the reign of Parākramabāhu II (1236-1270). The author speaks of Vijayabāhu III (1232-1236) as having built a monastery on the top of the Vātagiri rock for the mahāsthavira of the Mahanetpā-mūla. Further, the Pūjāvaliya mentions that a monk who benefited from the munificence of the king, Sumāṅgala of the Mahanetpāmūla, was a co-pupil

1. Anuruddha-Satakaya, ed. D.A.S. Batuvantudave (Colombo, 1879).
v. 101.

of the author and that the author had learned the Dhamma from him.¹ Sumaṅgala occurring in the Pūjāvaliya is identified with the author of the Abhidhammattha-vibhāvinī who has described himself as a pupil of Sāriputta.² To his authorship is also credited the Abhidhammattha-vikāsinī, the commentary on the Abhidhammāvatāra of Buddhaddatta. In the Vinayasārattha-dīpanī which is said to have been written by Vācissara, one of the distinguished pupils of Sāriputta, a thera Sumaṅgala has been mentioned as one of the monks who invited him to do the task.³ According to this he was a forest dwelling monk. Though there is not any direct reference to his fraternity it is not unreasonable to identify this Sumaṅgala with the monk of the same name in the Pūjāvaliya. In the light of this discussion we may infer that the Mahanetpamūla also rendered an important service in the development of religious and literary activities during this period.

A reference to the Sarogāma-samūha, which flourished in the time of Parākramabāhu I, is found in the colophon

-
1. Pūjāvaliya, ed. Medhankara (Colombo, 1932), ch. 34, p. 140.
 2. A.P. Buddhaddatta, Theravādībauddhācāryayō (Colombo, 1960), pp. 97-100; Abhidhammattha-vibhāvinī, ed. D. Pannasara & P. Vimaladhamma (Colombo, 1933), p. 158.
 3. A.P. Buddhaddatta, Pāli Sāhityaya (Colombo, 1956), p. 288.

of the Abhidānappadīpikā, a Pali lexicon compiled perhaps not long after the death of Parākramabāhu I. The author named Moggallāna describes himself as having lived in the Sarogāma-samuha of Jetavana at Polonnaruva. Further he mentions that he was benefited by the munificence of Parākramabāhu I. Moggallāna who figures in the Abhidhānappadīpikā was different from the grammarian Moggallāna.¹ As there is lack of evidence, it is difficult to give more details about the author. No reference other than this to the activities performed by this institution during the period is available from our sources, though this āyatana became later on one of the most eminent institutions in the field of religious and literary activity.

We have seen that no evidence mentioning some āyatanas by their names, such as the Dakkhina, the Vāhadīpa and the Senāpatirāja during the period, is available in our sources. However, we find a reference to a special term, Viyatpat-aṭa-ganaya, which shows some relationship with the institutions mentioned above, in the Daḷadā-Pūjāvaliya² and the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya.³ It is recorded in these two

1. Malalasekara, op. cit., p. 179.

2. Daḷadā-Pūjāvaliya, ed. F. Sugatapala (Colombo, 1929), p. 49.

3. Nikāyasaṅgrahaya, Ceylon Govt. edition, 1907, p. 18.

texts while dealing with the royal activities of Parākrama-
bāhu I, that the king had appointed the Viyatpat-ata-ganaya.
The term Viyatpat-ata-ganaya in the texts may signify the
eight corporations of those who had scholarly attainments¹
or a group of eight learned men who attended on the king
at his court.² Viyatnā occurring in the same texts was
probably the representative of these colleges.³

As we have seen in the above discussion, the
educational system during the reign of Parākramabāhu I
reached a climax under the patronage of royalty. The
hierarch Sāriputta and his contemporaries praised highly
the king's patronage of literary activity. The scholarship
which benefited from the munificence of the monarch was held
in high esteem. Many facilities were provided for those
who engaged in literary activity. Among the buildings
erected by the king in the new city, two libraries are
also mentioned.⁴ He is also known to have repaired one
hundred and twentyeight temple libraries.⁵ These
libraries were no doubt filled with various works both

1. History of Ceylon. (UC), p. 541.

2. R.A.L.H. Gunawardhana, op.cit., p. 461.

3. History of Ceylon. (UC), p. 541.

4. Cv. ch. 78, v. 37.

5. Cv. ch. 74, v. 80.

religious and secular, and were not only for monks but also for laymen who were interested in advanced learning. The king, who himself received a very liberal education, is said to have encouraged learning among officials in order to ensure better standards. It is also recorded that special endeavours were made by the king to increase the number of people versed in foreign dialects¹ with the ideas of facilitating espionage in the various parts of the Island and perhaps even outside the country.²

Viyatpat-ata-ganaya and the Viyatnā in the above reference probably imply some sort of well-organised education which was implemented throughout the country. The learning programme which was finally subject to royal consent must have been arranged by the Viyatnā with the assistance of his colleagues.

Though the king himself was described as a great scholar he was not credited with the authorship of any work.³ As evidenced by the building activities described

1. Ibid., ch. 64, vv. 22-23.

2. Sirima Wikramasinghe, The Age of Parākramabāhu I, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1958, p.281.

3. According to Munidasa Kumaratunga, the Kavsilumina was written by Parākramabāhu I. See Kavsilumini Pelagasma, ed. M. Kumaratunga (Colombo, 1945), Introduction.

in the chronicle, in which two chapters are devoted to that purpose, the monarch was no doubt a great connoisseur. As suggested by Paranavitana, the lofty Lankātilaka, the Tivanka image-house with its walls adorned with paintings, the impressive rock-cut images at the Galvihāra, that poetry in stone, the lotus bath, the less romantic Silā-pokkharanī and the Audience Hall within his palace attest to the king's grand conceptions and good tastes in art and architecture.¹ In addition to the great achievements of art and architecture a remarkable progress in irrigation exhibits another achievement of the intellectual awakening of the age. The vast tanks like the Parākrama-samudra, which perhaps was the most remarkable achievement of the ancient irrigation, display the wide spread of scientific knowledge in the nation. There is no doubt that in such a time of renaissance, intellectual activities had immense effects on the literary field.

However, the facilities for learning established during Parākramabāhu's long reign of peace and prosperity did not continue for long after his death. His successor, Vijayabāhu II (1186-1187) whose reign did not last for more than one year had no time to introduce any new

1. S. Paranavitana, Art and Architecture of Ceylon, 1937, p. 23.

arrangement for the development of literary activity. According to the Cūlavamsa he was a great poet (kavissara) and a scholar¹ who himself composed a Sandesa (message) in Pali, that was meant to be sent to the king of Arimaddana in Burma.² All his literary and religious activities were interrupted when he was assassinated by Mahinda with the help of a cow-girl named Dīpanī.³ Niśśaṅkamalla (1187-1196), the uparāja of Vijayabāhu II, assassinated Mahinda and ascended to the throne; his brief reign of nine years did him great credit in architectural achievements. Though he was also a monarch who loved tours de force, in art and architecture, as evidenced by the Niśśaṅkalatāmaṇḍapaya, Galpota and certain other remains in the precincts of the old Daladā-maḷuva in Polonnaruva, we know nothing of his activities in the literary field.

The death of Niśśaṅkamalla was followed by decades of internecine warfare and foreign invasion during which the military leaders wielded actual power. The queen Līlāvātī

-
1. The Kavsilumina is attributed to the authorship of this king by the celebrated scholar Walivitiye Sorata, who edited this famous ornate poem. See Kavsilumina Kalpalatā Vyākhyā (Colombo, 1946), Introduction, p. 3ff.
 2. Cv. ch. 80, v. 6.
 3. Cv. ch. 80, v. 15.

who succeeded Nissankamalla ascended the throne three times intermittently by the support of military leaders. She and her prime ministers, Kittī and Parākrama, are highly praised as supporters of religious activities.¹ The Sasadāvata which was written in her first reign (1197-1200) speaks of her and Kittī's generosity and patronage towards literary activity by which the author himself was encouraged in his task.² During these times when the rulers were outshone by the military leaders there was neither stability of the state nor any noteworthy advance in religious and cultural fields, but it was possible to protect and maintain former traditions and some institutions. In the light of this discussion, we may be permitted to conclude that the intellectual awakening during the period from the accession of Vijayabāhu I until the end of the twelfth century, paved the way for a renaissance which affected the social, spiritual and cultural life of the people, though it was interrupted for a time by some civil discord.

1. Sasadāvata, ed. A. Dhammapala (Vālitara, 1934), vv. 11-14.
Dāthāvamsa, ed. H. Silalankara (Alutgama, 1914), vv. 4-9.

2. Sasadāvata, v. 14.

CHAPTER II

ON SCHOLARS AND THEIR WORKS

The period which includes the two regimes of Vijayabāhu I and Parākramabāhu I can be regarded as an age of renaissance in the history of Ceylon. The country itself reached its summit in peace and prosperity under the unsurpassed rule of these glorious kings, and at the same time literature and art received much care and patronage from the royalty, the nobility and the Buddhist church. Though we have already discussed the role played by them in the process of religious and cultural revival, it is desirable to discuss in detail the services rendered by the celebrated scholars whose names deserve the respectful commemoration of the nation.

Kassapa

The Elder Kassapa of Udumbaragiri who was the most senior monk and a distinguished scholar in the reign of Parakramabāhu I, was one of the outstanding figures of the age. He was not only a man of letters but also a man of good conduct and behaviour whose leadership was beyond question among the dissenting groups too when he

was appointed the head of the council of Elders summoned by the king. It is mentioned that the Parākramabāhu Katikāvata in the Galvihāra inscription at Polonnaruva was written under the supervision of the hierarch Kassapa, who was specially proficient in ecclesiastical law. He is reputed to be the author of a Sinhalese sanne, a verbal paraphrase, to the Samantapāsādikā of Buddhaghosa, a work which is no longer extant.¹ To his authorship also are credited three other works in Pali, namely a Porāna Tīkā on the Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha, Buddhavamsa and the Anāgata vamsa.² His scholarship in Sanskrit too is well known and inspired enthusiasm for Sanskrit studies in many intellectual circles during this period. The Bālāvabodhana, a grammar in Sanskrit on the line of the Cāndravyākaraṇa, was written by him. Due to its brevity and simplicity this grammar was popular among students of Sanskrit and played the same role as did the Bālāvatāra, a Pali grammar on the Kaccāyana-vyākaraṇa, among the beginners in Pali grammar. His erudition as an expert in the

1. Malalasekara, op. cit., p. 178.

2. Ibid., p. 179.

Vinayapitaka and his leadership as the head of the saṅgha (saṅghapitu) were praised by his distinguished pupils.¹ Though his skill in scholarly activities produced widespread results in the subsequent periods, unfortunately it is difficult to assess the services rendered by him in the development of Sinhalese literature as his only work in Sinhalese, the paraphrase of the Samantapāsādikā, is no longer extant.

There was another learned thera named Kassapa whom the Sāsanavamsadīpa calls a poet of the Cōla country,² who lived at the same time as the Elder Kassapa or soon after his death. He is reputed to have written a commentary on the Abhidhammapitaka, called Mohavicchedanī, and a sub-commentary on the Samantapāsādikā, the Vimativinodanī. He is described as an orator and a monk of good conduct who was respected in the Cōla country.³ Though he was well known as a poet not a single one of his poetical works is now in existence.

-
1. Sāratthadīpanā, ed. B. Devarakkhita (Colombo, 1914), vv. 3-5, p. 1.
 2. Acariya Wimalasara, Sāsanavamsadīpa (Colombo, 1881), v. 204.
 3. Mohavicchedanī (PTS), ed. A. P. Buddhadatta, & K. A. Wader (London, 1961), pp. 359-360; Also see Buddhadatta, Theravādī-bauddhacāryayo (Ambalangoda, 1960), p. 105.

Ānanda

It is mentioned in the Nikāyaśaṅgrahaya that there were two Ānandas among scholars who played a prominent role in the religious and literary fields in the time between the tenth and the twelfth centuries. But, according to the available data, there were four Ānandas who flourished during this period or somewhat later.¹ Certain attempts have been made by some Pali scholars to identify them. A.P. Buddhadatta has pointed out that Ānanda, the author of the Mūlatīkā to whom is attributed the teachership of Buddhappiya and Vedeha, was different from the monk of the same name who lived in the reign of Parākramabahu II (1236-1270).² Further, he maintains that the latter, who was the pupil of Medhaṅkara of Udumbaragiri, was the author of Padasādhanaśanne.³ According to Saddhātissa there were four Ānandas, namely, the author of the Mūlatīkā, the author of the Saddhammopāyana, the teacher of Buddhappiya and Vedeha and the author of the Padasādhanaśanne. As he pointed out, the first Ānanda who was the

-
1. Upāsaka janālaṅkāra, ed. H. Saddhātissa, (London, 1965), Introduction, p.28; Nikāyaśaṅgrahaya refers to two scholars by the same name 'Ananda'. See Nikāyaśaṅgrahaya, p.21.
 2. A.P. Buddhadatta, Theravādi Baudhācāryayō, p. 69.
 3. Ibid., pp. 74-75.

teacher of Dhammapāla, the author of the Visuddhimagga Tīkā, lived in the tenth century, and was most likely the author of the Mūlatīkā. The second Ānanda was the author of the Saddhammopāyana, a Pali poem written for the elucidation of certain ethical topics of the dhamma. The Saddhammopāyana Sanne also was written by one who is called Ānanda. The third Ānanda was the teacher of Buddhappiya and Vedeha while the fourth was the author of the Padasādhana Sanne.¹

The second Ānanda, the author of the Saddhammopāyana, is said to have belonged to the Abhayagiri fraternity. As is apparent from the Sinhalese verbal paraphrase he held a title, Abhayagirikavicakravarti (monarch of the poets of the Abhayagiri circle).² The title itself implies that the author of the Saddhammopāyana was a leading monk of the Abhayagiri monastery. Since the Abhayagiri Vihāra seceded from the Mahāvihāra in the first century B.C., and remained as a separate fraternity until the unification of the sāsana in the reign of Parākramabāhu I, this Ānanda no doubt differs from the first Ānanda, who belonged to the Mahāvihāra school. The third Ānanda, the teacher of Buddhappiya Dīpaṅkara and Vedeha, according to Saddhatissa was the

1. Upāsakajanālaṅkāra, Introduction, pp. 29-31.

2. Saddhammopāyana with sanne, ed. K. Ratanasara (Colombo, 1911).

most probable author of the Upāsakajanālaṅkāra,¹ whereas Buddhadatta attributes its authorship to the later Ānanda, the author of the Padasādhana Sanne.² We agree with Saddhatissa when he reaches the conclusion that the fourth Ānanda, the author of Padasādhana Sanne who lived in the Dambadeni period, was not the teacher of Buddhapriya and Vedeha.³ As he has pointed out Piyadassi, the teacher of the fourth Ānanda, criticised the Rūpasiddhi of Buddhapiya in his Padasādhana.⁴ Apart from this, it is justifiable to suppose that the teacher of Buddhapiya and the author of the Padasādhana Sanne belonged to two rival schools of Pali grammar, the Kaccāyana and the Moggallāna. However, this Ānanda, the teacher of Buddhapiya and Vedeha, seems to have been outstanding figure during this time. He was eulogised with great respect by both his pupils. Buddhapiya describes his teacher as a banner to Ceylon⁵ and the jewel of the forest.⁶ This Ānanda's greatness

1. Upāsakajanālaṅkāra, p. 33.

2. A.P. Buddhadatta, Pāli Sāhityaya (Colombo, 1966), p. 448.

3. Upāsakajanālaṅkāra, p. 34.

4. Padasādhana with Sanne, ed. Dhammananda (Colombo, 1932), p. 67.

5. Rūpasiddhi, ed. K. Pannasekhara (Colombo, 1964), p. 311.

6. Paṭṭamaṅkara, ed. H. Devamitra (Colombo, 1887), Colophon.

has also been extolled by his other pupil, Vedeha in his Rasavāhinī and Samantakūṭavannanā. As is eulogised in the Samantakūṭavannanā, Ānanda was a great poet, (Mahākavi), a distinguished scholar who crossed the ocean of sāstras (satthasāgaraparago) and was as well known in the world as the sun in the sky.¹ It is worthy of note that the Ānanda who is described in Sundaramahādevi's inscription as a great dignitary of the sāsana in Ceylon, has been identified with this Ānanda.² In the inscription he is eulogised as a banner raised aloft in the land of Laṅkā and he is said to have been instrumental in the establishment of the sāsana among the Cōlas. It has been suggested that this Ānanda had some connexion with the monks of Tambaratṭha, the Malay Peninsula.³ It is evident from all this, that this Ānanda, the jewel of the forest, was a leading monk of the Theravādins somewhere around the twelfth century.

Though he has been described as a great poet in the Samantakūṭavannanā, there no longer exists even a single poetical work composed by him. But the

1. Samantakūṭavannanā (PTS), ed. C.E. Godakumbura (London, 1958), p. 75.

2. History of Ceylon (UC), p. 565.

3. EZ. Vol. IV, pp. 71-72.

Upāsakajanālaṅkāra, a descriptive work in prose dealing with the Buddha's teachings for laymen, is assigned to him by some scholars.¹ As is pointed out by Saddhatissa it is an exegetical treatise in nine chapters dealing with the following subjects: (1) three refuges, (2) moralities, (3) ascetic practices, (4) livelihood, (5) ten domains of skilful deeds, (6) harmful actions, (7) mundane happiness, (8) supra-mundane happiness, and (9) accomplishment of meritorious results.² As this list itself suggests, the Upāsakajanālaṅkāra is not purported to be a work of literary merit. The purpose of the work is to illustrate Buddhist precepts and practices for the benefit of laymen. This treatise shows the trend towards the composition of religious works of a simple character for the common devotees. This trend can also be seen clearly in such a didactic work as the Saddhammopāyana of Ānanda, styled Abhayagiri-kavicakravartī. It is mentioned in the prologue that the work was composed in order to be sent as a gift to Buddhasoma, an intimate fellow-monk of the author.³

1. Upāsakajanālaṅkāra, Introduction, p. 33

2. Ibid., Introduction, p. 1.

3. Saddhammopāyana, vv.3, 616.

It is believed that this work was written to dissuade his friend from reverting to the lay life.¹ The work containing nineteen chapters, all in verse, deals with such subjects as the difficulties of obtaining birth as a human being, the tendency to commit sin and the severe penalty attending acts of evil, the misery of existence as a preta or as a lower animal, the advantages of being righteous and the good results it brings. The entire subject matter of the Saddhammopāyana has been divided into two parts by B.C. Law, namely, the dangers or disadvantages of things immoral and the rewards or advantages of things moral.² Though the views of the author are not in any way new, the manner of treatment of each topic by which he was able to reach the heart of the devotee, is masterly.

Buddhappiya and Vedeha

Both Buddhappiya and Vedeha, the celebrated pupils of Vanaratana Ānanda, occupy a prominent place in the field of literary and classical Pali studies. From the available data we are not quite able to fix the time in which they flourished. Since the name of

1. Upāsakajanālakāra, pp. 307; Introduction, p. 32

2. B.C. Law, A History of Pali Literature (London, 1933), Vol. II, p. 626.

Buddhappiya is quoted in the Vimativinodani of Cōliya Kassapa¹ and the Padasādhana of Piyadassi,² both probably lived during the reign of Parākramabāhu I or a little later, and we cannot accept Malalasekara's view which assigns Buddhappiya and Vedeha to the Daṃbadeṇi period.³ It is still not clear from our sources whether the Buddhappiya referred to in the Sārasaṅgaha of Siddhattha⁴ who introduces himself as the last pupil of Buddhappiya, the incumbent of Dakkhinārāma, and the Buddhappiya who himself claims the pupilage of Ānanda, were one and the same. It may be noteworthy that there were two Dakkhinārāmas which were located in separate places, one in Anurādhapura and the other in Polonnaruva. The latter was built by Parākramabāhu I in the vicinity of his new city. If this was the monastery where Buddhappiya lived, as some scholars have already pointed out, the date at which he flourished may fall within the reign of Parākramabāhu the Great.⁵

-
1. Vimativinodani, ed. B. Dhammadhara-tissa (Colombo, 1935), p. 100.
 2. Padasādhana with sanne, ed. Dharmananda (Colombo, 1932), p. 67.
 3. Pali Literature of Ceylon, p. 220.
 4. Sārasaṅgaha, (a palm-leaf manuscript which is in the possession of Dr. Saddhatissa, London Buddhist Vihara) Colophon.
Also see Pāli-sāhityaya, p. 280.
 5. Pajjamadhu, ed. B. Devarakkhita (Colombo, 1887), Introduction, p. 1.

The Rūpasiddhi, the well known Pali grammar of Buddhappiya based on the Kaccāyana system, was composed while the author was residing in two monasteries including Bālāditya in the Cōla country.¹ The epithet 'lamp of the Tamil country' (damilavasumatidīpa) in the colophon of the Rūpasiddhi and the word Cōliya which is often used before his name, suggest that the author was a native of the Tamil country.² He may have been persuaded to come over from the Cōla country for the re-establishment of the sāsana activities in Ceylon as he had achieved eminence in both countries by virtue of his special abilities.

The work, written to elucidate and confirm grammatical methods introduced by the Kaccāyana, was held in high esteem among the Pali scholars who belonged to the Kaccāyana school in Ceylon as well as in Burma. A tīkā on it assigned to Buddhappiya himself and an old Sinhalese paraphrase written by an anonymous author are in existence. The latter was in frequent use in traditional Pali institutions in Ceylon.

Buddhappiya's other work, the Pajjamadhu, is a clever Pali composition of one hundred and four stanzas

-
1. Rūpasiddhi, ed. K. Pannasekara (Colombo, 1964), p. 311.
 2. The Pali Literature of Ceylon, p. 220.

written in praise of the Buddha. The poem is composed in sataka style, though not called so, and is the first composition of this category written in Ceylon. The language, the manner of description and the other poetical devices applied throughout the work display the influence of Sanskrit poetics and Sanskrit devotional literature as well. It extols the beauties of the Buddha's person from the nails of his toes to the halo round his head (ketumālā), the perfections (pāramitā) and unfathomable wisdom of the Buddha, the Saṅgha and Nirvāna. It is criticised for the author's lack of poetical imagination and the laboured artificiality of style which renders it far removed from the sweetness that the author suggests in its title, Pajjamadhu.¹

Vedeha, Ānanda's other pupil, was the author of two Pali works, the Samantakūṭavannanā and the Rasavāhinī, the first in verse and the second in prose and verse. He is also credited with having written the Sidatsaṅgarāva, the most authoritative old Sinhalese grammar extant.² The colophon to the Samantakūṭavannanā and the Rasavāhinī furnish us with some accounts of the author. In the

1. A History of Pali Literature, II, p. 625.

2. Sidatsaṅgarā, ed. James D'Alwis (Colombo, 1852), preface.

Rasavāhinī, probably the author's last work, he says: 'This Rasavāhinī is composed by Vedeha, pupil of Ānanda, the jewel of the forest; he is the banner of the Vip̄pagāmaṃsa in Ceylon and wrote Saddalakkhana in Sinhalese and the Samantakūṭavannanā.¹ In the prologue of the Samantakūṭavannanā he mentions only the Sīhala-sadda-lakkhana as his work.² So the order in which his books were written is: first, the Sadda-lakkhana, second, the Samantakūṭavannanā, and finally, the Rasavāhinī. It is quite possible that the Sīhalasaddalakkhana of Vedeha was a separate work from the Sidatsaṅgarā of Patiraja piruvana (the head of the Patiraja institute), for Vedeha does not speak of any connexion with such an institute called Patiraja pirivena. That work must have been in use for some time among Sinhalese scholars until the Sidatsaṅgarāva itself replaced it. As there is a lack of evidence on this point we are not permitted to infer that the Sadalakunu occurring in the Kāvyaśekaraya of Sri Rahula³ is identical with the Sīhala-sadda-lakkhana, whereas this has to be assumed in order to prove that the Sidatsaṅgarāva was

1. Rasavāhinī, ed. Saranatisa (Colombo, 1928), p. 194.

2. Samantakūṭavannanā (PTS), ed. C.E. Godakumbura (London, 1958), p. 75.

3. Kāvyaśekaraya, ed. R. Dharmarama (Colombo, 1915), II, v. 39.

written by Vedeha.¹

The Samantakūṭavannanā, the second work of the author, is a poem of eight hundred and two verses including colophon, enriched with literary excellence. As the title itself implies, the work purports to be a description of the peak Samanola on which the Buddha is said to have imprinted the mark of his left foot on his third visit to Ceylon. But only twenty-nine verses (718 - 746) are devoted to that purpose. The rest of the work contains the life story of the Buddha from his birth to his third visit to Ceylon. The poet describes in detail many incidents of the Buddha's life and, in the course of the narrative of the Master's visit to Ceylon, he makes use of the opportunity to describe in a poetical manner many parts of the island.

In comparison with the Pajjamadhu of Buddhappiya, Vedeha's Samantakūṭavannanā displays an easy-flowing elegance of language, vigour of expression, coherence of subject matter and vividness of pen pictures. While the Samantakūṭavannanā shows Vedeha's creative ability and skill in poetics, the Rasavāhinī shows his narrative skill. The latter is a collection of stories embodying

1. Sidatsaṅgarāva, ed. R.Dharmarama (Pāliyaḡoda, 1913), Introduction, p.1.

legends, historical and otherwise. According to the opening stanzas it is a revision or a reproduction of an old work.¹ The original work was compiled by a thera named Ratthapāla of Guttavaṅkapaṛiveṇa of the Mahāvihāra. Of a total of one hundred and three stories, the first forty deal with incidents which happened in Jambudīpa (India) and the rest relate to the incidents that happened in Sīhaladīpa (Ceylon). The manner in which the author narrates the incidents of each story and the trend which compels him to introduce didactic verses into the narrative shows his enthusiasm to inspire in the devotee a devotional faith and reverence towards the Buddha, the Dhamma and the Saṅgha.

Anuruddha

It is evident from our sources that the date of a distinguished scholar and a poet called Anuruddha who is reputed to have written three books on Abhidhamma and a eulogy of the Buddha should be assigned to the early part of the Polonnaru period.² Of these works the Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha which is well known among Pali scholars, especially those who are interested in the Abhidhamma mentions, in its colophon, that it was

1. Rasavāhini, p.1.

2. The Pali Literature of Ceylon, p.169.

written at the request of a devotee called Namba, and speaks of its author's relationship with Mūlasoma-vihāra.¹ Not much more is known about Namba and Mūlasoma-vihāra which according to Ceylonese and Burmese traditions is considered a monastery located in Ceylon.² Of Anuruddha's two other works on the Abhidhamma, the Paramatthavinicchaya states that Anuruddha, who was born in a distinguished family in Kāveri of Kāñci-pura-ratṭha, wrote that work while he was dwelling in the city of Tañja in Tambaratṭha.³ The Nāmarūpapariccheda, the author's final work on the Abhidhamma, says nothing of his place of residence but contains a glorification of the Mahāvihāra School to which the author himself belonged.⁴

A.P. Buddhadatta is of the opinion that there were two Anuruddhas, to one of whom he ascribes the authorship of the Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha and the Nāmarūpapariccheda; he lived in Mūlasoma-vihāra in Ceylon. The other who wrote the Paramatthavinicchaya, was a native of India

-
1. Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha with sanne, p.256.
 2. A.P. Buddhadatta, Theravādi-bauddhācāryayō (Ambalamgoda, 1960), pp.57-62.
 3. Paramatthavinicchaya, ed. Devananda (Colombo, 1926), Colophon.
 4. Nāmarūpapariccheda, ed. P. Buddhadatta (Colombo, 1954), Colophon.

and lived in Kāveri at the time when he composed the work.¹ In this connexion, we cannot agree with Malalasekara who concludes that Anuruddha, a native of Ceylon who spent part of his life at Kāñcīpura in South India, was the author of the three works on the Abhidhamma, for the Paramatthavinicchaya clearly shows that its author was a native of India. Taking all the facts into account, we can reach either of two alternative conclusions, namely that there were two separate authors by the same name, one in Ceylon and the other in India, or that Anuruddha, a native of India, wrote all three works on the Abhidhamma mentioned above. It may be of note, however, that the Ceylonese tradition inclined to attribute the authorship of the Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha and the Anuruddha-sāṭaka to a person who lived in Ceylon.² As is mentioned in the colophon to the Anuruddha-sāṭaka the sāṭaka was written by Anuruddha, Upasthavira, who was like unto a gem in the necklace of the Uttaramūla.³ It is clear that the author was one of the leading members of the Uttaramūla fraternity whereas the other Anuruddha, the author of the Nāmarūpapariccheda, was a member of

1. Theravādi-bauddhācaryayō, p. 63.

2. Anuruddhasāṭakaya, ed. Batuvantudave (Colombo, 1879) Introduction.

3. Ibid., p. 39, v. 101.

the Mahāvihāra school. It is therefore doubtful, as suggested by Wijesekara, whether he was identical with the Pali author of the same name whom we have already discussed.¹ Pannasara holds that this Anuruddha who according to him wrote the Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha can be assigned to a date not later than A.D. 1100.²

The Anuruddhasataka, however, does not provide us with any definite evidence to help us to determine its date.

The Anuruddhasataka which compares very favourably with the satakas of Indian origin is one of the few devotional poems written in Ceylon. The work, composed in elegant Sanskrit and the vaidarbha style of Sanskrit masters, clearly shows the learning and the skill of the author in Sanskrit poetry. In its one hundred stanzas (excluding the colophon) of different metres, various episodes of the life story of the Buddha are extolled in fervent devotional faith. Of his subject matter drawn from the life story of the Buddha, the description of dasapāramī (ten perfections), the Buddha's person from head to toe and various qualities of his morality and wisdom occupy more than

1. History of Ceylon (UC), p. 589.

2. D. Pannasara, Sanskrit Literature (Extant among the Sinhalese and Influence of Sanskrit on Sinhalese) (Colombo, 1958), p. 158.

half of the poem. There is no story running continuously throughout the poem. The subjects selected by the author seem to be separate items connected with various episodes of the Buddha's life. But at the same time, it seems that a certain attempt has been made by the poet to harmonize them so as to form an appearance of a life story of the Buddha. Though the work however is small, it draws our attention by its vigour of expression and alliteration. Though many of its verses, as in other satakas in the same category, seem to be clothed in high-flown metaphors with ornately elaborated ideas and jingling sounds, there are a few pieces of devotional poetry enriched with such beauty of sense as:

'adyāpi yaccaraṇalānchanamātradhārī
kṣonidharopi jagatām kurute hitāni
tam naumi tam pratinamāmi tamarcayāmi
tam bhāvayāmi sugatām tamanusmarāmi.' 1

Moggallāna

The great sage Moggallāna who is reputed to have written the Moggallāna-vyākaraṇa was one of the illustrious monks of the Polonnaru period. According to the available

1. Anuruddhasataka, p.37, v.96.

See also Ch. III.

data, there were four learned monks by the same name who probably flourished somewhere around the eleventh and the twelfth centuries. The first of them was Mugaḷan mahāsthavira of the Uttaramūla, who figures in the Velaikkāra inscription where he is described as the royal preceptor and grammarian, well known for his profound learning and saintly conduct.¹ The second was the dignitary, who as referred to in the Cūlavamsa,² led the Saṅgha of the Uparājaratṭha in the Elders' council. The third and the fourth were the authors of the Moggallāna-vyākaraṇa and the Abhidhānappadīpikā respectively.³ It is not necessary to discuss their dates and other facts regarding their identity since we have dealt with the matter in a previous discussion.⁴ The author of the Moggallāna-vyākaraṇa was contemporaneous with Kassapa and Sāriputta, as suggested by his works. It is mentioned in the colophon to the Moggallāna that it was written during the reign of

1. EZ. Vol. II, No. 40, p. 254.

2. Cv. ch. 78, v. 9.

3. Wickremasinghe provides a list of four Moggallānas in which he identifies the Moggallāna who figures in the Velaikkāra inscription with the author of the Moggallāna-vyākaraṇa.

EZ. II, p. 249.

4. See ch. I.

Parākramabāhu whose policy led the Saṅgha to the purification.¹ According to the colophon to the Padasādhana of Piyadassi, who claims the pupilage of Moggallāna, he lived in Anurādhapura.² The Pañcikaṅgadīpaya of Śrī Rāhula says that the great grammarian Moggallāna was the incumbent of the Thūpārāma-vihāra in Anurādhapura.³

Moggallāna's grammar paved the way for the beginning of a new school of grammar in Ceylon.⁴ Up to that time the only Pali grammar available and in frequent use among Pali scholars was the Kaccāyana. Moggallāna attempted to introduce a new system of Pali grammar based on the Cāndra school as an alternative to the Kaccāyana which followed the Kātantric methods. It is difficult to surmise what were the causes and circumstances which persuaded Moggallāna to introduce his new system as a substitute for the Kaccāyana which had remained in use for centuries. The influence of extensive Sanskrit studies during the period, as suggested by Malalasekara, had something to

-
1. Moggallāna, ed. H. Devamitta (Colombo, 1891), Colophon, vv. 1-4.
 2. Padasādhana, ed. Dharmananda, Colophon, pp. 301-303.
 3. Pañcikaṅgadīpaya, ed. Dharmarama (Colombo, 1896), p. 3.
 4. The Pali Literature of Ceylon, p. 179.

do with it.¹ As we have seen in a previous discussion, much attention was paid to Sanskrit studies in every learned circle. This had many results during that and the subsequent periods. It undoubtedly paved the way for the introduction of a Sanskritized Pali in the literary field. Perhaps Moggallāna's endeavour might have been engendered by the demands of this new phase of Sanskritized Pali.² On the other hand, he might have thought of reorganizing Pali grammar in a new manner which, in his view, was more comprehensible, more practical and more perfect than the grammatical system in practice up to that time. In applying his new methods, much inspiration was sought from the Cāndra system which was held in high esteem among prominent scholars at the time. As is mentioned in the colophon, Moggallāna wrote not only the aphorisms but also a vutti-vannana, called Pañcika, a commentary on his vutti. This new school of grammar which included such luminaries of learning as Piyadassi, the author of the Padasādhana, Saṅgharakkhita, the author of the Sambandha-cintā, Ānanda, the author of Padasādhana-sanne and Srī Rāhula, the author of the Pañcika-pradīpaya and the Buddhippasādhini, played an important role in intellectual circles.

1. Ibid., p.179.

2. Ibid., p.186.

Buddharakkhita

The authorship of the Jinālaṅkāra, a clever Pali poem of two hundred and seventy verses, composed in elaborate Kāvya style and sonorous language, is attributed to a learned monk called Buddharakkhita who must have flourished in the Polonnaru period. According to the colophon of the Jinālaṅkāra it was written in A.D. 1157¹ and Buddharakkhita, the author, was born in a 'pure family' (sucivamsa) in Rohana and was a leading monk, well versed in the Abhidhamma. As is further mentioned he was honoured by distinguished scholars in Ceylon, Cōla and Tambarattha and was well known as an orator.² A commentary called Jinālaṅkāra-vannana also was written by the same author.³ The Jinālaṅkāra purports to be a panegyric of the Buddha and contains various incidents of the Buddha's life. It seems that the author paid more attention to describing such incidents in separate form rather than to making an organic whole of a biography of the Buddha.

-
1. Malalasekara mentions that James Gray assigned the work to 426 B.C. This dating is incorrect and seems to have been the result of a misinterpretation of the phrase 'sattarasasate vasse' in the colophon. See The Pali Literature of Ceylon, p.110. See also Jinālaṅkāra ed. James Gray (London, 1894) Introduction, p. 1.
 2. Jinālaṅkāra, ed. R. Palita (Matara, 1955), p.31, vv.272-276.
 3. The Gandhavamsa attributes the Jinālaṅkāra itself to Buddhadatta and its tīkā to Buddharakkhita. See Gandhavamsa (JPTS), ed. J. Minayeff (London, 1886) pp.69-72.

But he deliberately contrives to relate briefly the main incidents of the Buddha's life.¹ The incidents chosen from the whole life of the Buddha are essential to elucidate unfathomable qualities of the Master and are divided into eighteen small sections. They are named as: yogāvacaradīpanī gāthā, vatthusodhanī gāthā, tividhabuddhakkhettadīpanī gāthā and so forth. In every part an attempt has been made to attract the devotee's mind towards the Buddha whom the author himself worships in fervent faith.

In such parts as nekkhammajjhāsayagāthā, pāduddhāravimhaya and mahāpadhānadīpanī gāthās the author seems to have attempted to display his skill in writing verses adorned with compound words, difficult constructions, jingling of syllables and other rhetorical devices rather than to depict his genuine devotional feeling through the rhetorical medium. It would be very difficult to get the meaning of some verses if the author himself had not provided us with a commentary. But there are some few verses enriched with devotional merit and they can be regarded as pieces of Pali ballad which are removed from Sanskrit influence. Those verses which delineate various aspects of worshipping the Buddha

1. Jinālaṅkāra (ed. Palita), vv. 238-254.

portray a devotee who kneels down before the Buddha, with fervent devotion.¹ Though there are a few such verses of great devotional merit, generally the work does not rank as an excellent piece of creative writing. But it seems to have been in use for centuries among Buddhist scholars as a text book for Pali students and a source for Sinhalese writers as well. It is noteworthy that this work is one of the sources from which Gurulugomi quoted some verses in his Dharmapradīpikāva.²

Sāriputta and his Disciples

Sāriputta Saṅgharāja, one of the most prominent figures during the Polonnaru period, certainly deserves special mention when we are dealing with the religious and literary activities of the age. As Ceylonese tradition itself extols, he was a great and erudite scholar endowed with an unparalleled skill of learning; he is also called 'sāgaramati', like unto the ocean in wisdom. Undoubtedly he must have possessed a great scholarly knowledge in both religious and secular subjects. As is extolled by an anonymous writer,³ Sāriputta was as

1. Jinālaṅkāra (ed. Palita), vv.209-267.

2. cf. Dharmapradīpikāva, p.14, Jinālaṅkāra (ed. Palita), p.9. vv.61.

3. Saddhatissa supposes that Sumaṅgala, the author of the Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī, was the probable writer of this verse and added it to the colophon.

See Upāsakajanālaṅkāra, Introduction, p.105.

profound in the Cāndra and Pāṇinī as Candragomī and Pāṇinī themselves; he was well versed in all logic, as if he were its author, and as a source of joy to thrill the hearts of other poets he was a Kālidāsa.¹ As mentioned in the opening stanzas of the Sāratthadīpanī, a masterly sub-commentary on Buddhaghosa's Samantapāsādikā, he was a pupil of hierarch Kassapa of Udumbaragiri. Eulogizing his teacher, Sāriputta says that he reached prosperity in the sāsana by association with him. In this work, reference has been made to another erudite thera, by name Sumedha; he was one of his teachers of whom we know little.² Sāriputta played an important role in Parākramabāhu's convocation which eventually led to a unification of the Saṅgha. As stated in the Cūlavamsa Parākramabāhu built for him a mansion of splendour containing many halls and chambers, attached to the Jetavana-vihāra at Polonnaruva.³ The Sāratthadīpanī says that the work

1. 'yam cande candabhūtam nisitataramatiṃ pāṇiniṃ pāṇiniye, sabbasmin takkasatthe paṭutaramati yo kattubhūtam va taṃ taṃ maññante kālidāsam kavijanahadayānandahetun kavitte sāyam lokatthasiddhim vitaratu racanā tassa sārīsutassa'.

Abhidharmārthasaṅgraha sanne, p. 257.

2. Sāratthadīpanī, p.1, vv.6-7.

3. Cv. ch. 78, v.34.

was written by Sāriputta at the request of Parākramabāhu while he was dwelling in the Jetavana-vihāra.¹ The Sāratthamañjūsā, the sub-commentary of the Manorathapūranī, and the Pāli-muttaka-vinaya-vinicchaya-saṅgaha were also written by him at the instance of the same king. Sāriputta is reputed to have written a concise Sanskrit grammar called the Padāvatāra and a Sinhalese paraphrase to the Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha of Anuruddha. To his authorship are attributed four other works - a ṭīkā on Ratnasriñāna's Pāncikālaṅkāra, Visuddhipathasaṅgaha, Kammaṭṭhānasaṅgaha and Maṅgalasuttasaṅgaha² which are not known at the present day. Saddhatissa is of the opinion that three other sub-commentaries of Dīgha, Majjhima and Samyutta-nikāyatthakathās were also written at the Jetavana-vihāra by his colleagues, under his supervision,³ whereas Wickremasinghe ascribes their authorship to Sāriputta himself.⁴ Of Sāriputta's works mentioned above, the Sāratthadīpanī and the Abhidharmārthasaṅgraha-sanne are regarded as masterly works. The immense amount of valuable information he has collected

1. Op.cit., Colophon, vv. 1-3.

2. Abhidharmārthasaṅgraha-sanne, Colophon, p.257.

3. Upāsakajanālaṅkāra, Introduction, p.47.

4. D.M.de.Z Wickremasinghe, Catalogue of ^{the} Sinhalese MSS. in ^{the} British Museum (London, 1900), p. XV.

and certain descriptions and comments he has given on obscure and difficult words clearly show his extensive and profound knowledge and exegetical ability as well. The language employed in both works displays the wide influence of the author's Sanskrit learning. The Sāratthadīpanī, one of the most comprehensive sub-commentaries on the Vinayapitaka, which follows closely the lines laid down by Buddhaghosa, is based on Sinhalese glossaries which are no longer extant. Sāriputta says, in the opening stanzas of his Sāratthadīpanī, that the exegetical works on the Vinaya written by the scholars of earlier times cannot be understood by the bhikkhus everywhere because they were written in Sinhalese. Hence, as the people of different countries cannot grasp the sense on account of the defective nature of the extant exegetical works, the author says that he will discard the language (Sinhalese) and extract what is best in those works and give his explanations clearly (in Pali).¹

This account shows that there were some glossaries on the Vinaya in Sinhalese which existed at the time of composition of the Sāratthadīpanī. As is referred to in the Sāratthadīpanī, there were three Ganthipadas in

1. Op.cit., p.2.

Sinhalese, namely the Mahāganthipada, the Majjhimaganthipada and the Cūlaganthipada¹ which probably went out of use after Sāriputta's work came into prominence. While the Sāratthadīpanī exhibits Sāriputta's traditional way of learning at the Mahāvihāra school which inclined very much to orthodoxy and specialization in the study of the Vinaya, the Abhidharmāthasaṅgraha - sanne, the author's only work in Sinhalese, shows his profound learning in Buddhist philosophy.

In many instances Sanskrit quotations are cited by the author in order to illustrate subtle ideas and to justify some statements. For example, the 'mango simile' which is used to illustrate the process of conscious moments (cittakkhana) has been cited from the Āryasatyāvātāra.² Likewise, he quotes a verse from the Vākyapadīya of Bhartrhari to justify his views about the significance of words depending on their context.³

Though the work is classified as an interverbal paraphrase of the Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha, as in the case of the Dhampiyā-atuvā-gātapadaya of Abhāsalamēvan Kasub, the glossary to the Dhammapadatthakathā, many explanations and comments on certain words have been added by the author.

1. Sāratthadīpanī, p.7.

2. Abhidharmāthasaṅgraha-sanne, p.96.

3. Ibid., p.9

These passages display clearly his language, style of writing and the manner in which he proves his views logically. Unlike the language of the Dhampiyā-atuvā-gātapadaya, the language employed in the Abhidharmārthasaṅgraha-sanne is full of Sanskrit loan words. The author seems to have often used such language when he gives word-for-word meanings and explanations of subtle facts, philosophical and otherwise. In some passages Śāriputta's language and syntax closely resemble those of other writers in the Polonnaru period. This will be clear from the following passage concerning the 'mango simile' :

' mehi vīthi cittapravṛttiya suva sē dāna gannā piṇisa
 āmbopamāvek kiyānu lābē.ek puruṣayek palagat āmbagas
 mula hisa vasā porava gena nidannē tamā āsannayē
 hunuvāvū āmba pakeka 'sabdāyēn piḍida hisin perava-gat
 vastraya pahakoṭa 'ās dalvā dāka ē āmba paka gena atin
 māda himba piyā vilikun bava dāna anubhava-koṭa
 mulhagata vū avāśesaya 'śleṣmaya hā samaga anubhava
 koṭa nāvata ehima elesin-ma nidannēya.'¹

'Here, a certain illustration called the 'mango simile' will be elucidated for easy comprehension of the stream of conscious moments. A man who is sleeping under a mango tree with fruits and has covered himself with a cloth wakes up by the noise caused by the falling of a fruit; he picks it up with his hand and having noticed that it is ripen by touching and smelling it he eats it. Then he swallows every thing that remained in his mouth together with the saliva and goes to sleep there again in the same manner.'

1. Abhidharmārthasaṅgraha - sanne, p.96.

By no means does Sāriputta employ this sort of language everywhere in his work. Sometimes, especially when he deals with a philosophical or doctrinal matter, he uses a language full of Sanskrit loan words, the like of which can be found in such portions of the Dharmapradīpikāva of Gurulugomi. Thus the work itself is a very useful source for those interested in the study of the development of Sinhalese language.

Saṅgharakkhita

Among Sāriputta's disciples whose profound learning and high literary abilities had great effects on the contemporary and subsequent periods, Saṅgharakkhita, Sumaṅgala, Vācissara and Dhammakitti are outstanding figures.

Saṅgharakkhita, who succeeded the hierarch Sāriputta, possessed expert knowledge in grammar, prosody and poetics. He is credited with the authorship of some seven works on different subjects, including the Vuttodaya in prosody, the Subodhālaṅkāra on poetics, the Sambandha-cintā and Susaddasiddhi on grammar, and the Sumaṅgalappa-sādini on the Vinaya. Of these the Vuttodaya and the Subodhālaṅkāra are considered masterly works in their respective fields in Pali. In the introductory stanzas the author mentions that the works written in Sanskrit on these subjects do not fulfil satisfactorily the needs

of those studying the pure Māgadhī, and his attempt was for that purpose.¹ This really implies that there were no works on the subjects in Pali until Saṅgharakkhita's works were written. The terms employed, the manner in which they are described and many of the examples given seem to have been borrowed from Sanskrit.

Though his work bore a close relationship to the Kāvyaḍarśa of Daṇḍin, the author attempted to select what was meant to be essential and suitable for the Pali when he wrote the Subodhālaṅkāra. Some parts which were not in the Kāvyaḍarśa were added by him, for example, in the Subodhālaṅkāra there are nine rasas described instead of eight in the Kāvyaḍarśa. The sānta or the sentiment of tranquillity is the ninth. His formulations concerning the rasa theory clearly shows the author's knowledge of poetic conceptions other than the alaṅkāra.² Both works must have been regarded as authoritative on those subjects.

Sumaṅgala

Sumaṅgala, one of the senior pupils of Sāriputta, is said to have specialized in the Abhidhamma. He is credited with the authorship of two commentaries on the Abhidhamma, namely the Abhidhammatthavikāsinī on the

-
1. Vuttodaya with sanne, ed. W. Dipankara (Alutgama, 1925), ch. I, vv. 2-4.
Subodhālaṅkāra, ed. D. Dharmasena (Vālitara, 1910), p. 1, vv. 2-3.
 2. Ibid. ch. V, vv. 1-31.

Abhidhammāvatāra of Buddhadatta, and the Abhidhammattha-vibhāvinī on the Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha of Anuruddha. The latter is well known among students of the Abhidhamma. It is evident from the work that it is based on the Abhidhammārtthasaṅgraha-same of Sāriputta. As is mentioned in the Pūjāvaliya of Mayūrapāda Buddhaputra, he was a co-pupil as well as a teacher of Buddhaputra and belonged to the Mahanetpāmula.¹

Vācissara

Contemporaneous with Sumaṅgala, there was another pupil of Sāriputta called Vācissara. Wickremasinghe and Malalasekara are of the opinion that there were two scholars by this name, both of whom lived before the end of the thirteenth century, the one slightly senior to the other. According to Malalasekara, the younger Vācissara was the pupil of Sāriputta, to whom the authorship of the Sambandhacintā-tīkā, Subodhalankāra-tīkā and the Vuttodaya-vannanā is attributed.² The Pali Thūpavamsa and the Sīmālaṅkāra were also written by a scholar called Vācissara.

-
1. Pūjāvaliya, ed. B. Saddhatissa (Colombo, 1930), p. 754.
 2. Wickremasinghe, Cat. Sinhalese MSS. p. XVI;
The Pali Literature of Ceylon, pp. 202-204.

It is still not clear whether this Vācissara was different from the other who claimed to be a pupil of Sāriputta. According to the colophon to the Thūpavamsa, its author was in charge of the Dhammāgāra of Parākramabāhu and wrote the Līnatthadīpanī, a commentary on the Patīsambhidāmagga, and Sinhalese paraphrases of two works, namely the Saccasaṅkhepa and the concise Visuddhimagga.¹ The Parākramabāhu referred to in the Thūpavamsa is identified by an editor with the second king of this name but Buddhadatta does not agree with him.² The Thūpavamsa, as mentioned by the author himself, is a revision of an old Thūpavamsa written in Sinhalese³ which is no longer extant. The Sinhala Thūpavamsa of Sakala-vidyā-cakravartī Parākrama Pandita which was written somewhere about the thirteenth century is a descriptive translation of Vācissara's work.

1. Thūpavamsa, ed. D. Vācissara (Colombo, 1941), p. 82.

It must be noted that this concise Visuddhimagga referred to in the colophon appears to be lost.

2. Ibid., Introduction, p. 2.
Theravādī-bauddhācāryayō, p. 92.

3. Thūpavamsa, p.1, v. 3.

Dhammakitti

Dhammakitti, the royal preceptor and a distinguished poet, is reputed to have composed the Pali Dāthāvamsa. He was a pupil of Sāriputta, and he extols his teacher with great respect in the colophon to the work. As mentioned by the author himself, the Dāthāvamsa was written at the request of Parākrama, the Prime Minister of Līlāvati. Dhammakitti speaks highly of both the Prime Minister and the Queen, in the introductory stanzas of the work.¹ He further tells us that his work is based on an older Jinadhātuvamsa written in Sinhalese by the poets of Siṃhala. It is believed that this 'Elu Daladāvamsaya,' was composed in the reign of Kittissiri-megha-vanna, soon after the Tooth Relic was brought over to Ceylon.² The work however, is no longer extant.

It is of note in this respect that to a thera named Dhammakitti is attributed the authorship of the first part of the Cūlavamsa (ch.37-v.57 to ch.79-v.84).³ This work is traditionally believed

-
1. Dāthāvamsa with sanne, ed. Silalankara (Alutgama, 1914).
 2. Ibid., paraphrase of verse no.10, p.4.
 3. C.E. Godakumbura, The Cūlavamsa (its authorship and date) JCBRAS, 1949, Vol. XXXVIII, Parts 3 & 4 No.107, p.123.

to have been written during the reign of Parākramabāhu II of Dambadeniya. Godakumbura, referring to a passage quoted from the old Sinhalese verbal paraphrase of the Dāthāvamsa concludes that some of the Cūlavamsa existed before the reign of Parākramabāhu II.¹ As there is lack of evidence it is difficult to identify this Dhammakitti with the author of the Dāthāvamsa.

1. Ibid., p. 123.

Author of the Mahābodhivamsa-granthipadaya:

The authors whom we have so far dealt with were outstanding scholars who flourished during the Polonnaru period or soon after. Many of them are known to us by their names, by those of their teachers or by other information of when and where they lived. But there were some scholars and poets who are considered to have lived in that period though there is no historical evidence to establish the exact date at which they flourished. The only evidence which can be drawn from the works they have left behind is the language and the style of their writings and some quotations. Among such scholars the foremost was the author of the Mahābodhivamsa-granthipadaya, a Sinhalese glossary to the Pali Mahābodhivamsa. The Pali Mahābodhivamsa was composed by a learned thera called Upatissa who probably flourished about the tenth century.¹ The highly Sanskritized Pali with long compounds possibly derived from Sanskrit kāvyas, which is employed in the work, as suggested by Godakumbura, must necessarily have demanded several supplementary works to aid its study.²

1. The Pali Literature of Ceylon, pp. 156-157.

2. C.E. Godakumbura, Sinhalese Literature, p. 33.

As far as we are concerned, the first writer who came forward to supply that demand was the author of the Granthipadaya. The work itself says nothing of its author. Many scholars attribute the work to the twelfth century when Sanskrit learning and culture had assumed full sway over Sinhalese scholarship.¹

Paranavitana is of the opinion that the work, as suggested by its language, belongs to the early Polonnaru period and that its author lived at a time when the topography of Anuradhapura was still familiar.²

Since the Bodhivamsa-tīkā, a commentary on the Mahābodhivamsa written in Pali which appears to be a translation of the Mahābodhivamsa-granthipadaya, mentions that it was written in A.D. 1203,³ the author of the Granthipadaya must have lived before this date. It may be noted that the work itself bears some evidence which enables one to make a surmise regarding its probable date. The author seems to have quoted a verse from the Abhidhānappadīpikā⁴ of

-
1. Sinhalese Literature, p.34; Simhala-Sāhityavamsaya, p.93; Simhala-Sāhityaya, I, p. 84.
 2. History of Ceylon (UC), II, p.584.
 3. Bodhivamsa-tīkā, (unpublished) See Mahābodhivamsa-granthipadaya ed. G.Dhammapala, M.A., Dissertation, Vidyodaya, 1967. p.183.
 4. cf. Abhidhanappadipikā, ed. W. Subhuti (Colombo, 1921) v.107.
Mahābodhivamsa-granthipada-vivaranaya ed. Dharmarama (Colombo, 1910), p.47.

Moggallāna, probably compiled in the later part of the reign of Parākramabāhu the Great or soon after his death. Sinhalese comments on the word 'ketubha' of the original text also reveals its relationship to the Abhidhānappadīpikā.¹ Further, describing the same word the author refers to Dandi and Jayadeva. Dandi in this reference, no doubt, must be the author of the Kāvyaḍarsa while Jayadeva must be either the author of the Candrāloka, a work on Alaṅkāra, or the author of the Gītagovinda, the celebrated devotional poem.² Accordingly, we may conclude that the Granthipadaya was written during the latter part of the twelfth century. However, no evidence is available to identify its author. According to Burmese tradition, the Mahābodhivamsa-tīkā mentioned above was entitled Sahassaransi³ (Sk. Sahasrarasmi), perhaps because its original work, the Mahābodhivamsa-granthipadaya, was written by a scholar known as Sahasrarasmi. As we

1. Ibid., p. 116.

2. Jayadeva, the author of the Candrāloka is assigned to the period between the later quarter of the 12th century and the first quarter of the 14th by S.K.De. See History of Sanskrit Poetics, II, pp. 196-199.

Jayadeva, the author of the Gītagovinda is believed to have lived in the reign of Lakṣmanasena (A.D.1175-1200). See A.B.Keith, A History of Sanskrit Literature, pp. 190-191.

3. M.H.Bode (PTS), The Pali Literature of Burma (London, 1909), p.104 n.9.

have mentioned earlier, the tīkā is based on the Granthipada. It appears to be a word-for-word translation of the Granthipadaya.¹ If we take this fact into account, then we may be able to surmise that the author of the Mahābodhivamsa-granthipadaya was Sahasrarasmi. This hypothesis may be supported by a statement occurring in the Dharmapradīpikāva which says that the author selected the words to be commented on from among the words 'paraphrased by Sahasrarasmi' (or 'divided into twelve (chapters)').² Sorata is of the opinion that there was a certain scholar known by this name.³ It is, however, worthy of note that certain explanations and phrases of both the Granthipadaya and the Dharmapradīpikāva seem to be very similar as if they were quoted one from the other. The great similarity in language and style too would make one think that both authors belonged to the same school.⁴ The author of

-
1. Mahābodhivamsa-granthipadaya, Introduction, pp.11-13.
 2. 'Sahasrarasmin vibhakta' Dharmapradīpikāva p.1.
To the editor the word 'sahasrarasmin' denotes the numeral 12. If so, the meaning would be 'divided into twelve'.
See Dharmapradīpikāva, Introduction, p.1.
 3. Sri Sumaṅgala Sabda-kosaya, ed. W. Sorata (Colombo, 1956), II, p.1026.
 4. cf. Mahābodhivamsa-granthipada - vivaraṇaya, pp.13, 129
Dharmapradīpikāva, pp. 68, 300.

the Mahābodhivamsā-granthipadaya, like Gurulugomi, was undoubtedly a celebrated scholar, well versed in Pali and Sanskrit as well. Like Gurulugomi he also cited many verses from Sanskrit grammatical and literary works in support of his explanations and arguments and to describe certain situations in the original work, the Pali Mahābodhivamsa. Among the Sanskrit works cited are Raghuvamsā,¹ Meghadūta,² Jānakīharana,³ Kādambarī,⁴ Nāgānanda,⁵ Sisyalekhā,⁶ Amarakoṣa⁷ and Vākyapadīya.⁸

1 - 8. Mahābodhivamsāgranthipada-vivaranaya, pp.32, 33, 127, 127, 11, 129, 18, 6, 35.

Author of the Jātaka-atuvā-gāṭapadaya.

The Jātaka-atuvā-gāṭapadaya, a Sinhalese glossary to the Pali Jātakatthakathā, is considered to have been written during the Polonnaru period.¹ The Jātaka stories seem to have become popular among the Buddhists of Ceylon from an early date. Monks as well as laymen were interested in reading them and listening to them while they were recited in religious ceremonies by Jātaka Bhānakas.² As the Jātakas themselves had much appeal for society, they necessarily must have become also an interesting subject for learned circles. The Jātakatthakathā seems to have been used as a text book for beginners in Pali. It probably demanded some sort of supplementary work like a granthipada which gave certain explanations and meanings of obscure or selected words. The Jātaka-atuvā-gāṭapadaya can be regarded as a successful attempt to meet that demand. In fact, it was not the first nor the final attempt to facilitate the study of Pali text.

-
1. Godakumbura attributes it to the early part of the Polonnaru period whereas Hettiaratchi is of the opinion that the work belongs to the end of the same period. See Sinhalese Literature, p.36; Vesaturu-dā-sanne, ed. D.E.Hettiaratchi (Colombo, 1950), Introduction, p. 101.
 2. Manorathapurani (PTS), ed. Max Walleiser & Herman Kopp (London, 1930) II, p.249.
See also E.W.Adikaram, Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon (Colombo, 1953), pp.30-31.

As is apparent from our sources there were some glossaries and translations of the most popular Jātaka stories like Mahā-vessantara and Mahā-ummagga. A reference is made in the Pañcīkāpradīpaya of Śrī Rāhula to some Sinhalese glossaries of certain Jātakas, namely Khaṇḍahāla-jātaka-gāṭapadaya, Umañ-dā-gāṭapadaya and Saunaka-jātaka-gāṭapadaya. The Pañcīkāpradīpaya also refers to a glossary of the Jātakatthakathā written in Tamil.¹ It is suggested by Hettiaratchi that the Saunaka-jātaka-gāṭapadaya mentioned in the Pañcīkāpradīpaya may be identical with the same gāṭapadaya found in the present Jātaka-atuvā-gāṭapadaya, for the quotation occurring in the Pañcīkāpradīpaya tallies completely with that in the latter work.² The Khaṇḍahāla-jātaka-gāṭapadaya in the same reference according to Hettiaratchi, was an independent glossary of the Khaṇḍahāla-jātaka.³ However, it is worthy of note that, though the quotation from this glossary in the above reference is not found

1. Pañcīkāpradīpaya, pp.114-115.

2. Vesaturu-dā-sanne, Introduction, p.103.
cf. Pañcīkāpradīpaya, p.115 and Jātaka-atuvā-gāṭapadaya, ed. D.D.Hettiaratchi & M.Sri Rammandala (Colombo, 1960), II, p.166.

3. Vesaturu-dā-sanne, Introduction, p.103.

in the corresponding section of the Jāṭaka-atuvā-gāṭapadaya, yet it is to be found in the Nimi-jāṭaka-sannaya of the present Ata-dā-sannaya.¹ The Ata-dā-sannaya also is one of the sources the Pāncikāpradīpaya quotes from. The work itself is an independent glossary of eight Jāṭakas, namely Temiya, Mahājanaka, Sāma, Nimi, Khaṇḍahāla, Bhūridatta, Mahānārada-kassapa and Vidhura² and is considered a later work than the Jāṭaka-atuvā-gāṭapadaya.³ The Umañ-dā-gāṭapadaya and the Demala-jāṭaka-gāṭapadaya must be regarded as separate glossaries to the Ummagga-jāṭaka and to the whole Pali Jāṭakatthakathā respectively.

Apart from these, there are two other Sinhalese glossaries called Vesaturu-dā-sanne and Jāṭaka-gāthā-sanyaya. Of these the Vesaturu-dā-sanne is mainly a verbal paraphrase of the Pali stanzas occurring in the Pali commentary to the Vessantara-jāṭaka, though it sometimes comments on certain obscure words outside the words of stanzas. Judging by the language, it seems to be a work prior to the Jāṭaka-atuvā-gāṭapadaya and may be dated somewhere about the twelfth century.⁴ Nothing is known

1. Ata-dā-sannaya, ed. M. Vimalakitti & N. Sominda (Colombo, 1954), p. 111.

2. Some scholars read Makhādeva-jāṭaka instead of Mahānārada-kassapa-jāṭaka. This must be a mistake. See Sinhalese Literature, p. 37.

3. Ata-dā-sannaya, Introduction, p. VI.

4. Vesaturu-dā-sanne, Introduction, p. 70.

about its author. The jāṭaka-gāthā-sanyaya, a Sinhalese paraphrase to the Pali Jāṭaka verses, written by a scholar called Rājamurāri of whom we know nothing other than the mention of his name in the Nikāyaśaṅgraha, is also an interesting accessory work for those studying Jāṭakas. The work which contains word-for-word paraphrases of 1505 verses is assigned to the latter part of the Polonnaru period.¹ Of the glossaries so far mentioned, the Jāṭaka-atuvā-gāṭapadaya is the largest and the foremost, containing commentaries to all Jāṭakas of the Jāṭakatthakathā except the Vessantara and the Ummagga to which glossaries had presumably already been written. Its author and date are not mentioned either in the work or elsewhere. The work seems to have followed the lines of the Dhampiyā-atuvā-gāṭapadaya in its interpretations and comments as well. But it differs in language and style from the former work. In comparison, the language of the Jāṭaka-atuvā-gāṭapadaya displays a new stratum which embodies many traits of the language of the Polonnaru period. It is a mixed language with more loan words from Sanskrit, and at the same time is free from the abundance of alternative words which occur frequently

1. Godakumbura, op.cit., p.40;
Sinhala-sāhitya-vamsaya, pp.98-99;
 Also see Nikāyaśaṅgraha, p. 21.

in the Dhampiyā-atuvā-gāṭapadaya. Though, like other glossaries of the period, it quotes some etymological clauses and phrases from Sanskrit grammars, unlike the Mahābodhivamsa-gāṭapadaya or the Abhidharmārtha-saṅgraha-sannaya it does not quote Sanskrit verses frequently in order to illustrate certain points or to support the author's suggestions.¹

-
1. Godakumbara is wrong when he concludes that there are no quotations either from Pali or Sanskrit in the Jāṭaka-atuvā-gāṭapadaya. Sinhalese Literature p.36.

For Sanskrit quotations see Jāṭaka-atuvā-gāṭapadaya, Part I, ed. D.B. Jayatilaka (Colombo, 1943), pp. 72, 132 and Part II, ed. D.E. Hettiaratchi & M. Sri Rammandala, p. 110.

Atthadassi

We have seen in the foregoing discussion the great attention paid by scholars in the Polonnaru period towards the Jātakas. All the works we have dealt with there are nothing but exegeses. They certainly do not bear the real traits of prose; nor do they display any literary merit. However, there do seem to have been certain attempts to produce prose works based on popular Jātakas. A Sinhalese work called the Nimijātakaya or Nirayavarnanā, which is based on the Nimijātaka of the Jātakatthakathā, is found in a still unpublished palm-leaf manuscript. According to Paranavitana and Vimalakitti it is the earliest Sinhalese prose work of the Polonnaru period.¹ But neither of them has made any further remark regarding its author, date and so forth. Wickremasinghe, who collected some few versions of the work, also adds nothing more than what the introductory stanzas themselves say about the author.² As stated in the opening stanzas, the work was written by a monk called Atthadassi,³ who describes himself as a pupil of Kassapa of the forest-dwelling fraternity. If the Kassapa

1. History of Ceylon (UC), Vol.II, p. 580.

M.Vimalakitti, Sāsānavamsapradīpaya (Colombo, 1954), p.160.

2. D.M.de.Z.Wickremasinghe, Catalogue of the Sinhalese Manuscripts in the British Museum (London, 1900), pp.123-124.

3. Ibid, pp.123-124.

mentioned in this reference was the hierarch Kassapa of Udumbaragiri, Atthadassi, the author of the Nimijātakaya, was probably contemporaneous with Sāriputta.¹ It is of note that three of the five opening stanzas of the Nimijātakaya seem to be cited from the Sāratthadīpanī of Sāriputta.¹ Since the Sāratthadīpanī, as we have seen elsewhere in this chapter, was written after the unification of the Saṅgha, Atthadassi must have lived during the latter part of the Polonnaru period. The final stanza which bears the name of the author seem to be evidence for making a conjecture concerning the author. The stanza appears to say: 'The bhikkhu Atthadassi relates the Nimijātaka at the request of Kassapa or asking Kassapa's assistance' (to fulfil the task).² The word 'yācento' (present participle of yāc) occurring in the verse implies that Kassapa who requested him or supported him to compose the work was alive at the time when it was composed. And as is implied by the word bhikkhu found in the same reference,

1. Sāratthadīpanī, p.1 - vv. 4-6.

2. 'vadhittam addiye bhikkhu - atthadassī'ti nāmako yācento kassapattheram - kathenti nimijātakaṃ.'
Cat. Sinhalese MMS. p.123.

By comparison with other versions, the word 'vadhittam' and 'kathenti' can be read as 'caittam' and 'karonti', yet none of them gives a clear meaning.

it seems that Atthadassi had not attained the high rank of a thera or mahā-thera in the Saṅgha when he wrote his work. Nothing more than this mention is known about him from our source. A deduction has been made by some scholars, which may be important in identifying this Atthadassi. The author of the Bhesajjamañjūsā, a medical treatise written in Pali in the reign of Parākramabāhu II, is said by them to be a Buddhist monk called Atthadassi.¹ According to the colophon of the Bhesajjamañjūsā, the work was written by the head of the Pañcaparivena-samūha, whose name is not mentioned either in the work or in any other ancient reference. In any case, the author of the Bhesajjamañjūsā did not claim the pupilage of Kassapa. As there is lack of evidence,

-
1. Malalasekara and Gunawardhana have mentioned that the Yogaratnākaraya, compiled at the end of the fourteenth century, gives the name of the author of the Bhesajjamañjūsā as Atthadassi. Since neither of them quotes the direct reference of the Yogaratnākara, and these words are not found in the printed text, this mention seems to be based on a secondary source and its reliability is in doubt. It is mentioned in a certain medical report that the Mañjūse was written by a Buddhist priest 'Atthadasse of Parakumbura who resided in Attanagalla Vihāra in Siyanākōralē about the year 1267 in the reign of Parākramabāhu. ' See W.R.Kynsey, Report on the Parangi disease, Ceylon Sessional Papers (Colombo, 1881), Vol. VIII, p. 78. Pali Literature of Ceylon, p. 215; History of the Buddhist Sangha in Ceylon, p. 459.

we are not in a position to identify the Atthadassi, author of the Nimijātakaya, with the author of the Bhesajjamañjūsā. The Nimijātakaya, as promised by its author at the very beginning of the work (karomi niraya-vannanam), purports to be a description of the nirayas (hells). Though it is a descriptive translation of the Nimijātaka of the Pali Jātakatthakathā, much attention is paid to a full description of one hundred and thirty six nirayas occurring in Buddhist literature. Of the nirayas described in the Atthadassi's Nimijātakaya, only a few are found in the Jātakatthakathā and the Siṃhala-Jātaka-pota which followed closely the Pali Jātaka version. It is, therefore, interesting to note that the Nimijātakaya of Atthadassi is an independent composition, although it drew its material from the Pali original. The Nimijātaka of the Jātakatthakathā contains the present and past stories of the Jātaka including verses and their respective commentaries.¹ The author of the Jātakatthakathā does not narrate the whole story in prose. In the course of his narration he quotes quite a number of verses from the Jātaka-gāthā and provides respective commentaries, but such commentarial passages seem to damage the normal flow of the story. The reader who goes through the verses and their commentaries may find it difficult to grasp the main plot and may tend to lose his way amidst the forest of words.

1. Jātakatthakathā, ed.W.Piyatissa, Vol.XLI, Part,VII (Colombo,1939), pp.80-111.

The Nimi-jātaka, as related in the Jātakatthakathā, can be summarized as follows: The Enlightened One related this story while he was dwelling in Makhādeva's mango park near Mithilā. Once upon a time the Bodhisatva was born as a son of the king of Mithilā and was named Nimi. He succeeded his father, followed his father's line and became a man of good conduct and behaviour. The virtues of the Great Being were sung in the world of men and in the heaven as well. One day as usual he observed eight precepts and spent time in his chamber in the palace, concentrating on the virtues he observed. It occurred to him to wonder whether practising charity (dāna) is more fruitful or living a holy life (brahmacariya). Though he thought over it, again and again, he could not reach a satisfactory solution. At that moment Sakka, the king of gods, came there and solved the question, saying that brahmacariya was more fruitful. Sakka related some episodes in order to support his argument and returned to the heaven. The devas who gathered in the assembly, having heard the story of Nimi from Sakka, wished to see him. Mātali, the charioteer of Sakka, was sent with the divine chariot to bring the Great Being to heaven. Mātali on the way back to heaven showed Nimi the nirayas first, and the heavens secondly.

This is just a summary of the main incidents of the Nimijātaka which occupies more than 30 pages in the Jātakatthakathā. The author of the Jātakatthakathā seems to have paid equal attention to the descriptions of both nirayas and devalokas (hells and heavens). In his description of nirayas he has mentioned only four nirayas by name¹ while two devatās are mentioned by their names in the description of devalokas.² In Atthadassi's work, as we have shown earlier, 136 names of nirayas were mentioned and each of them is described separately, whereas the Siṃhala-Jātaka-pota provides us with only fifteen names of nirayas.³ In many descriptions of both nirayas and devalokas, the Nimijātakaya of the Jātaka-pota goes side by side with Atthadassi's work. Some parallel passages of the two works are only slightly different one from the other, and that too not in content, but in language and style. This similarity shows the close association of the Jātaka-pota with the work of Atthadassi. No doubt, the author of the Nimijātakaya of the Siṃhala-Jātaka-pota must have closely followed Atthadassi's work when he undertook the task of translating that Jātaka into Sinhalese.

1. Jātakatthakathā, p.89, 93, 96, 98.

2. Ibid., pp.100-101.

3. Pansiya Panas-jātaka-pota, G.F.Munasinha Appuhami & D.W.Siriwardhana Appuhami (Colombo, 1955), pp.1385-1390.

In comparison with the Pali Nimijātaka, the Nimijātakaya of Atthadassi bears certain characteristics of its own while being a descriptive translation of the first. Though it follows the lines of the Pali version sometimes, it seems to be different from the original in content as well as literary technique. Atthadassi, in accordance with the tradition of other Sinhalese writers, gives a short description of the life of the Buddha at the outset of his work. In this portion he summarizes the most important incidents of the Buddha's life from Bodhisatvahood to the first sermon of the Buddha, and then begins the present story of the Jātaka. Next, he describes the story of king Nimi. In Atthadassi's work, it seems that some descriptive Pali passages have been omitted¹ deliberately, while certain other new descriptions which are not found in the original version have been added.²

The author of the Jātakatthakathā seems to have attempted to fulfil a threefold purpose in handling his subject matter, viz. to praise the practice of asceticism, to disdain sins, and to appreciate meritorious deeds. The main incidents of the story appear to focus on these themes. The first part of the past story of the Nimijātaka

1. Of the episodes Sakka has related in support of his arguments when he met the king Nimi, the episode of the ten thousand hermits is omitted.

Jātakatthakathā, p.84.

2. The summary of the Buddha's life and the descriptions of nirayas and devalokas other than those of the Pali version are newly added.

in the Jātakatthakathā, up to the conversation of Nimi with Sakka, purports to be a praise of ascetic life while the descriptions of niraya and devaloka provide the second and the third themes, respectively. Since equal attention is paid in the narration to the latter two themes, it is not necessary to divide that portion into two separate parts. Those parts appear to be combined as two extremes of the same incident. Thus the whole past story of the Pali Nimi-jātaka could be divided thematically into two parts. Nevertheless, it is desirable that the main character runs throughout the story from a certain point at the beginning till the end.

Unlike the author of the Pāli Nimi-jātaka, Atthadassi seems to have laid stress on the second theme while the first and the third were given a merely subsidiary place. Though he too deals with the fact that asceticism is more fruitful than practising charity, as is the case in the Jātakatthakathā, that part occupies only a little place in his narration. The description of nirayas, on the other hand, which comprises the second theme, predominates over the other parts, where the first and the third themes are discussed; in other words, that part occupies more than two-thirds of the whole story in Atthadassi's work.

The Nimijātakaya of Atthadassi does not excel in literary value either as a translation or as a piece of creative writing. The author's desire to write a religious discourse according to Buddhist tradition must have surpassed any literary purpose. The author appears to intend to frighten ignorant and wicked people who do not appreciate moral or social obligations and keep them away from evil deeds by showing them the severe tortures and pains which evil-doers have to undergo in the hells, and at the same time to persuade them to pursue a religious life. He has employed the literary medium not for the sake of art but for the sake of religious discourse. This does not mean, however, that the author was devoid of literary skill. In certain parts of his work he was able to display his skill. In the course of his narration, he seems to be more or less successful in using conversations occasionally as a device for the expansion of the story. This trait can be seen in his descriptions of the hells and the heavens. It may be exemplified from the following paragraph :

'mesē pañcavidha bandhanayen kamkaṭul deti. ovunge karma balayen yamapalhu siṭa, "eṃbala nirisat, kumak rusva" yi vicāraṭi. ekala nirisat, "svāmini, pipāsitayemi vahanse" yi kī kalhi ginigena dilihena loho diya laṅ kereti. e gini gat loho diya bālāṅ bhayin vevulā ās muva piyā layi. e dāka vaṭa koṭa siṭi yamapalhu gini gat yahaṅḍuven kaṭa depiṭa āda

gini gat loho diya vatkereti. ekala ohuge uguru
davā, atunu davā, adhōbhāgayen nīkmeysi. mesē maha
duk viñdinavun dāka nīmi maharājānō," māṭaliya,
mohu kumana pav kāla minissudā " yi vicāḷaha.

"maharaja, me nirisat'hu minis piya lat kālhi
rahamera tanā anuṅṅa dī visa kannā men kāvun hā
kansā abin ganu denu koṭa umatu vūvan āvit pāsena
narakaya maharājāneni," kiha.¹

'Thus they are tortured in five ways. The ministers
of Yama who appear before an infernal creature by
the result of his karma ask him, "O, infernal soul,
what dost thou want?" "My lord, I am very thirsty,"
says the inhabitant of the hell quivering with fear.
Then they give him burning melted metal. Having
seen that melted metal he shuts his eyes and mouth
with enormous fear. The ministers of Yama, who
gather round him, throw him down on the floor and
open his mouth with pincers and put the burning
liquid into his mouth. It goes out through the
fundament burning all internal organs like throat,
bowels and mesentery. The king Nimi having seen
the inhabitants of the hell being tortured severely
asked Māṭali, "What sort of karma have they done
when they were in the world of men?" "Your
Excellency the King," said Māṭali, "This is the
hell for those who became intoxicated by taking
alcoholic drinks like drinking poison and gave them
others, and who sold and bought ganja and opium." '

1. MSS. Nevill, Vol. I. p.125, Or.6603 (17).

This short passage cited from the description of Nirabbuda-niraya displays one of his modes of description. The technique used here may give some readers an impression of the accuracy of what the author says. The first part of the above passage which is nothing but narration makes way to a conversation between Nimi, the main character, and Mātālī, the charioteer who led him to the spot. The conversation, which is focussed on the incidents that take place at the same moment as they converse, is helpful in heightening the realism. From a literary point of view, this section is not enough to bring great credit to the author, yet it shows his attempt to employ some literary devices for the fulfilment of his religious purposes.

Atthadassi, the author of the Nimijātakaya, seems to be successful, to a certain extent, in using language in accordance with the subject matter. As we have mentioned above, this work is a descriptive translation. It may not be unreasonable to regard it as an indigenous work. In this connexion it seems to be necessary to make a survey of the modes of the author's translation. Here are some passages cited at random from the Nimijātakaya, which may be compared with the original work.

' ekala budun sinā pahala kalā dāka ānanda mahaterun
 vahansē dakuna't pasa ukkutukayen hinda dohot mudun
 dī sita "sinā pahala kalā karuṇa kimek da svāmīni,"

vicāla sēka. ebasāṭa karuṇā nidhāna vū lokanātha
vū tun lovaṭa nāṅgū pradīpayak baṅḍu vū budura jānan
vahansē vadārana sēk, "ānandaya, mā sasara perum
purana kalhi me miyulu nuvara nimi maharaja vīmi,"
vadāla sēka. ebasāṭa ānanda mahaterun vahansē
vicārana sēk, "svāmīni, kavara kaleka raja vū sēk da ?"
me nam kebaṅḍu vū vīriya kaḷa bimek dā yi vicāla sēka."

'Having seen that the Buddha had allowed himself to smile, Ānanda who was squatting at the right side of the Buddha with hands clasped on his head asked him: "Why dost thou smile, my Lord?" "Ānanda," answered the Buddha, the hoard of compassion, the lord of the world, like unto a lamp aloft to the three worlds, "once I was born in the city of Miyulu and was a king named Nimi while I was concentrating on the perfections in the samsāra (circle of birth)." Ānanda having heard these words, asked the Buddha again: "When wert thou born, my Lord?" "When didst thou become a king?" "What sort of a spot is this in which thou hast endeavoured?"

The original Pali passage of the Sinhalese translation cited above is as follows:

' āyasmata ānandena sitakāraṇaṃ puṭṭho, " ānanda, ayaṃ
bhūmippadeso mayā makhādevarājakāle jhānakīlaṃ kīli-
tena ajjhāvutthapubbo'ti" vatvā tena yācito...¹

1. Jātakatthakathā, ed. W.Piyatissa (Colombo, 1939),
Vol. KLI, part VII, p.80.

' When asked by Ānanda why he (Buddha) smiled, he answered:

"In yonder spot, Ānanda, I once dwelt, deep in ascetic meditation, in the time of king Makhadeva." Then at his request...

In comparison with this short passage, Atthadassi's translation seems to be an independent one in which the author has expanded what is contained in the original by adding certain amount of material of his own. Ānanda's reverential attitude towards the Buddha, as narrated in the translation, and the phrases ascribed to Ānanda, bear testimony to the skill of the translator. Atthadassi appears to have employed more than one device in order to expand ideas drawn from the original version, by way of giving his composition a new look. As in the above passage, he adds epithets, explanatory phrases and conversations between characters, and occasionally some descriptions which can be regarded as pieces of his own creative writing. The following passage is a good specimen of such a description:

' ekala saṅḍa hā samaga ena divyarathaya dāka ada dasas
pera nuduṭu virū saṅḍa dedenek enṇēya yi kiyā nāṅgū
piyavara peralā bima obāgata nohī samaharu siṭa
balannāhu ya. samaharu kaṭa dalvā sitiyama āṅḍi rū
sē niscalā va balati. samaharu nagāgat susma helāgata
no hī balā siṭināhu ya. samaharu divyarathayaṭa kara
nētra pūjāvaka men āspiya no solvā siṭiti.'

' The men having seen the divine chariot coming together with the moon thought, 'There are today two moons coming that have never been seen before.' They gazed at it with such astonishment that some of them who were walking there forgot to put their raised feet down on the ground again; others stood still with their mouths opened as in a drawing; some found it difficult to breathe out, and still some others gazed at it without winking, as if paying homage to the divine chariot. '

This description shows something of the creative skill which occasionally manifested itself in Atthadassi's work. It is impossible to find a word of this description in the original Pali passage. Everything here is the translator's own. The similes used in this passage deserve mention. Though they seem to be drawn from tradition, they are helpful for strengthening the situation depicted. The author does not always choose his similes only from literary tradition. Sometimes he has drawn them from his social environment, as follows :

'valan vasnak ī ī mata tābuvā sē,

'Like earthen cooking pots placed one on top of another;'

'naleka purā tibū tumba sunu sē'

'Like lead powder packed in a tube;'

'uk daṅḍu men mirikā'

'Squeezed like sugar-canes;'

'gāl no vadanā gerin elavannā sē;'

'Like driving cattle into a cattle-fold which they themselves do not wish to enter.'

From what we have discussed, it is clear that Atthadassi's intention was to make a descriptive translation and at the same time to make it into an independent composition.

Authors of the Sasadāvata and the Muvadevdāvata

We have seen elsewhere in this discussion the great attention paid by writers to the Jātakas during the Polonnaru period. Some scholars wrote accessory works in Sinhalese for those who studied the Pali Jātakas, while others concentrated on prose and poetry drawing their subject matter from the Jātakatthakathā, both for the learned and the less learned. Among Sinhalese classical poems the Sasadāvata and the Muvadevdāvata are the earliest surviving examples. They were much influenced by the Sanskrit ornate poems. The Sasadāvata, based on the Sasajātaka of the Jātakatthakathā, was composed by an anonymous poet who lived in the latter part of the Polonnaru period. The date of the work must fall during the first period of the reign of Queen Līlāvati (1197-1200) who came to the throne by the support of general Kittī. The Queen and her Prime Minister who extended their magnanimous patronage towards the poets are described with great respect in the preliminary verses of the Sasadāvata. The work purports to be a devotional poem of 293 verses in praise of the virtues of the Buddha.

Its main theme is to praise the aspiration for charity of the Bodhisatva, which is included in the past story of the Sasajāṭaka, yet the author has also made an elaborated description of the various virtues of the Buddha in the course of delineating the present story. It is of note, in this respect, that the poem is described as a panegyric of the Buddha¹ in the old sanne (interverbal paraphrase) of the Sasadāvata, probably written soon after the poem.

The Muvadevadāvata is also meant to be a devotional poem² of 164 verses, though in fact there is an excessive amount of secular subjects in it. Scholars are of the view that the work itself belongs to the same period as the Sasadāvata. Godakumbura and Sannasgala hold that the work is anterior to the Sasadāvata,³ yet their hypotheses are not well supported. However, the poem seems to have been most popular among the Sinhalese learned circles. Some verses from the Muvadevdāvata are found quoted in later works like the Elusañdaslakuna⁴ and the Sidatsaṅgarāva⁵ which are assigned to the

-
1. Sasadāvata-purāna-sannaya, ed. A. Dhammapala (Vālitara, 1934), p. 2.
 2. Muvadevdāvata, p. 4.
 3. Godakumbura, op.cit., p. 146 & Siṃhala-Sāhityavamsaya, p. 90; an attempt is made to identify the author of the Muvadevdāvata by Vini Vitarana. See Vidyādaya, Vol. I, No. 1 (Nugegoda, 1968), pp. 58-62.
 4. Elusañdaslakuna, ed. K. Panmananda (Colombo, 1938), p. 7. v. 43.
 5. Sidatsaṅgarāva, ed. R. Dharmarama, p. 31.

Dambadeni period. An ancient Sinhalese verbal paraphrase to the work is also found. Like the Sasadāvata the Muvadevdāvata too followed the Sanskrit kāvya style. Unlike the Sasadāvata however, it focuses only on the past story of the Makhādeva jātaka of which the theme is the praise of asceticism, the third perfection of the Bodhisatva.

Gurulugomi

Gurulugomi, who appears to have had great talent and poetical skill, is regarded as one of the foremost writers during the Polonnaru period. The distinguished glory he earned as an erudite scholar, a great translator and a poet endowed with creative skill was achieved by only a very few other writers in the field of Sinhalese Literature. He is credited with two works, namely the Dharmapradīpikāva, a compendium of Buddhist doctrine, and the Amāvatura, a prose work on the life of the Buddha. The first displays his great erudition and poetical skill while the second mainly shows his unparalleled skill in literary translation. Nothing much is known of Gurulugomi himself or his date, other than the mention of his name in the Sidatsaṅgarāva, Mayūrasandesaya and the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya.¹

1. Sidatsaṅgarāva, ed. R. Tennakon (Colombo, 1959), p. 5.
Mayūrasandesaya, ed. W. Dipankara (Colombo, 1910), v. 160,
 p. 69. (Gurulugāmi).
Nikāyasaṅgrahaya, Govt. ed. (Colombo, 1907), p. 21.
 (Guruludāmi).

In the tradition he is believed to have come over to Ceylon from Kāliṅga in India and his language, which bears certain peculiarities, has been ironically referred to as 'kaliṅgu eluva' (Kaliṅga's Sinhalese);¹ yet this belief is not based on any historical evidence. As we shall deal with his works in detail later on, we need not make any comment here on the matter.

Vidyācakravartī

Vidyācakravartī, the author of the Butsarana, also called the Amrtāvaha, is regarded as a contemporary of Gurulugomi or not far removed from his date.² To him are attributed the authorship of two other works of the same category as the Butsarana, called the Dahamsarana and the Saṅgasarana. Godakumbura is of the opinion that this author is identical with Parākrama Paṇḍita, the author of the Sinhala Thūpavamsaya who bears the title of 'sakala-vidyā-cakravartī.' But the authorship of the last three works is still in conjecture. Many scholars prefer to differentiate the author of the Butsarana from those of the other works, for its peculiarities in language and style, and for the artistic talent it displays in contrast to the other works.³ As in the case of Gurulugomi, nothing is known of the author. The Nikāyasāṅgrahaya says nothing

1. Amāvatura, ed. W. Sorata (Colombo, 1960), Introduction, p. VIII-IX.

2. Sinhalese Literature, p. 5.

3. Butsarana, ed. Sorata, Introduction, pp. IV-V; Sinhala-sāhityaya, 1, pp. 182-189.

of Vidyācakravartī but mentions a certain scholar called Āgamacakravartī.¹ Vidyācakravartī and Āgamacakravartī are generally believed to have been one and the same person.

A perspective on authors and their works

Before concluding this discussion, it is necessary to summarize what we have covered in this chapter. It is evident from our discussion that the Pali authors played a prominent role in the religious and literary fields, and seem to have invaded almost all learned faculties in Ceylon during the period. Since Pali was considered a common language medium for international communication among Theravādī monks in Ceylon, India and South-east Asian countries, Pali studies at that time received much attention in learned circles. It seems to have been given priority in every institution of clerical education. Many scholars at the time, even though their mother tongue was Sinhalese, tried to enrich Pali literature with various interesting works. While some of them attempted to compose creative works, others were engaged in translating Sinhalese works into Pali and writing exegetical works and works on poetics. As a result, a large number of works including creative writings, grammatical works, commentaries, works on poetics, prosody and lexicography were produced in Pali during this period.

1. Nikāyaśaṅgraha, p. 21.

The Ceylonese Pali authors who were well versed in Sanskrit appear to have used their knowledge of Sanskrit for the purpose of improving Pali. They gave a new look to the Pali by adding a considerable number of loan words from Sanskrit, and poetical terms and usages which were shared in common with Sanskrit poetry. Though Sanskrit studies too were practised widely among scholars in Ceylon by this time, the works in Sanskrit produced by them were only a few in number. They do not show any excellence other than devotional and exegetical merits. Among Sanskrit writers the authors of the Anuruddhasataka, Namastāsataka and the Buddhagadya who are believed to have lived in the Polonnaru period¹ deserve special mention, for their contribution to the devotional literature. As is evident from these works the authors seem to be greatly influenced by their counterparts in India.² Like the Indian devotee poets who were affected by the concept of bhakti and wrote many volumes of devotional works in praise of the deities of the Hindu pantheon, these authors appear to have released their fervent devotion towards the Buddha through the form of the śataka. Their works can be introduced as one phase of the influence of the Hindu bhakti cult. Another phase of it becomes clear from Pali works like the Pajjamadhu,

1. Pannasara, op.cit., pp.154, 166, 171.

2. Pannasara sees some relationship between the Buddhagadya and the Gitagovinda of Jayadeva. See Sanskrit Literature, p. 172.

Samantakūṭavannanā, Rasavāhini and Jināṅkārā of which authors had close relations, direct or indirect, with Indian writers, or at least had an acquaintance with Indian bhakti literature. Buddhappiya, the author of the Pajjamadhu, was certainly a native of South India. Vedeha, the author of the Samantakūṭavannanā and the Rasavāhini, was a co-pupil of Buddhappiya, the teacher of both of whom was Ānanda, a dignitary well known in Ceylon as well as in the Cōḷa country. Some relationship between Buddhārakkhita, the author of the Jināṅkārā, and his counterparts in India is evident from the introductory stanzas of the work.¹ Do these works in Pali and Sanskrit reveal collectively some traces of the Indian bhakti concept that migrated to Ceylon from India and did they pave the way to a new type of devotional work in Sinhalese like the Sasadāvata and Butsarana ? It appears that they share some common features of Indian devotional literature. Since these traits will be described in their right place none of them requires detailed mention here. No author nor work can be singled out as a pioneer in these devotional traits to Ceylon. But it is reasonable to conclude that Ceylonese authors of devotional literature, like their counterparts in India, were stirred simultaneously by the waves of the Indian bhakti movements which influenced extensively most countries of South and Southeast Asia during this period.

1. Jināṅkārā, p. 31, v.276.

Of the scholars we have mentioned above, more than one-third were primarily Pali authors; in other words, they were Buddhist monks of the Theravāda school whose main intention was to improve Buddhist learning as found in the Pali scriptures by teaching, preaching and making new contributions to it. Most of them, however, were Ceylonese by birth and so were also supporters of Sinhalese literature. Their contributions to Sinhalese literature, though chiefly exegetical in character, were undoubtedly of great value for the development of literary activities in Sinhalese. They facilitated the understanding of what was contained in the original works and, at the same time, contributed a considerable vocabulary and various sentence patterns to the Sinhalese language. The service rendered by those exegeses to the progress of Sinhalese literature by bringing the language to a higher standard and making it an adequate medium for the creation of a literature is great. As we know, the language of any nation is a most powerful and essential instrument which enables its users to express their cognitive and emotional views and ideas through the literary medium. Exegetical works therefore, as a vital part of language study, cannot be excluded from literary studies. Accordingly, those who produced any kind of exegesis in Sinhalese are worthy of mention as supporters of that literature. But the curious thing here is why they are not specially credited with

even a single poetical work in Sinhalese. Some of them, as their literary works in Pali show, were well-suited for undertaking such a task. For instance, Vedeha, the author of the Samantakūṭavannanā and the Rasavāhinī, who also was reputed to have written the Sadalakunu, a grammar in Sinhalese, was certainly a man of great poetical skill and creative ability. There must have been a considerable number of such poets in Buddhist institutions. Why, then, did they not leave behind any poetical work in Sinhalese? Was there any restriction on monks which prevented them from composing poems in the language of natives, as in the Daṁbadeṇi period? Or were their productions lost in the course of time? Those questions seem to be difficult to answer satisfactorily from our sources.

As we have seen in the first chapter, no restriction was imposed on the Saṅgha so as to prevent them from studying certain subjects during this period. Monks appear to have been permitted to study any subject relevant to intellectual pursuits, including poetry and drama which were forbidden for them later in the Daṁbadeṇi Katikāvata.¹ Otherwise, how did they write those poems and works on poetics in Pali mentioned above? Were they permitted to compose poems only in Pali? Or as suggested by Martin Wickramasingha, did the encouragement which the Sinhalese poets received from the Mahāyānists no longer exist after

1. Katikāvatsaṅgarā, p.15.

the establishment of the supremacy of one nikāya in the Island during the reign of Parākramabāhu the Great? ¹ It is not justifiable to suppose that the Buddhist church or the royalty imposed any sort of language barrier on the monks who were engaged in literary activity. If versification in Sinhalese was considered a violation of ecclesiastical law, how was it justifiable to give permission to do the same in Pali or Sanskrit? On the other hand, even though the Theravādins paid less attention than the Mahāyānists to arts like poetry and drama, they do not seem to have disdained these subjects until they were forbidden by the Dāmbadeni Katikāvata. It is an unmistakable fact that the Theravādins in Ceylon at that time studied poetry and poetics as well. This does not, however, mean that they admired the erotic descriptions found abundantly in Sanskrit poetry, especially in some works of the decadent epoch in India. What they have actually done was to study Sanskrit poetry and poetics well, and sharpen their poetical skill by that new inspiration. At the same time they seem to have substituted the sentiment of tranquillity in place of the erotic which was given priority in many Sanskrit poems. The fact that the monks of the Theravāda school in Ceylon had been engaged in poetical activities widely until the proclamation of the Dāmbadeni Katikāvata is indicated by the evidence that could be gained from the works of Buddhappiya, Vedeha,

1. Martin Wickkramasingha, Simhala-sāhityayē Nāgīma (Colombo, 1945), p. 70.

Buddharakkhita, Dhammakitti and Saṅgharakkhita. Of these authors the first three probably belonged to the early years of Parākramabāhu I, while the others belonged to the last part of the Polonnaru period. It is probable that most learned monks were preoccupied with literary activities in Pali, their favourite subject. Yet there appears to be no reason to conclude that they neglected literary pursuits in Sinhalese, their mother tongue. Perhaps their poetical works in Sinhalese were lost in the course of time or perished at the hands of opponents, internal and external. On the other hand, even today we are not sure who the authors of the Sasadāvata and the Muvadevdāvata were. As is evident from our sources there seem to have existed a considerable number of poetical works which have left behind nothing more than a few verses or some fragments of verses.

The Elusaṅdaslakuna, a work on prosody in Sinhalese ascribed to the Daṁbadeṇi period, furnishes us with some evidence to a number of poetical compositions in Sinhalese.¹ The Sidatsaṅgarāva of Patiraja-piruvana which is also ascribed to the same period provides some indications of the prevalence of other poetical works in Sinhalese.² It is of note that the Elusaṅdaslakuna is the work of a Buddhist monk called Bhadra of whom we know nothing else.

1. Elusaṅdaslakuna, pp. 2-4, 8-20.

2. The examples given for the metre 'Minimal' seem to be quoted from an old Kusajātaka poem other than the Kavsilumina. See Elusaṅdaslakuna, p.10.

It is apparent from these works that there must have been more poetical works written in Sinhalese during the period than those that have survived to the present day; and perhaps, at least some of them were compositions of Buddhist monks.

It is necessary to give our attention, at this stage, to the question: On what basis did our authors select their subject matter? All the works we have discussed here can be classified into two categories: exegetical and creative. Grammars, glossaries, compendia and other works of poetics, prosody and lexicography are included in the first category. All other works, prose and verse, are categorized in the second. Since no drama can be found in our literary history the term creative writing here implies only prose and verse. Though there was another kind of creative writing called 'sapu'¹ (Sk. campu) it is omitted here, because it is only nominal; it is nothing but the combination of prose and verse. Sometimes a compendium like the Dharmapradīpikāva may occupy the place of a piece of creative writing though it is primarily exegetical in character.

It seems to be a characteristic of this period that many authors preferred to compose exegetical works, either on religious and linguistic subjects or otherwise. Some of them who concentrated on religious subjects tried their hand at philosophical problems in the Abhidhamma and wrote

1. Siyabasakara, ed. H. Nanatilaka & H. Nanasiha (Colombo, 1933), ch. 1, v. 13.

compendia of doctrinal matters and otherwise. Others who were interested in linguistic subjects attempted to explain grammatical matters, to reproduce or invent new theories regarding the learning of languages and to make commentaries or glossaries. Only a few gave their attention to poetics, prosody and lexicography. Other writers who were interested in creative writing seem to have preferred to extol the life of the Buddha, present or past or both, or to narrate a story or an important event connected with Buddhist literature.

To select a subject from the religious background was a long standing convention of Ceylonese writers. The Siyabaslakara, the earliest extant work on poetics in Sinhalese, lays down the convention of selecting the Buddha's life as subject matter appropriate for the composition of poems (in verse).¹ This tradition appears to have disciplined almost all poets of the Island for centuries. Just as Hindu tradition directed Indian poets to select subjects from the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyāna, this poetical tradition, inspired by the Buddhist culture, played its part in guiding Ceylonese poets. We see from our sources that Sinhalese poets turned to the Buddhist Jātakas for this purpose, unlike the Pali poets of this period who inclined to select the actual ('present') life of the Buddha. In general, almost all Ceylonese poets appear to have aimed at using the life of the Buddha for

1. Siyabaslakara, ch.1, v.20.

their poems instead of selecting a hero as in the case of many Indian poems where a traditional Hindu character is delineated elaborately. But certainly, this does not mean that none of them sought to make alteration of the aforesaid convention.

Perhaps some of them inclined to choose their subject matter from a worldly background. We found some verses in the Elusaṅdaslakuna, probably quoted from some ancient poems, which seem to be directly dealing with the worldly life.¹ The supposed Miyurusandesa, evidenced by some quotations in the Sidatsaṅgarāva, might also have followed a line different from the convention.² Though we know nothing at all about it, according to the evidence provided by the other sandesa poems, it may be reasonable to infer that this Miyuru-saṅdesa also drew its subject matter from worldly background.

The Mānavulusandesa, the earliest sandesa poem surviving in Ceylon, written in Pali by an anonymous writer who probably lived in the reign of Parākramabāhu I or soon after, does not contain a religious story. It deals partly with worldly matters. It was composed as a reply to the great sage Saṅgharakkhita Kassapa of Arimaddanapura in Burma who had sent a sandesa earlier to Mahānāgasena of

-
1. Elusaṅdaslakuna, pp.2,9,10. Examples of the Umatugi, Yoṇmatvāla and the Kanil. See also Siṃhala-Sāhityaya, II, pp.275-279.
 2. Sidatsaṅgarāva, ed. R.Tennakoon (Colombo,1959), pp.5,7; Also see Vini Vitarana, Purāna-Mayūra-Sandesaya, Sāhityaya (Colombo,1962), 6-1. pp.29-32.

Rambhāvihāra in Rohaṇa, Ceylon, seeking his intimate friendship.¹ This poem, filled with picturesque descriptions of natural beauty and the tranquil atmosphere of the Rambhāvihāra, also provides us with a clue to the interest of some authors in turning to worldly matters. It is of some significance that not everything described even in the aforesaid religious poems concerns religion; a considerable number of verses is concerned with things outside religious matters, drawn from poetic convention — what we call 'kavisamaya.' Thus, in many religious poems some episodes were purposely selected from the main stories with a view to adding certain descriptions, erotic or otherwise.

The purpose of writing as intended by the authors, who produced a considerable number of creative works, is not mentioned clearly either in these works or elsewhere. The Siyabasilakara, which followed the same lines as the Kāvyaḍarśa of Daṇḍin, mentions a fourfold purpose of a mahākāvya (great or long poem) when it deals with that genre.² The term sivvaga-pala, an exact equivalent of (Sk.) 'caturvargaphala'³ occurring in the Kāvyaḍarśa, means four kinds of aims or purpose which are said to

-
1. Manāvulusandesa, (with sanne); ed. M. Nanananda (Colombo, 1925), vv. 52, 56, 57.
 2. Siyabasilakara, ch. 1, v. 21.
 3. Kavyaḍarśa, ed. Jivananda Vidyasagara (Calcutta, 1925), ch. 1, v. 15.

have been followed by poets; they are: dharma (virtue), artha (wealth), kāma (pleasure), and moksa (liberation of the soul). Of these purposes, all except the second seem to be common alike to poet and reader. Mammāṭa, the author of the Kāvya-prakāśa, a Sanskrit work on poetics, pointed out that a poet like Dhavaka was rewarded by a king called Harsa for his literary work; here Mammāṭa was dealing with a sixfold purpose of writing poems (kāvya), at the very beginning of the Kāvya-prakāśa.¹ Of the purposes mentioned by Mammāṭa, the third, fifth and sixth deserve our special attention though they are not traceable directly in any of the works we have so far dealt with. According to the third purpose mentioned in the Kāvya-prakāśa, a literary work gives the reader a knowledge of customs, habits and so forth. The fifth and the sixth correspond respectively to a 'dissociated pleasure' (paranirvṛti), which is regarded as an immediate consequence of a poetical work, and to the aspect of teaching readers like the teaching of a loving mistress to her lover (kāntā-sammita). These two purposes bear witness respectively to the ultimate power of aesthetic enjoyment relished by a connoisseur (sahrdaya) and to the peculiar power of suggestion concerned with a literary creation.

1. Kāvya-prakāśa, ed. R.D.Karmakar (Poona, 1965), I, v. 2.

Whether the Ceylonese writers of the period knew of these purposes introduced by Mammata, still seems a matter for conjecture. But it is interesting to note that Ceylonese poets had known of the rasas (aesthetic sentiments) since the time of the Sīgiri poets.¹

Direct mention of the rasas can be found in the

Sīgiri graffiti, the Siyabaslakara² and the Kavsilumina.³

In this respect, many Pali authors of the Island appear to have employed the terms pasāda and sanvēga⁴ (feelings of ecstasy and self-disparagement). This however, suggests that some creative writers composed their works with a literary purpose in their minds while others wrote for religious and other purposes. Among the creative writings mentioned above, all except the Sulukaliṅgudā of the Dharmapradīpikāva seem to concentrate on both religious and literary purposes, while that episode appears extraordinary in its prose style and the purpose intended as well. Indeed this episode has nothing at all to do with religious merit. Neither the characters nor incidents of this composition bear any special Buddhist religious significance. Its highly elaborated style and poetical imaginations certainly display the literary purpose concentrated on.

1. Sīgiri graffiti, ed. S. Parānavitana (London, 1956), vv. 164, 302, 356, 380.

2. Siyabaslakara, ch. 1, vv. 25, 36, 39-41.

3. Kavsilumina, ed. W. Sorata (Colombo, 1946), ch. 1, v. 2.

4. Mahāvamsa (PTS), ed. Wilhelm Geiger (London, 1908), ch. 1, vv. 3, 4.

Now, it is necessary to consider the problem of whom those authors wrote for. Various categories of readers seem to have been expected by them from both learned and unlearned men, including monks, kings, queens, ministers and others who came from the nobility and the common people. Some of them appear to have been critics well versed in poetics. The Sasadāvata,¹ the Muvadevdāvata² and the Kavsilumina³ speak indirectly of those who might have been connoisseurs. It is clear that such classical poems were not intended for the common reader but for the scholar. We cannot, however, find in either of the earliest two classical poems any direct word to indicate those readers who were intended by the poets. But the Kavsilumina employs the word 'viyat'⁴ which means a scholar to indicate its intended reader. It also speaks of connoisseurs (rasahav-vindunā denetā) who probably were considered competent to criticise the work. But Gurulugomi mentions, in the preliminary passages of the Amāvatura, that he composes the work in Sinhalese for the benefit of the

-
1. Sasadāvata, vv. 5-9.
 2. Muvadevdāvata, vv. 4-5.
 3. Kavsilumina, ch.1, vv.1, 2-4.
 4. Kavsilumina, ch.1, v.4.

less learned people.¹ The term used here is 'noviyat hudījana' the literal meaning of which is 'unlearned men of virtues' or 'less learned intelligent people'. Many Pali writers seem to have used the term 'sādhujana' in this sense.² This term usually implies some relationship with religious teaching. The Amāvatura and other works of this sort, in which the life of the Buddha and his doctrinal matters are described, were composed mainly for the benefit of devotees. But this certainly does not mean that they were confined to the devotees only. They were clearly open to any reader who had a cultured mind and good taste. If we distinguish the term 'sādhujana' from its religious connotation we will be able to see some similarity in meaning between 'sādhujana', 'hudījana' and the familiar term 'sahrdaya'.

1. Amāvatura, p.1.

2. 'Sādhujanamanopasādatthāya kate thūpavamse'
Thūpavamsa, p.81.

Chapter III

The Devotional Literature

(a) Bhakti cult

It is necessary to elucidate some problems concerning the bhakti cult which influenced the later devotional literature extensively, before we deal with the subject directly. The word bhakti, employed in religious literature, connotes devotion or love towards God or a religious leader, though it has the original meaning of secular love and affection. The verbal root of the term bhakti in Sanskrit is bhaj, which can be conjugated in both ātmanepada and parasmaipada; it means to deal out, apportion, divide, share and allot to. As Mariasuai Dhavamony elucidates it, the concept of love includes many aspects, dealing with the varied manifestations of love, such as (1) possession and enjoyment, (2) preference and choice, (3) esteem and honour, (4) attachment and affection, (5) loyalty and devotion.¹

Though the word bhakti is considered a common religious technical term used to express the devotion or the love fixed upon a god or a religious leader, as far as religious history is concerned, its special connotation

1. Mariasuai Dhavamony, Love of God, According to Saiva Siddhānta (London, 1971), p. 13.

can be found first in the Bhāgavata religion. 'Bhāgavat' and 'Bhāgavata', kindred words with bhakti, are also derived from the same root bhaj. While the first denotes the Lord or the Adorable One, the latter means a person who worships him. It is of note that the word bhagavā (P.), the corresponding Sanskrit of which is 'bhagavat', can often be found in the Pali canon as an epithet of the Buddha. But its definition as explained by the commentators seems to have differed from the Sanskrit form, concerned with the Bhāgavata cult.¹ Nevertheless, no one can gainsay the similarity between those words, bhaj being the verbal root. Gurulugomi, the author of the Dharmapradīpikāva, a Sinhalese classical prose work, describes a sixfold meaning of bhagavā, derived from the root. There is nothing new here, but the repetition of the tradition of Pali commentators.² It must be emphasized in this respect, that the word bhāgavata is not employed anywhere in Buddhist literature in order to signify the worshippers of the Buddha. Now it is obvious that the term bhakti as its etymological meaning itself implies connotes the love or the devotional faith towards the Bhagavat as a means of salvation from the circle of rebirth. It was considered the only way of mystical

1. Visuddhimagga, ed. Buddhadatta (Alutgama, 1914), pp. 157-159.

2. Dharmapradīpikāva, ed. Dharmarama (Colombo, 1951), pp. 28-29.

realization and communion with God. As Grierson has described, the bhaktimārga (bhakti path) is introduced in opposition to the karmamārga (works path) and the jñānamārga (knowledge path).¹

In the Bhāgavata religion, faith (śraddhā), worship, sacrifice and meditation are considered inferior to bhakti. For instance, according to the concept of bhakti, faith (śraddhā) is described as merely a subsidiary preliminary to bhakti. It forms only a part of all godward relations.² Being superior to Karma (action) jñāna and yoga (knowledge and meditation), bhakti forms the principal element in religion. Its formal effect is to make one abide steadily in God. Though jñāna may produce bhakti, the latter differs from the former. In the opinion of Sāṅdilya, bhakti is the terminus. It is impossible to know by bhakti but only to recognize, and recognition implies previous knowledge.³

Some interpretations regarding the concept of bhakti made by scholars in this field may be helpful in understanding the problem, which is still a subject of controversy. One of the most controversial definitions,

-
1. G.A.Grierson, Bhakti Mārga, Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. J.Hastings (Edinburgh,1909), Vol.II, p.539. Nārada Bhaktisūtra says that bhakti is higher than action and knowledge. See The Bhakti Sūtras of Nārada, Translated by Nandalal Sinha (Allahabad,1911), No. 25, p.12.
 2. The One Hundred Aphorisms of Sāṅdilya, Translated by Manmath Paul (Allahabad,1911), No. 24, p. 22.
 3. Ibid., No. 33.

is the theory of Guntert for whom bhakti is merely libido raised to the higher state of Amor Dei. The author of the Love of god regards this as a mistaken theory and concludes that the only source of bhakti is not sexual desire.¹ Bhakti according to Betty Heimann does not mean devotion offered to a single god, but reciprocal participation, its verbal root being bhaj which means to share, to participate. Moreover, she declares that it is a later expression for the earlier sacrificial partnership between God and man, which again is based on the natural law of cause and effect, on the supposition that bhakti has no personal connotation.² The views of R.G. Bhandarkar on this term seem to be simple and vivid though they are disciplined by the normal Hindu tradition. Bhakti, as he believes, is an equivalent of the term priya or preyas in the Upanisad period, and implies the love for the Ātman or the supreme soul. Further he indicates that the word bhakti is not always used in the sense of love even by Rāmānuja, to whom it was constant meditation corresponding to the Upāsana of the Upanisad.³

The comments concerning the word bhakti mentioned briefly above, need no further discussion. There is one

1. Love of God, p.21.

2. Betty Heimann, Indian and Western Philosophy, (London, 1937), p.73 ff.

3. R.G. Bhandarkar, Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism and Minor Religious Systems, (Bombay, 1913), p.29.

thing to be stressed. The English term 'love' by which bhakti is translated is not sufficient to express its specific connotation. It is not desirable to ascribe an erotic connotation to that word when it is used in a religious context. The god-ward love or devotion is absolutely pure and free from lust and hatred.¹ But in the Vaiṣṇava sectarian literature, there can be found some sort of poeticised mystical eroticism, especially connected with the Kṛṣṇa-gopī legend which came to play an important part in medieval religious works. As S.K.De states, the earthly moment of the eternal divine sport of Kṛṣṇa is an interpretation in terms of symbol and allegory.²

The first occurrence in Brahmanic literature of the term bhakti in its religious technical sense is believed to be in the Svetasvatara Upaniṣad which pours its loving adoration to Rudra-Siva. The Svetasvatara is considered to have stood at the door of the bhakti school and it declares that its entire teaching will become manifest only to him who has the highest love for God and for the guru.³

-
1. One Hundred Aphorisms of Sāṅdilya, pp. 35-36. Nārada Bhaktisūtra, p.3.
 2. S.K.De, Early History of Vaiṣṇava Faith and Movements in Bengal (Calcutta, 1942), p.4.
 3. Love of God, p.67. See also Sanskrit English Dictionary, Monier Williams (Oxford, 1899), p.743.

To the great-souled man who has loyal and great love (bhakti) for (his) God, who loves his spiritual master even as his God, the matter of this discourse will shine with clearest light, - With clearest light will shine.¹

It is obvious that in this context the term bhakti means godward love.

According to Grierson, the term bhakti in the sense of love directed to God, which is also found quoted in one of rules (IV.III.95) by the great Sanskrit grammarian Pāṇinī, appears first in "a Buddhist work of the fourth century B.C."² Bhandarkar points out that this term is used in the same sense by Yāska too.³ However, it is fully established as a religious technical term in the older parts of the Bhagavad-gītā in which bhaj is never used to mean secular love, sexual or asexual, while the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyana often employed it in the sense of both secular and religious love.⁴

-
1. Svetāsvatara Upanisad, ed. Siddhesvar Varma Shastri (Allahabad, 1916), VI-23, p.119.
 2. Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, p.539. We are not sure that whether he is speaking of the Jātakamālā of Āryasūra. If so, his dating seems not correct.
 3. Vaisnavism, Saivism and Minor Religious Systems, p.29.
 4. Bhagavadgītā, ed. The Pandits of Adyar Library (Adyar, 1941), ch.4, v.3; ch.7, vv.26-27; Mahābhārata, ed. V.S. Sukthankar (Poona, 1942), 1.92.7; 3.221.28; B.3.31.4; B.3.231.57; Rāmāyana, ed. G.C. Jhala (Baroda, 1966), 5.47.4. The author of the Love of God has made a commendable attempt to distinguish various connotations of this term, See op.cit., pp.32-42 ff.

Apart from the great epics and the Bhagavadgītā it occurs in the same religious sense in the Jātaka-mālā of Āryasūra,¹ a Buddhist work ascribed to the fourth century A.D.²

The term bhatti (P.) derived from bhakti can rarely be found in Pali treatises, ascribed to early times. It also appears to have been confined to the meaning of the verbal root bhāj. No special connotation, such as god-ward love, occurs in those contexts. The Pali English Dictionary refers to the Puggalapaññatti,³ the Dhammasaṅgani and the Jātakagāthā where the term is found used in the meanings of devotion, attachment and fondness respectively. In another context of the Jātakagāthā the term is said to have been employed in the sense of affection (sneha).³ But the term appears to be used in the early parts of the canon such as Āṅguttara and Majjhima Nikāyas to mean devotion and allegiance.⁴ According to the commentary on Puggalapaññatti it is an equivalent of the term saddhā.⁵ Since the word

-
1. Jātakamālā, ed. Max Müller, translated by J.S. Speyer, (London, 1895), No. XXIII, p.211.
 2. A History of Sanskrit Literature, p.68.
 3. Pali English Dictionary (PTS), ed. T.W. Rhys Davids and William Stede (London, 1925) p.121.
 4. Āṅguttaranikāya (PTS), ed. E. Hardy (London, 1896), III, p.165. Majjhimanikāya (PTS), ed. Robert Chalmers. (London, 1951), III, p.23.
 5. 'punappunanbhajanavasena saddhā'va bhatti' (Faith is devotion in the sense of continuous adoration). Puggalapaññatti-Atthakathā, ed. G. Landsberg and C.A.F. Rhys Davids, (JPTS.) (London, 1913-1914), p.248.

saddhā is found used synonymously with bhatti and pema in some canonical works it may well need some further explanation. In the Nikāyas, the term saddhā does not always bear the same meaning as its Sanskrit form śraddhā which is translated by the English word 'faith'. It has been pointed out that by using the word 'faith' for śraddhā in translating, one restricts one self to its meaning of confidence, trust and belief.¹ There seems to be a considerable divergence of opinion among scholars on the attitude and value of saddhā in the Pali canon. As Dasgupta has shown, śraddhā in Vedic texts simply implies confidence, trust or belief based on knowledge. According to him the term has never been used even in the later literature in the sense of bhakti.² In Śāṅḍilya śraddhā is described as a mere faith that plays only a little part in godward love, and also differs from bhakti.³

The term saddhā in the Pali canon, as pointed out by Jayatilaka, is such that the meanings of bhatti, pema and pasāda (devotion, filial and mental appreciation) overlap with it.⁴ Saddhā appears to be closest in meaning to pasāda in the Nikāyas where we can find the latter in place

-
1. Gyomroi Ludowyk, The Valuation of Saddhā in the Early Buddhist Texts, University of Ceylon Review, Vol.V, p.49.
 2. Dasgupta, Śraddha and Bhakti in Vedic Literature, Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol.VI, p.332.
 3. One Hundred Aphorisms of Śāṅḍilya, No.14, p.22.
 4. K.N.Jayatilaka, Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge (London, 1963), p.385.

of saddhā. 'yato yato imassa dhammapariyāssa paññāya attham upaparikkheyya, labhetha eva attamanatam labhetha cetaso pasādam', i.e., in as much as he examines with his intellect the meaning of this doctrinal passage he obtains satisfaction and a mental appreciation.¹ This short passage reveals the close relationship between saddhā and pasāda. It is of note that the real mental appreciation (pasāda) and faith (saddhā) springs from understanding. In Buddhism, as Rahula has showed, emphasis is laid on seeing, knowing and understanding, not on blind faith.²

There can also be found employed in the Nikāyas another term, aveccappasāda in the sense of deep faith which described as acala-saddhā (unshaken faith). In this usage avecca (ava + i = to go) means 'understanding'. Thus aveccappasāda defines the faith born out of understanding. Gyomroi Ludowyk holds that pasāda, which is different from faith as understood in western religions, implies a mental attitude which unites deep feeling, intellectual appreciation and satisfaction, clarification of thought and attraction towards the teacher.³ Whatever may be the difference

1. Majjhimanikāya (PTS) (London, 1935), I, p.114.

2. Walpola Rahula, What the Buddha Taught (Gordon Fraser, 1959), p.8.

3. Gyomroi Ludowyk, Note on the Interpretation of Pasādati, UCR, I, p.82.

between the views so far dealt with, one thing is clear, that pasāda is identical with saddhā, and this sheds some light on the understanding of the fundamental nature of the latter term. It is said that saddhā in Pali Buddhism carries three distinct aspects, namely affective, conative and cognitive.¹ But, to Dutt it carries two distinct meanings, (i) one is faith(pasāda) producing pīti (serene pleasure), (ii) the other is self-confidence producing virīya (energy).² Referring to this latter division, Jayatilaka has pointed out that Dutt is speaking of the affective and conative aspects of saddhā respectively, not of two different uses of the word altogether. Further, he has mentioned that both in the Milindapañha and the Atthasālinī, saddhā is said to have the characteristics of appreciation (sampasādana-lakkhana) and endeavour (sampakkhandana-lakkhana). The first (sampasādana-lakkhana), according to him represents the affective characteristic of faith while it corresponds to what was denoted by pasāda, bhatti and pema in the Nikāyas. Sampakkhandana represents the second aspect. The third aspect (cognitive) of saddhā consists of the characteristic of trust and the proximate state of belief (inclination)

1. Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge, p.387.

2. N. Dutt, Place of Faith in Buddhism, Indian Historical Quarterly, XVI, p.638.

(okappana-lakkhanā saddhā adhimutti-paccupatthānā).¹

In the light of the foregoing discussion, we may be permitted to conclude that the concept of saddhā in Buddhism carries its own connotation which is different from its equivalent Sanskrit term in non-Buddhistic works, and that the bhakti in the Nikāyas, which is not in agreement with the meaning of bhakti in the Bhāgavata cult, implies an idea consonant with saddhā. And it also shares the same affective aspect of faith.

In this respect it seems necessary to observe the place saddhā occupies in the role of salvation. As we have seen earlier, in the Bhāgavata religion bhakti is considered the means of salvation. But in Buddhism (Theravāda) saddhā is not regarded as a path leading to Nibbāna. If saddhā had been regarded as essential to the attaining of Nibbāna it would have found its place in the noble eight-fold path. According to the Ābhidhammikas' division, it has been given a place in the process of

1. Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge, pp.387-388.

Walpola Rahula describes three other aspects of śraddhā as expounded by Asaṅga, the great Mahāyāna Buddhist philosopher of the fourth century A.D. According to him they are: (1) full and firm conviction that a thing is (2) serene joy at good qualities and (3) aspiration or wish to achieve an object in view. See What the Buddha Taught, p.8.

the thirty seven bōdhipakkhiyadhammas (qualities or items constituting or contributing to wisdom).¹ Though it is described in some suttas as a means by which one may cross the oghas (flood of defilements); in any case, excessive faith is never praised in Buddhism. It is said that a monk called Vakkali who was the highest of those who had faith was requested not to attach himself to the person of the Buddha but to concentrate on the Dhamma. His excessive faith towards the Buddha was considered a hindrance to salvation.²

However, saddhā, as Dutt has shown, is particularly important for the laity who are interested in the Buddhist way of life.³ The house-holders who are engaged in their family life should practice dāna (charity) and sīla (morality) as a first step; later on they are advised to develop saddhā (faith) and paññā (wisdom).⁴ By saddhā was meant the cultivation of faith in Buddha, Dhamma and Sangha, by paññā

1. Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha with saṃne, p.185.

Jayatilaka furnishes a number of lists of virtues or requirements for salvation, in which saddhā occurs as the first member, while paññā is almost always the last. See Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge, pp.396-397.

2. Samyuttanikāya (PTS), ed. M. Leon Feer (London, 1890), III, pp.119 ff.

3. N. Dutt, Place of Faith in Buddhism, IHQ, -Vol. XVI, p.640.

4. Anguttaranikāya (PTS), ed. E. Hardy (London, 1899), IV, p.271.

the comprehension of the four truths. Thus the latter (paññā) plays the prominent role in the way of attaining of Nibbāna while the first provides energy and determination. But in the Bhāgavata religion parā-bhakti or the highest devotion is taught as an essential requirement for salvation from the circle of rebirth.¹ Now it is clear that there is no similarity in attitude or evaluation between saddhā in Buddhism and bhakti in the Bhāgavata cult. As we have seen in the above discussion, though the term bhatti is found as an equivalent of the term saddhā in the Buddhist canon, it does not bear any relationship to the meaning of the term bhakti in the Bhāgavata cult. But later on the term seems to be influenced by the concept of bhakti. As Gyomroi Ludowyk has pointed out, some evidence of this influence may emerge from the later Pali works, especially those written in medieval times.² In the Rasavāhini compiled by Vedeha the term bhatti has been

1. One Hundred Aphorisms of Śāṅgilya, p.4.

2. Gyomroi Ludowyk, The Valuation of Saddhā in the Early Buddhist Texts, UCR. V, p.48.

employed in the sense of religious devotional faith.¹ Here the context in which the term is used denotes a closer relationship to the bhakti concept than to the Buddhist concept of saddhā in the Pali canon. It shows that, as time went on, the bhakti cult paved the way for a new and higher form of devotional faith towards the Buddha in place of saddhā occurring in the Nikāyas. It is necessary to add that this term is used in some medieval Sinhalese works also, in the same religious sense as in the Rasavāhini. In the Butsarana of Vidyācakravartī the term bhakti is found in the meaning of faith towards the Buddha while in the Dahamsarana it occurs in both meanings, religious devotion and secular allegiance.² All this suggests that to the old term bhatti, an equivalent of saddhā, has been attributed a special connotation approximate in value and attitude to bhakti in the Bhāgavata cult by later Buddhist writers.

1. Rasavāhini, ed. B. Saranātissa, (Colombo, 1928), p. 47.

The work, in one of its narrations laying stress on the spiritual efficacy of the Buddha says:

'buddho'ti vacanaṃ seṭṭhaṃ - amanussānaṃ bhayāvahaṃ
buddhabhattikajantūnaṃ - sabbadā mudavāhanaṃ.'

cf. issarabhattika, Op.cit., p. 50.

2. Butsarana, ed. W. Sorata, pp. 74, 104, 120.

Dahamsarana, ed. K. Dhammananda (Colombo, 1929), pp. 24, 4.

(b) A note on the historical development of devotional literature.

As we have already seen, the earliest literary antecedents of Sanskrit devotional poems and hymns can be found in the Rgveda. They consist of hymns of praise and prayer centring round some specific god or gods, most of whom were merely deified phenomena of nature. In the post-vedic Indian devotional literature, the stotras which revived the old devotional spirit with a new outlook and trend, seem to have played a prominent part. They attracted the minds of many devotee poets and scholars of Hindu, Buddhist, Jaina and various other religious sects. Within a few centuries a large number of volumes most of which are still not studied thoroughly occupied the field. Although not all of them can be considered works of high literary merit, they certainly form an important link in the chain of devotional literature.

Among Hindu spiritual literature some Purānas like Viṣṇu, Brahmānda, Mārkaṇḍeya, Padma, Skanda, and Bhāgavata are regarded as store-houses of remarkable stotras. S.K.De has described how the Tantras like the Prapañcasāra, Rudrayāmala, Viśvasāra, Sāradātilaka, Mahānirvāna, Tantrasāra and later apocryphal sectarian Upaniṣads like

Nārāyaṇa, Kaivalya and Gopālatāpanī contain some good specimens of classical stotras.¹ Some of these works are mere theological collections of sacred epithets or strings of a hundred or thousand sacred names, while others present eulogies of some localized deities and sacred rivers, with great devotional inspiration.

The history of Buddhist eulogies and stotras goes back as far as the great Buddhist poet Asvaghosa who is believed to have flourished in the second century A.D.² He himself and his successor called Mātṛceṭa have written a good number of devotional poems with high literary value. Of Asvaghosa's compositions the Buddhacarita, the Saundarananda and the Gandistotra are well known. The Buddhacarita, as the title itself denotes, describes the whole life of the Buddha in verses. In a considerable number of episodes deliberately elaborated according to the kāvya style, but full of literary merit, the Buddha and his doctrine were extolled. The author's deep devotional feelings towards the Buddha are reflected in these descriptions. The Saundarananda which relates the famous love story of Nanda and Sundarī gives much

1. S.K.De, Aspects of Sanskrit Literature, (Calcutta, 1959), p.103.

2. M. Winternitz, History of Indian Literature, Vol.II (Calcutta, 1933), p.257.

space to devotional descriptions in its latter half. The eulogy ascribed to Nanda who attained arhantship by the advice of the Buddha is a specimen of early Buddhist devotional poetry and is certainly enriched with poetical value as well as true devotional faith.¹

Though both works are based on religious stories they are not classified as real devotional poems, for the whole scope of the works is not devoted to the devotional purpose. The Gandistotra, the final one, was composed for that purpose. It is a hymn in praise of gandi, the Buddhist monastery gong. The theme of the poem is the religious message which its sound is supposed to carry to the hearts of men when beaten with a short wooden club. However, the work, a small poem with twenty stanzas mostly in 'sragdharā' metre, displays great metrical skill and attests the author's comprehension of the power of music.² Though it is not marked by much poetical skill, as an early Sanskrit 'stotra', it deserves special mention.

Mātrceta has ascribed to him some twelve works preserved in Tibetan and one in Chinese. Most of these are in the nature of 'stotras'. In Sanskrit two fragments

1. Saundarananda, ed. E.H. Johnston, (London, 1928), ch. XVII, vv. 63-73.

2. A.B. Keith, A History of Sanskrit Literature. (London, 1941), p. 56.

of his stotras have been recovered and these works appear to be simple devotional poems in sloka metre, of little literary merit. The Sūryasataka of Mayūra and Candīsataka of Bāna are also regarded as devotional poems, although they are given the name of sataka which means a poem with a hundred verses. The theme of the Sūryasataka consists of an extravagant description and praise of the sun god. While Candī's mythical slaying of the Buffalo-demon which is mentioned in the Mahābhārata¹ is the subject matter of the Candīsataka, Bāna makes use of it not for relating a story but for a high-flown panegyric of Candī.

A well-known Jaina poet called Mānatunga is said to have written two stotras, namely the Bhaktāmara in Sanskrit and the Bhayahara in Prakrit. The Bhaktāmara is a hymn of forty-four stanzas in the Vasanta-tilakā metre in praise of Jaina Rṣabha. Unlike the satakas of both Mayūra and Bāna, it is set forth as a proper hymn, addressed directly to the saint himself. It also does not apply the 'āsir' form, a distinctive feature of satakas, which is usually employed to invoke blessings on the devotee. Even though

1. As related in the Mahābhārata, Skanda slew the demon Mahiṣa.

See Mahābhārata, ed. V.S.Sukthankar, (Poona, 1942), Pt. II, 3.229-231.

See also The Candī-sataka of Bāna, ed. G.P.Quackenbos, (New York, 1917), Introduction, pp.247 ff.

the author set aside the elaborate kāvya style, especially rhetorical devices, punning and alliteration, his unmistakable devotional feeling is reflected in almost every verse. In one verse he confesses the inadequacy of his own scholarly knowledge to compose an eulogy though the devotional feeling itself forced him to undertake such a task.¹

To the king poet Harṣavardhana himself are ascribed some Buddhist stotras. Of these the Suprabhāta-stotra in Sanskrit is a morning hymn of twenty-four stanzas addressed to the Buddha. The hymn however, is not of much literary value but only a string of eulogistic epithets with the refrain: "daśabala tava nityam - suprabhātam prabhātam."

It is said that the stotra established itself as a distinct form of literature by the seventh century, and with the rise of medieval sects and cults, the number of stotras naturally multiplied and became the basis of the living faith of the people.² Religious hymnology was a wide, congenial and fruitful field in which the Indian mind at every period of literary history was active vigorously. The impetus of speculative thought, scholastic learning and the different religious tendencies of the medieval

1. 'alpaśṛtam śṛtavatām parihāsadhāma
tvadbhaktireva mukharī kurute balān mām.

See Aspects of Sanskrit Literature, p.109.

2. Aspects of Sanskrit Literature, p.110.

age must have imparted a variety of theme, content, form and expression to the Sanskrit hymns. A large number of Vedāntic stotras many of which are ascribed to the great Sankara himself, the Kashmirian Saivite poems, the Jaina and Buddhist Mahāyāna hymns, the South Indian Vaiṣṇava and Saivite panegyrics and the Bengal Tantric and Vaiṣṇava eulogies display the religious inspiration which affected the subject.

S.K.De has pointed out that the later history of stotra literature presents two lines of development which sometimes blend but which stand in no constant relation.¹ According to him, the first is a continuation of the earlier tradition of a descriptive eulogistic character which has sometimes taken the form of Pañcaka, Aṣṭaka, Daśaka or even Sataka. The other line shows the steady development of a highly emotional type of stotra, which evolved a new literary form for direct popular appeal by allying itself with song, dance and music, and very often passed through the whole gamut of sensuous and erotic motif, imagery and expression. While the one became more and more imbued with scholastic learning or speculative thought, the other was shaped and coloured by fervent religious emotion. On the one hand, the intellectual satisfaction and moral earnestness inspired the high-toned traditional stotras, and on

1. Aspects of Sanskrit Literature, p.114.

the other hand a mood of erotic mysticism which was popular with the rise of medieval sects and propagation of emotional bhakti movements provided the basic inspiration of the later type of devotional writings. These writings, which purport to express intense religious longings in the intimate language and imagery of earthly passion, gave birth to a new development in Sanskrit religious poetry. Though this wing belongs mainly to a religious sect its relation with erotic poems is very close.

In a work like the Gītāgovinda of Jayadeva which contains both religious and erotic traits, the mighty sex impulse is transfigured into a deep religious emotion. In it Kṛṣṇa, the divine incarnation, is worshipped in fervent devotion and at the same time his bodily relation with the gopīs (cowherdresses) is described emotionally. The theme of the Gītāgovinda is Govinda's love for Rādhā, his beloved. The cowherd god Kṛṣṇa who is also called Govinda is extolled in the poem. It describes how Rādhā keeps herself aloof from him on account of jealousy, the consequent yearning of the loving pair, the efforts of Rādhā's intimate friend and confidante to bring the lovers together, their hopes and disappointments and ultimate reconciliation and union. The poem which has cleverly

blended Rādhā's love for Kṛṣṇa with the author's own fervent devotion to lord Kṛṣṇa, according to some critics, has mystical significance.¹ Rādhā, from their point of view, stands for the human soul and Kṛṣṇa for God.² The love of Rādhā is the love of the human soul for God. The whole eroticism of the poem is considered merely a part of bhakti to the god Kṛṣṇa.³ Jayadeva in his poem seems to have represented his mystic experience through the symbolism of earthly love.⁴

In the hands of erotico-religious emotionalists like Jayadeva, devotional poetry, which was remote from the orthodox tradition, elevated its hymnology and poetry from dry dogmatism and scholastic thought to a picturesque and luscious spiritualisation of sensuous words and ideas.

Devotional poetry, whether speculative or emotional, was an essential feature of literature in every period of

-
1. A.B.Keith, A History of Sanskrit Literature, p.194;
S.N.Dasgupta & S.K.De, History of Sanskrit Literature (Calcutta, 1962), Vol.I, pp.392-393;
M.Krishnamachariar, History of Classical Sanskrit Literature (Delhi, 1970), p.341.
 2. M.Krishnamachariar, History of Classical Sanskrit Literature (Delhi, 1970), p.341.
 3. Such an interpretation may be supported by Jayadeva's own words. See Gitagovinda, ed. V.M.Kulkarni (Ahmadabad, 1965), ch. 1, v.3, ch.7, v.12.
 4. A History of Sanskrit Literature, p.194.

literary history. Though its original source can be traced to the Vedic age its development began in the second century A.D., or so. With the rise of medieval sects and cults, especially the bhakti cult, it seems to have been faced with a sudden change which affected the field in various ways. On the one hand, it became enriched in quantity as well as in poetical merit and became diverse in form, content, pattern and expression, while on the other hand, it expanded in many areas and influenced various religious sects and cults including non-theistic religions like Buddhism and Jainism.

Some Buddhist poets of the Mahāyāna school, who were interested in devotional worship rather than the practical aspects of Buddhism, seem to have made a priceless contribution to the Buddhist hymnology. A work like the Svayambhūpurāna, the Mahātmya of Nepal in which the Buddha was transformed into god in a theistic sense, is a good specimen of Mahāyāna Buddhist devotional literature, which reveals the direct influence of Vaisnavite Mahātmyas.¹ Likewise the Sragdharāstotra of Sarvajñamitra, the Kalyānapañcavimsatikā of Amṛtananda, the Lokesvaraśataka of Vajramitra and the Sapta-Buddha-stotra of an unknown poet display the influence of Vaisnava and Śaiva hymnology.² It has been said that

1. G.K.Nariman, Literary History of Sanskrit Buddhism (Bombay, 1920), p.110.

2. Winternitz, op.cit., Vol.II.pp.377-378.

the Buddhist hymns are in no way differentiated from those which are devoted to the veneration of Viṣṇu and Śiva.¹ In fact the difference between Buddhist hymns and those which are dedicated to Viṣṇu or Śiva, as pointed out by Winternitz and De, lies in the object of adoration.² According to De, Buddhist hymns are true to the manner and diction of Hindu stotras. The Āryatārā-sragdharāstotra of Sarvajñamitra (8th century), the Lokesvarasataka of Vajramitra (9th century) and the Bhaktisataka of Rāmacandrakavibhāratī (15th century)³ are adduced in support of his argument. The first two of these belong to the theistic school of Mahāyāna⁴ while the latter belongs to the Theravāda. Being a fervent Buddhist, Rāmacandrakavibhāratī composed his hymn within the framework of Theravāda Buddhism. No special comment on his kāvya style and model is needed, for these features are shared in common with the early Buddhist and Hindu hymns. The fact which must be stressed regarding the

1. Nariman, op.cit., p.110.

2. Winternitz, op.cit., II, p.377.

De, op.cit., pp. 116-117.

3. M.Winternitz and S.K.De ascribe the Bhaktisataka to the 13th century. It is obvious that Rāmacandrakavibhāratī, a student of Sri Rāhula, lived in the reign of king Parākramabāhu VI.

See A History of Indian Literature, p.379.

Aspects of Sanskrit Literature, p.117.

4. A History of Sanskrit Literature, p.215.

Bhaktisataka is the application of the Hindu bhakti concept to an extravagant eulogy of the Buddha. In the words of Winternitz, the Bhaktisataka affords an example of how the Brahmanical Indian idea of bhakti or the love of god was transferred to the Buddha.¹

It is not necessary to argue whether the Buddhist poets imitated the Hindu stotras and hymns when they composed the aforesaid works or vice versa, for on the one hand, the earliest Sanskrit stotras within our reach emerged from the distinguished Buddhist poet, Asvaghosa, and on the other hand the original of Sanskrit stotras and hymns could be found in Rgveda and the earliest Purānas. It is reasonable to surmise that the bhakti concept affected indiscriminately the later stotras and hymns whether they were Hindu, Buddhist or Jaina. The influence of this bhakti concept brought about far-reaching effects in the religious and cultural fields of the various sectarian and racial groups in India and its related countries. It spread among Theravādins in Ceylon through Sanskrit education which was closely connected with Mahāyanism, while the constant relations with Hindus furnished it with a suitable environment. Though the effects of Mahāyāna were considered¹ a deviation from the original principles of Buddhism as

1. History of Indian Literature, p.379.

2. Nikāyasāṅgrahaya, pp.10-17 ff.

represented by the orthodox tradition, it was however impossible to prevent their penetration into the heart of contemporary society. That influence must also have received substantial backing from the Cōla invasion which forcibly established the image of Hinduism in Ceylon. As is known, many temples were built to Hindu deities, offerings and rituals were held, and hymns composed in the names of Hindu deities were recited daily in the temples. All these features are in one way or another included in the bhakti-mārga or the path of devotion. We agree with Sannasgala when he rightly concluded that the adoration or the love of god introduced by Hindus was transferred to the Buddha by Buddhist devotees. He has pointed out that not only did Hindu architecture itself influence the huge Buddhist temples built in Polonnaruva but also that some traits of Hindu rituals were assimilated by Buddhist religious ceremonies.¹ Thus one aspect of culture, art, reveals the influence of Hindu devotional faith while the other, the most prominent one - that is to say, literature - also displays the fervent enthusiasm of authors towards the eulogizing of the Buddha.

1. P.B.Sannasgala, Siṃhala-Sāhitya-vamsaya (Colombo, 1961), p.90.

Some evidence which shows that the authors were inspired by the Sanskrit stotras and hymns can be traced in many literary works in Sanskrit, Pali and Sinhalese during the Polonnaru period. Of these works the Anuruddha-sataka and the Nāmāstāsataka, the Pajjamadhu and the Jinālakāra, the Sasadāvata and the Butsarana are the most interesting literary sources which reflect the influence of the concept of bhakti.

(c) Some aspects of Ceylonese devotional works:

Before elucidating the elementary characteristics of Ceylonese devotional works, it is necessary to deal with some aphorisms promulgated by Śāṇḍilya and Nārada,¹ which seem to be of much influence on subsequent devotional works. According to Śāṇḍilya, the marks of devotion to God can be known from the acts of well known devotees and the fullness of their expression showing features such as: honour (sammāna), excess of honour (bahumāna), delight (prīti), grief of separation from the Lord (viraha), aversion to everything else (itaravicikitsā), singing his glory (mahimākhyāti), preservation of life for his sake only (tadarthaprānasthāna), sense of belonging to him only (tadiyatā), the idea that he is the all (sarvatadbhāva) and absence of enmity (apratikūlya).² Nārada, who summarizes some concepts of other teachers of the same cult regarding this matter, thinks that devotion is indicated by the condition of having dedicated all observances whatsoever to him and by the feeling of extreme uneasiness (paramavyākulatā)

-
1. The exact date of Śāṇḍilya and Nārada Bhaktisutras is not known. However, Śāṇḍilya is believed to have been an authority on the Pañcaratra both in Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja. See A History of Sanskrit Literature, p.480. See also History of Indian Literature, Vol.III, part II, (Delhi,1967) p.498.
 2. The One Hundred aphorisms of Śāṇḍilya, (with commentary of Svapneśvara), translated, Manmath Paul (Allahabad,1911). pp.33-34.

in losing him from memory. According to the disciples of Parāśara, as Nārada mentions, ardour in his worship and like performances (pujādiṣvanurāga) is the mark of devotion, while Garga holds that it is known from indulgence in talk of his glory.¹ These are regarded as the various means by which the profound devotional feeling becomes clear. Collectively, it implies that the devotee must inevitably be single-hearted towards god and indifferent to all that is antagonistic to him. The devotion, though one in kind, is said to have appeared in eleven forms according as it takes the course of attachment to the attributes and greatness of God (guṇamahātmyāsakti), attachment to his beauty (rūpāsakti), attachment to his worship (pūjāsakti), attachment to his memory (smaraṇāsakti), attachment to his service (dāsyāsakti), attachment to his friendship (śakhyāsakti), attachment to parental affection towards him (vātsalyāsakti), attachment to him (as) to a beloved wife (kāntāsakti), attachment to self-consecration (ātmanivedanāsakti), *attachment to self-absorption* (tanmayāsakti), and attachment to permanent self-effacement (paramavirahāsakti).²

These aspects of devotion are not common to all religions, especially nontheistic religions like Buddhism

-
1. Bhaktisūtras of Nārada, translated, Nandalal Sinha (Allahabad, 1911), pp. 8-9.
 2. Ibid., p. 30.

and Jainism where emphasis is laid on discipline and wisdom. In Buddhism, though there are some teachings concerning trust, faith and regard towards the religious leader and his doctrine, they are deemed of secondary value. As we have seen in the case of Vakkali, the attachment to the Buddha's person is strongly rejected. No direct mention of these aspects can be found in the early Buddhist canon. But later on as the bhakti cult expanded intensively through literary and other media of propagation, some of these devotional aspects were probably transferred to the Buddhist literature disguised in religious technical terms. It is, therefore, interesting to pay our attention to the question how far those early aspects of devotion appear in the Ceylonese devotional works.

As we have seen in the second chapter, some Ceylonese devotional works written in Pali seem to have followed the line of the 'sataka' and other Sanskrit devotional poems of eulogistic character. The Pajjamadhu of Buddhappiya, for instance, can be seen to have very often used the 'āsīr' form, one of the distinguished structural characteristics of Sanskrit 'sataka poems, while the Jinālakāra shows its indebtedness to them in descriptive eulogy and in some other poetical devices.

The overlapping descriptions of various episodes and other subjects which are not combined neatly with one another and are drawn at random from the life of the Buddha, strings of eulogistic epithets, high-flown scholastic thoughts rather than real emotional feeling and the laboured kāvya style are some of the main characteristics of both these works, which can frequently be found in the Sanskrit devotional works, including sataka.

Among Ceylonese devotee poets of both Pali and Sanskrit, there can be seen a common interest in selection and arrangement of subject matter. They seem to prefer to extol the auspicious marks of Buddha's person in extravagant intensity. In the Pajjamadhu¹ sixty-nine verses of its total number (104) are used for this purpose while the Anuruddhasataka² offers thirty-six stanzas (25-61). The Jinālaṅkāra³ in this respect dedicates only one stanza (61) which lists them all. Of the other subjects which attracted their minds, the ten pāramitās (perfections) which includes the past births of the Buddha and the defeat of Māra, seem to have played a considerable part in these devotional works.

-
1. Pajjamadhu, (with sanne), ed. H. Devamitta (Colombo, 1887).
 2. Anuruddhasataka (with sanne), ed. D. A. de S. Batuvantudave, (Colombo, 1979).
 3. Jinālaṅkāra, (with sanne), ed. R. Palita (Matara, 1955).

The author of the Pajjamadhu, who deals with the subject generally in respect of his description of the auspicious marks, versifies another twelve stanzas (70-82) in order to describe them separately, whereas the Anuruddhasataka describes them in ten verses (11-20). The Jinālaṅkāra which does not mention the names of the pāramitās separately lays stress on the activities which compose the pāramitās (32-45). But it pays great attention to detailing the defeat of Māra which occupies twenty-eight verses (133-161) whereas the other two works describe that in only one stanza. It seems that all the Ceylonese devotee poets lavished their attention equally to glorify the super-human virtues and the transcendental powers of the Buddha which are said to have enabled him to predominate over all living beings including devas and brahmas, and to extol the aptness of the Buddha to be worshipped by human beings as well as gods. The Jinālaṅkāra and the Anuruddhasataka have attempted to raise the superiority of the Buddha to its utmost state so that he is ascribed godly powers. The desire of the author of the Jinālaṅkāra to give super-humanity to the Buddha and to extol his miraculous powers is evident from some verses in the descriptions of 'Māra-vijaya' and 'Abhisambodhi' (133-193). Through a statement ascribed to the Buddha, he says: 'that the Buddha was neither a human being nor

a nonhuman being, nor a brahma nor a deva, but one, who came to this world to show decay and death and who is considered a human being by the ignorant' (148-149).

In another statement, the Buddha is said to have enjoyed such a power as to be able to walk inside a mustard seed and overshadow the universe by his own figure (153). In the description of 'abhisambodhi' Buddharakkhita details how the Buddha was worshipped and lauded by devas and brahmas (162-174). The author of the Jinālaṅkāra, who seems to be not satisfied with the worship by devas and brahmas only, prefers to engage himself in attachment to the worship of the Buddha in various ways. He offers everything which comes to his mind, at the moment, to the Buddha including fragrant flowers of various colours in the worlds of men and snakes (nāga) and the heavens, odours, sound of music, dancing and so forth, and worships him in fervent devotion (209-261). In this respect, the Anuruddhasataka which goes even beyond Jinālaṅkāra, extends the Buddha's superiority to non-Buddhist deities like Īsvara, the supreme god of the Saivas. As he describes it, not only Sakra and Brahma but Īsvara as well came to the Buddha to worship and knelt down at his feet (60). It also describes some miracles that coincided with the Buddha's walking on the road. The author's poetic imagination concerning the

incident reads as follows:

'On his (Buddha's) walkings clouds themselves form canopies over his head; the wind itself cleans the road, spreads fragrant flowers; lotuses sprung from the earth take the place of his jewelled shoes; drums themselves begin to beat rhythmically (72).'

Both the Jinālaṅkāra and the Anuruddhasataka lay their stress directly on the Buddha worship only and look down on others who do not take part in the worship of the Buddha. The Jinālaṅkāra asks: 'Who with intelligence and faith, except lunatics, do not take part in the worship of the Buddha? (192).' And it says 'one who is attached to the glorification of the Buddha and to his memory, with beliefs in his Buddhahood, may overcome all sins and attain Nibbāna (207).'

The disdain in the Anuruddhasataka for all except Buddhist devotees seems to be more polite than in Jinālaṅkāra. But the impulses which gave equal effectiveness to both writers must have been aroused by the same source. The relevant passage in the Anuruddhasataka reads as follows: 'he who does not listen to the doctrine of the Buddha, neither sees his beautiful figure nor glorifies his virtues, his ears are not ears; his eyes are not eyes; his tongue is not a tongue (95).'

Like the author of

the Jinālaṅkāra, the author of the Anuruddhasataka too engages himself in Buddha worship saying: 'even the mount which bears the footprint of the Buddha on its summit brings every fortune to the world; I glorify him, worship him; I keep him in my mind and attach myself to his memory (96).'

At the end of the Anuruddhasataka there is to be found a certain devotional characteristic distinguished from that of the Jinālaṅkāra which seems to be related to some devotional aspects in the Nārada Bhaktisūtra. It is of note that in the Bhaktisūtra emphasis is laid on the utmost intimacy between the devotee and the object of devotion. At the final stage of the bhakti path, as the Bhaktisūtra postulates, even the slightest thing which creates a gap between devotee and object of devotion is eliminated, and ultimately they both become one and the same.¹ Though these aspects of devotion as expounded by Nārada were not applied directly and in the same way as in the works of Bhāgavata religion to these Buddhist devotional works, their close relation with the works is evident. The following verse quoted from the concluding part of the Anuruddhasataka may furnish us with evidence

1. The Bhaktisūtras of Narada, p.30, (no.82).

of that relationship:

'tvam maulireva śikhare mama śekharaśca
 tvam candrikā nayanayoramṛtāñjanañca
 tvam candanaṃ vapuṣi sārarasāyanañca
 tvam nātha, hārāracanā hr̥di jīvitañca'.¹

'Oh, Lord, thou art the crown and the garland on my head;
 thou art the beams of the moon and collyrium to my eyes;
 thou art the sandal ointment and the elixir to my body;
 thou art the necklace of pearls and the life to my heart.'

This verse which depicts the author's profound devotion towards the Buddha is certainly an attempt to make a personal attachment to the object of devotion.

Similar sentiments in consonance with the devotional aspects discussed above, can be found in some stories of the Rasavāhini of Vedeha. For instance, the Ahigunṭhika-vatthu which lays stress on the spiritual efficacy of the Buddha displays the influence of those devotional concepts. Vedeha, summing up the main results to emerge from the story, concludes:

'It only is the mouth which often speaks the word Buddha; it only is the mind which keeps in itself the word Buddha; they only are the ears which themselves listen to the word Buddha.'

And further he infers: 'the word Buddha is the only guardian and the donor of all required'.²

1. Anuruddhasataka, v. 97.

2. Rasavāhini, ed. Saranatissa (Colombo, 1928), p. 14. vv. 4-7. For devotional thoughts see also 'kāvīrapaṭṭana-vatthu'. Ibid., pp. 56-58.

These devotional thoughts [above mentioned], can be seen to be effective on some Sinhalese works like the Sasadāvata and the Butsarana in the same or more advanced forms. The Sasadāvata, a classic poem on the Sasajāta of the Jātakatthakathā, purports to be a eulogy of the Buddha. In some episodes of the present and past stories of the Jātaka, the author of the poem seems to have attempted to give impulse to his devotional feelings. In the first half of the poem, he describes how nature and devotees including devas and brahmas worshipped the Buddha. In the other half the eulogy by Śakra and the worship of the forest deities are described. From the main episode of the present story the poet has had a successful opportunity to depict devotional feeling towards the Buddha. Two occasions, concerning the Buddha's walking to the donor's house and his preparation to deliver his sermon, are chosen for this purpose. The author has focussed his attention on the Buddha's superiority and aptness to be worshipped by the world. Like other devotee poets mentioned above, he too gives a poetical description of some miraculous incidents which coincided with his walking to the donor's house. 'Springing of lotuses from the earth, cleaning of the

road, spreading of flowers by the wind and canopies by the clouds' are some of the miracles described by him. Further, he mentions that the Buddha was worshipped with dancing and singing as on a carnival day.¹

In the description of the preaching hall, the author focusses on some distinguished listeners who came to the congregation. Among them there were Sak (Śakra), Yama, Varuna, Vesamunu (Vaiśravaṇa), Mahabaṃba (Mahābrahma), Ven (Viṣṇu), Mehesuru (Mahēśvara), Hala'vi (Halāyudha), Ganadevi (Ganeśa) and Kaṇḍakumara (Skanda).² This shows that all the deities of the Hindu pantheon had come to worship the Buddha and listen to his doctrine. The author's intention in giving such a description, however, is clear. Undoubtedly he was anxious to affirm the Buddha's superiority over the Hindu pantheon.

Thus the Sasadāvata shows some devotional aspects which are common with those of other devotional works. In contrast to the Sasadāvata the Butsarapa provides more devotional aspects and they require more detailed discussion.

1. Sasadāvata, vv.156-161.

2. Ibid., vv.176-185.

(d) Some devotional aspects of the Butsarana.

The Butsarana seems to be a good specimen of Sinhalese devotional works in prose, the devotional aspect of which have not yet been paid much attention by scholars in the field. The devotional characteristics occurring in the Butsarana, therefore, need a critical analysis together with an inquiry into its influence from the Indian bhakti cult which stimulated contemporary minds on a large scale. In this connexion there may be an argument that both the Butsarana and the Amāvatura are much the same in subject matter and purpose and nothing would appear to distinguish one from the other. Indeed we cannot refute completely such an argument, for there is a certain similarity between these two works.

It is clear that both writers, Vidyācakravartī and Gurulugomi, often turned to the Pali canon and commentaries for their subject matter and seem to have had much the same expectations - what we call religious motives - from their compositions. But of course, there is no reason to conclude that both works create one and the same picture though they in some cases narrate the same story. The authors of the Butsarana and the Amāvatura sometimes

had a common inspiration in selecting the same subject, usually famous Buddhist stories related in the Pali literature. For instance, such stories as the subjection of Angulimāla, Nālāgiri, Nandopananda, Ālavaka, Saccaka and Bakabrahma are narrated more or less at equal length in both works.¹ But the tone of each narration and the stress each puts on the incidents of the story are not the same. Each writer has attempted to embellish his narrative with his personal vision and to give it a new look according to his own originality, personal understanding and motives. It must therefore, be emphasized that each work contains its own soul and character in spite of its having the same subject matter. The difference between two works of art more often lies in how the author says things than in what he says.

Vidyācakravartī appears to have focussed his attention on almost every tiny incident of each story so that every one of them may shed light to depict his fervent devotion (bhakti) towards the Buddha, whereas Gurulugomi relies on the climax which flashes a light on his faith (saddhā) in the Buddha. This may become clear from a comparison between two narrations of the

1. Butsarana, pp.61-91, 129-154, 191-205.
Amāvatura (ed.Sorata) pp.88-97, 159-166, 166-176,
 102-118, 205-212.

same story in the two works. In Vidyācakravartī's narration of the taming of Nālāgiri, a descriptive manner has been applied to almost all episodes of the story, but in Gurulugomi's a concise manner which shortens subordinate incidents and directs them to the main point.¹ It is of note that Gurulugomi being a faithful translator tried to retain what was in the original, whereas the other tried his hand at embellishing what he had drawn from the original.

The introductory parts of the story in both works follow more or less the same lines as the original in Pali, but the tone and the descriptive manner of the Butsarana are distinctive. Every little incident of the other parts seem to be given specific attention in the Butsarana. The preparation of the disciples of eighteen vihāras around the Veluvana temple for going into the street together with the Buddha where he confronted the elephant Nālāgiri, Buddha's entering into the street and the enthusiastic desire of either party of citizens, Buddhists and non-Buddhists, to watch the confrontation, and finally the taming of the elephant Nālāgiri are described elegantly with much care in the Butsarana. The tone, diction and images of each episode in this

1. Butsarana, pp.62-82; & Amāvatura, ed.Sorata pp.162-166.

narration differ from those of Gurulugomi. Vidyācakra-
varti seems to have employed his entire skill in order to
pour out the devotion his heart was full of. He has
devoted four pages to describing the gathering of disciples
in the Veluvana, to escort the Buddha, where the author
provides a list of their personal names with their status
in the hierarchical order and their special personal
abilities - what we call religious titles - whereas
Gurulugomi devotes only one and a half short sentences
to this. Vidyācakravarti's description, however, displays
his ardent desire to extol the Buddha's predominant power
and greatness. According to Vidyācakravarti, each disciple
gathered there with determination to tame Nālāgiri under
the Buddha's permission. The tone given by the epithets
and the similes in each short description of this episode
imply the author's attitude towards miraculous powers.
It seems that Vidyācakravarti had a great faith and esteem
in such powers as performing miracles, which in fact do
not play an important part in the early canonical works.¹
His desire to elaborate the characters of the chief
disciples with such powers must have been motivated by

1. It is recorded in the Kevaddhasutta of Dīghanikāya that
the Buddha loathed, abhorred and was ashamed of the
practice of mystic wonders.

See Sacred Books of the Buddhists, ed. Max Müller, vol. II,
(London, 1899), p. 278.

that temperament. This attitude of the author can be seen in almost every page of the story from beginning to the end. In comparison with Vidyācakravartī, Gurulugomi's attitude toward miracles seems not so ardent and firm, though his great faith in the Buddha's super-human spiritual power and self-confidence plays a considerable part.

In Gurulugomi's narration only one direct mention of a miracle can be found. It occurs in the middle of the story where the author was dealing with the incident of Ānanda's coming forward to protect the Buddha in spite of his refusal of such help. The Buddha, as mentioned by Gurulugomi, put Ānanda backwards by his miraculous power. The author speaks no more of miracles throughout the story but alludes to Buddha's super-human virtues, such as compassion, universal love, self-confidence, unshaken boldness and wisdom, which are regarded as the instruments by which he tamed intractable beings. Though these virtues are not discarded in Vidyācakravartī's narration they seem to be submerged in the flood of miracles. A considerable scope is reserved in his narration for miracles, apart from indirect mentions. He begins the story with a short description of the miracles that had been performed by the Buddha. And thereafter, in the description of the disciples'

gathering, within the dialogue of Buddhists and non-Buddhists, in the description of the emanation of six colours from the person of the Buddha and in the case of Nālāgiri's becoming white the miraculous power inherent in the Buddha is held in high esteem.

His regard for mystic wonders may be evidenced by the words ascribed to the Buddhists who spoke in favour of the Buddha in his imaginary dialogue with the opposition; it says:

'me āt'hu ada tamange śrī pāda patmayāta bāta
bāmbarak'hu pūmbunā paridden rddhiprātihārya
pā ehi pahan bohō dena amā maha nivanhi lati.
ada e peḷahara balaṃha.'

'This elephant may be blown away, like a bee that has come to alight on the lotuses of his feet, by the Buddha, showing his miraculous power, and the beings who are delighted by that miracle may be led to Nirvāṇa; let us see it today.'¹

But in Gurulugomi the miracles are not paid such attention.

He depicts the same incident by these words:

'ada mahā nāgayan dedenāge saṅgrāma veyi,
nirupamāna buddhalīlāyen nālāgirihi damana
sē balaṃha.'

'The fight between two great elephants takes place today; let us see how the Buddha tames Nālāgiri with his unparalleled deportment.'²

1. Butsarana, p.76.

2. Amāvatura, ed. Sorata, p.163.

Here, Gurulugomi does not make any mention of the Buddha's miracles but lays stress on his greatness which lies in super-human virtues. Now it is quite clear that there is a considerable difference between the attitudes towards miracles of two writers.

All that we have described above suggests Vidyācakravarti's enthusiasm and attachment to the glorification (mahimākhyāti) of the Buddha. It is interesting to examine whether the devotional aspects expounded by Śāṇḍilya and Nārada, or some of them at least, have had some relationship with this narration.

Vidyācakravarti's description of Ānanda's coming forward to protect the Buddha is noteworthy for the specific stress laid on 'self consecration' caused by his long-standing intimacy with the Lord. The author, unlike Gurulugomi, exploits the occasion for his own devotional purposes. He attempts to illustrate Ānanda's yearning to ensure Buddha's safety by being himself a victim of the furious elephant, Nālāgiri. Vidyācakravarti's comments and short descriptions of Jātaka stories in which Ānanda had played the same part for the Bodhisatva's sake show his intention of conveying to his readers such a mentality as that of Ānanda towards the Buddha. The motive inherent in this passage, which is also supported

by similar incidents of other stories of the Butsarana, permits us to suppose that the author had a direct or indirect acquaintance with the attachment to self consecration (ātmanivedanāsakti) expounded in the Nārada Bhaktisūtra.

Another aspect which may be compared with the attachment to his service (dāsyāsakti) in the Bhaktisūtra can be found in the culminating point of the story where the author's intention is brought to fruition. Nālāgiri, the dreadful elephant, intoxicated and maddened by mahouts, who was employed to kill the Buddha on this occasion, becomes an obedient servant with fervent devotion towards the Buddha. One incident of this occasion, pictured by the following words, bears special significance:

'ē vadāla pansil tevalā budu vadan puhunu kala sādāhāti
upāsakayak'hu piḷigannā se ē āt piḷigena maṅdak pasu bāsa
semen ata dik kota srīpādaya alvā ē ata geṇa gos hisa
tabamin muhuna tabamin sripādaya pahala tānā pas geṇa
tamā hisa oṃin valgaya hakuḷuvā depāhassehi ganvamin
buduruva balabalā nāmemin sarvāṅgayehi rōma tāk satutin
kelin siṭuvamin gauravayen siṭiyē ya.'

'The elephant observes pansil (five precepts) administered by the Buddha, as a devotee conversant with the three pitakas, and having retreated slightly backwards touches Buddha's feet with its trunk that it stretched out gently. Again, it puts the tip of that trunk by which the Buddha's feet had been fondled on its own head and face. It puts

on its head soil which it had taken from where the Buddha's feet touched the earth. It thrusts its tail in between its rear legs and stands in front of the Buddha with tremendous respect, bending towards the Buddha and making its hair stand on end over its whole body.¹

This short passage gives us an idea how far Vidyācakra-vartī was inspired by devotional feeling. His imagery of the elephant is undoubtedly a symbol of the fervent devotion his heart was full of; it represents the ideal characteristics of a devout person as conceived by the author. Here, the elephant seems to be substituted in the place of a devotee who attaches himself in humble service to the object of his devotion. The devotional features embodied in the elephant's character seem to be expected by the author in all devotees including himself, especially in his readers. The various gestures of the elephant reveal the author's close relationship with the above mentioned devotional aspects. According to the doctrine of bhakti, at the stage of 'dāsyāsakti' a devotee is said to have succeeded in attaining such a personal relationship as that of a servant with his master. In other words, the devotee becomes attached in rendering service to the object of devotion, as a servant does to his master.²

1. Butsarana, p.82.

2. Bhaktisūtras of Narada, p.31.

Nālāgiri's ecstatic nature, due to its new experience of devotion towards the Buddha as described in this passage, may throw light on another fact concerning the devotional aspects of the Bhaktisūtra. As we have mentioned earlier, gratification or delight (prīti) is considered a distinctive mark by which devotion is known, in the Sāṅdilya Bhaktisūtra. The commentator, Svapne'svara, compares this delight to that of Vidura in the Mahābhārata and quotes an expression in which Vidura says to the Lord: "Oh, Puṇḍarikākṣa, how shall I express to thee the sense of gratification that thrills my heart in thy presence? Thou art the soul of all; Thou knowest it." ¹

The Bhaktisūtra of Nārada also deals with such mental states as becoming overjoyed, quiet and satisfied.² According to Vidyācakravartī's description of Nālāgiri, it seems that the elephant has enjoyed a great ecstasy that can be compared to the sentiment expected of a devotee by the Bhaktisūtra. It is clear that Nālāgiri, at the final stage of the story, behaves like an ardent devotee who was overjoyed with devotion.

Aversion to everything else other than the object of one's own devotion occupies a considerable place in almost all works of devotion. Directly or indirectly, other religious concepts and objects of adoration are ridiculed

1. One Hundred Aphorisms of Sāṅdilya, p.34.

2. Bhaktisūtras of Nārada, p.3.

and jeered at harshly by devotee writers. Any defect whatsoever, either in morality concerning personal character or in the assessment of doctrinal matters, may be subjected to their contemptuous attack. Thus, to disdain everything else outside those writers' own religious beliefs seem to have become more or less a common feature of devotional writers. This feature, too, receives a significant place in Vidyācakravartī's Butsarana.¹ In the story of the taming of Nālāgiri, a mention of non-Buddhists can be found twice; first, in the dialogue between the Buddhists and non-Buddhist communities which took place before the confrontation of the Buddha with the elephant, and secondly, in the jubilant moment, just after the subjection of Nālāgiri. Vidyācakravartī showed his aversion to the non-Buddhists indirectly, by dismissing the point raised by them in the dialogue, that the Buddha would be crushed by the mighty Nālāgiri, since everything happened in favour of the Buddha. His second attempt was to attack them directly when he stressed the actions of the triumphant Buddhists in attacking their opponents physically. As he has mentioned they knocked the tīrthakas² on the head

-
1. Butsarana, Tīrthakadamana (pp.90-114), Gaṅgārohanakathā (pp.161-162), Misrakathā (pp.257-260).
 2. In this context this term seems to denote non-Buddhistic ascetics as well as their followers. See Butsarana, p.82.

and kicked them. By making the Buddhists to attack their opponents Vidyācakravartī directly shows his aversion to other religionists and their practices.

Thus the aversion to everything else other than one's own object of adoration is one phase of that devotion of which the other phase is to regard the object of that devotion as the only supreme figure.¹ To ascribe such a predominant power as to control everything, animate and inanimate in the universe, to the object of devotion is the nature of almost all religions, especially in theistic religions. In some branches of Mahāyānism which had a close relation with theistic religions, the Buddha was given god-like powers. Later on some of their features seem to have been absorbed by the other branches of Buddhism. Though some early canonical works of the Theravādins speak of the Buddha's incomparable virtues by which he excelled all beings including devas and brahmas they certainly did not ascribe to him any divine power. In the course of time, by taking these virtues into account, the Buddha was placed on such a superior place by later devotee writers that he enjoyed predominant powers over the world. They frequently used such epithets as 'devātideva', 'sakrātīśakra', brahmāti brahma'² (god of gods, Śakra of

1. cf. 'sarvatadbhāva', 'he is the all' in 'Sāndilya'.
See One Hundred Aphorisms of Sāndilya, p.34.

2. Butsarana, p.113.

(Sakras, Brahma of Brahmas) and so forth in order to emphasize his superiority. Many Sinhalese devotee writers from Vidyācakravartī onward preferred to use such strings of epithets in their compositions in order to affirm the conventional belief in the Buddha's predominant power. Vidyācakravartī who had a great devotion to the Buddha's superiority as an embodiment of super-human virtues and unconquerable miraculous powers tried to extol it both by narrating stories and by describing it separately. In the course of his narration considerable space is reserved for detailing the superiority of the Buddha. In the narration of the taming of Nālāgiri such a description can be found, which deals with the occasion of the Buddha's going into the street accompanied by his disciples. This passage which contains a string of heaped similes deliberately emphasizes the Buddha's supremacy in one sense, which must be the direct meaning, and shows an aversion to other religious concepts and their objects of devotion, in the other. Here, the author who is not convinced of the appropriateness of his similes to describe the Buddha, denies their suitability and, finally, compares the Buddha to the Buddha himself.¹

1. Butsarana, pp. 77-78.

Now we have analyzed briefly some devotional aspects which can be seen conspicuously in the story of Nālāgiri in the Butsarana. These fundamental characteristics which are more or less common to nearly all devotional works can be found either in more vivid forms, or at least obscurely in almost all the stories narrated by Vidyācakra-
varti. In such stories as the subjection of the jatilas and the descent from the heaven (devārohanakathā), these devotional features seem to be vigorously effective. Devotional aspects inherent in the Butsarana sometimes seem to have received much vitality from the commentarial form of the work, which perhaps provides adequate scope for different descriptions not obviously connected with one another. Though this literary form has been subjected to many criticisms the author appears to have made much use of it for his devotional purposes. In such portions as Prakīrnakakathā and Mīsrakathā he has had many occasions to extol the Buddha as he wished without confining himself only to one theme. This literary form which can also be found frequently in the sataka poems must have been inspired by them and adapted by the author for his own devotional descriptions in prose.

It is of note in this connexion, that the Butsarana unlike the Amāvatura¹ also used^s the word bhakti, many times, to signify the devotional feeling towards the Buddha. Here we quote some phrases where the term is used:

'budun vahansē kerehi bhaktiyen yukta vū bhaddiya maha terun vahansē ya.'

'(There came) the great sage Bhaddiya who had devotion towards the Buddha.'²

'gharanī nam upāsikā kenek sarvajñayan vahansēgē 'srī pādaya bhaktiyen vānda..'

'A female devotee called Gharani having worshipped the feet of the Buddha in devotion..' ³

'ē nāgarāja tema budun vahansēgē 'srī mukhaya bala balā bhaktin hisa hakuluva hakuluva pātradhātun vahansē ātulāt'hi hottē ya.'

'The snake lay in the Bowl Relic folding its head in devotion and looking at Buddha's face.' ⁴

The use of the word bhakti in the Butsarana does not in itself provide adequate evidence to support our argument that its author was influenced by the devotional theories, but it cannot be ignored in such an argument if we take into consideration the fact that this word had previously not been employed in such a context as this in Sinhalese prose.

1. The word 'bhakti' which can be found in another context in the Amāvatura seems to be used there in the sense of allegiance and is never used to denote the devotion towards the Buddha.

See Amāvatura ed. K.Nānāloka (Colombo, 1959), p.79.

2. Butsarana, p.74.

3. Ibid., p.104.

4. Ibid., p.120.

The foregoing discussion shows how far the concept of bhakti influenced the later Buddhist devotional works in Pali, Sanskrit and Sinhalese written in Ceylon. In the light of this discussion we may be able to conclude that Ceylonese devotee writers who were inspired by their Indian counterparts transferred the concept of bhakti consciously or unconsciously to the Buddha when they tried their hand at devotional writings.

CHAPTER IVA Comparative Study of the Prose Works of Gurugomi and Vidyācakravartī.

As is discussed in the second chapter, Gurugomi and Vidyācakravartī, the great prose writers of the Polonnaru period, seem to have lived at the same time. Supposing they were contemporaneous with each other or even if one lived few decades earlier than the other, it is clear that they would have enjoyed much the same inspiration and communication with major literary movements which were causing upheaval among the learned circles. It is, therefore, interesting to make a contrast between them by treating the role played by each in creative activity. Special attention should be paid in this survey to the genetic inspiration of each work and to their respective literary values. Both writers have chosen much the same line to compile what each has drawn from the original works. Accordingly, though the works of the two writers differ from one another in style, and content as well as artistic values, and on the whole in different ways of treatment, these works share the same fundamental structural design or motif which runs equally through them from beginning to end.

Actually we are not certain how the Sinhalese prose narrative genre embodying a structural design which brings various subjects into one literary form came to operate in Sinhalese literature. In the case of Butsarana some scholars see its relationship with the 'koṣakāvya' occurring in Sanskrit poetics.¹ The term 'koṣakāvya' signifying unconnected verses composed on different subjects is employed by Daṇḍin when he deals with various categories or genres of poems.² This term seems not to refer to works in prose in Sanskrit literature. We also find two other genres called 'ākhyāyikā' and 'kathā' in the manuals of Sanskrit poetics. In such Sanskrit works as the Pāncatantra, Daśakumāracarita and the Kathā-saritsāgara a large number of stories were compiled in the form of kāvya. The terms 'ākhyāyikā' and 'kathā' are used by Winternitz as a common name for all such different types of narratives³ despite the traditional arguments to

-
1. Butsarana, ed. W. Sorata, Introduction, p.II.
 2. Kāvyaḍarśa, ed. S.K. Belvarkar (Poona, 1924), ch.1, v.13; also Kāvyaṅuśāsana, ed. R.C. Prakash, & V.M.Kulkarni (Bombay, 1964) p.466.
 3. M.Winternitz, History of Indian Literature (Delhi, 1963) Vol.III, Part, 1 p.307.

distinguish between these two terms.¹ But the prose genre to which the above mentioned Sinhalese works belong cannot be recognized as a direct derivative of so called 'kosa', 'ākhyāyikā' and 'kathā' because it does not share the same features as assigned to these genres by the exponents of Sanskrit poetics.

Of the Sinhalese prose works the Amāvatura and the Butsarana can be rightly called collections of Buddhist stories scattered in different areas of canonical and non-canonical literatures if we remove their stories from the associated commentarial passages. But unlike those kathās and ākhyāyikās these Sinhalese prose works select and compile their stories with the aim of illustrating certain virtues of the Buddha. This aim brings about a unity of all the stories and descriptions they contain. The Amāvatura, for instance sets forth with fervour the illustration of one of the Buddha's epithets, viz. 'purisadammasārathi'² (tamer of the hearts of tamable men) in its every denouement, and the Butsarana purports to be an illustration of the nine virtues of the Buddha.

1. Kāvyaalankāra, ed. P.V. Naganatha Sastri (Delhi, 1970) Kāvya-darśa, ch.1, vv. 23-28.

Ten varieties of kathā are mentioned by Hemacandra, See Kāvyaṅuśasana, pp. 462-465.

2. Amāvatura, ed. W. Sorata, (Colombo, 1960) p.1.

If the prose genre to which these Sinhalese works belong does not come down from such genres as kosa, ākhyāyikā and kathā then how did it emerge? Can it be regarded as an indigenous invention? Or does it have any relationship with other sources?

The fact that Sinhalese literature was inspired by Buddhism is certain. At the early stage of the Sinhalese literature probably there were some glossaries or commentaries containing annotations for understanding scriptures, and certain collections of stories, religious and otherwise. The early Helatuvā or Sinhalese commentaries are lost. The oldest Sinhalese commentary that survives, which belongs to the Anurādhapura period is the Dhampiyā-atuvā-gāṭapadaya. It mainly expounds the verbal meaning of various words selected from the Pali Dhammapadatthakathā, while giving some explanatory phrases which were presumably regarded as essential.

The commentarial character that can be seen in the Dhampiyā-atuvā-gāṭapadaya must undoubtedly have taken its form from the explanatory sections of the Dhammapadatthakathā which also is said to have been based on a Helatuvā.¹

1. Dhampiyā-atuvā-gāṭapadaya, ed. M. Vimalakitti & N. Sominda (Colombo, 1960), pp.5 - 6.

In such a prose work as the Sikhavalāṇḍa-vinisa, this characteristic can be found in an embryonic form, used to compile the Vinaya rules selected from the manuals of Vinaya. It is certain that this long standing convention of commentarial composition could not at first be neglected by Ceylonese writers when they were composing prose works in Sinhalese or Pali. It is a matter of course that those ancient commentaries, written either in Sinhalese or Pali, will have had some sort of effect also on the later works of Ceylonese writers. For instance, the Pali Mahābodhivamsa of Upatissa which probably belongs to the late Anurādhapura period, seems to show this characteristic in rather an advanced form for a literary purpose. This work collects its materials from various sources so as to illustrate and support one major theme, that is to say, the history of the bodhi, the tree under the shade of which the Buddha^h was enlightened, and is composed to answer five questions raised by the author himself.¹ In the same way the Amāvatura and the Butsarana have collected their stories and other descriptions with the intention of illustrating some specific virtues of the Buddha.

1. Mahābodhivamsa, ed. P. Sobhita (Colombo, 1890) p.1.

Thus, the Sinhalese prose narrative genre, especially its fundamental structural design seems to have related to an indigenous literary tradition rather than to the above mentioned literary genres in Sanskrit poetics. This is not to deny that its later developments may have undergone the potent influence of Sanskrit poetic traditions. It is not unreasonable to think that this prose genre assumed a new turn and new shape with which we are dealing later in this discussion, in the hands of such writers as Gurulugomi and Vidyācakravarti who were no mean Sanskrit scholars. They treated the genre in two slightly different ways.

The difference between their implementation of this prose genre, however, is quite a simple one. The Amāvatura collects stories and short descriptions which are pertinent to its main theme from various sources but it does not make any attempt to intersperse its narration with extraneous descriptions, whereas the Butsarana combines both aspects.

After all, the method of compilation of stories is in no way an unusual type to Buddhist writers, for a great number of stories concerning previous lives of the Buddha himself and those of his disciples as well were compiled in early canonical works and in commentaries.

In later Pali works like the Sahassavatthu and the Rasavāhini also can be found such collections of stories and Buddhist legends concerning the greatness and spiritual efficacy as well as other most charming qualities of the Buddha and his disciples, in prose and verse.¹ Similarly a large collection of Buddhist stories can be found in the Avādāna literature in Sanskrit. It seems to be of great interest to go further into the latter subject, for it might throw some light on how far the Avadāna literature influenced our early literary works. As far as we are concerned the only works in Sanskrit that can be compared, but remotely, to the early Sinhalese prose works are the Avadānas. It seems difficult to make out any other Sanskrit counterpart of our early prose works except the Avadānas, which however do not bear a very great resemblance to them. According to some Sanskrit literary historians the earliest specimen of the Avadānas can be found in the Avadānaśataka, the Karmaśataka, and the Divyāvadāna of unknown date.²

-
1. This type of writing is called 'campu' in Sanskrit poetics. See Kāvya-darśa, ch.1, v. 30.
 2. Avadānaśataka, ed. J.S. Speyer (St. Petersburg, 1906), Vol. I, Introduction, p.1. & Vol. II Preface, pp. XIV - XX.

The first of these is believed to be a discourse of the Buddha himself (sugatabhāṣita).¹ The Avadānas are said to have occupied the seventh place in the list of twelve types of the discourse uttered by the Master.² The word Avadāna as has been shown by some scholars signifies a great religious or moral achievement as well as the history of such achievements.³

Like the Jātaka the Avadāna is also a species of Buddhist sermon; both are preferably employed for preaching purposes. The main tendency of both is, on the one hand, to show the irresistible and all-pervading power of karma towards determining for each creature the course and the fortune of his existence within the boundless and never-ending samsāra, and on the other, to convince men of their individual responsibility for gathering 'white karma'. It seems that many stories narrated in the Avadānas lay more stress on the results of karma than do the Jātakas. We often find in the Avadānas a stereotyped rule which says: "Black karma bears black fruits, white karma bears white fruits and the mixed ones mixed fruits".⁴

1. Ibid, Vol.II p.206, fn.

2. Ibid, Vol. II preface, p.1.

3. G.K. Nariman, Literary History of Sanskrit Buddhism (Bombay, 1920) p.45.

4. Avadānaśataka, Vol.II p.6; Divyāvadāna, ed. E.B. Cowell & R.A. Neil (Amsterdam, 1970) pp.23, 55,135.

It is obvious that in the Jātakas the Bodhisatva must necessarily be the main character, but in the Avadānas it is not so. Yet a large number of Avadānas, too, contain the Bodhisatva as the main character. Every Jātaka may be called Avadāna, but the reverse is not true. The Jātakamālā of Āryasūra has as its second title Bodhisatva-avadāna-mālā¹. Though there is some relationship between the Jātakas and Avadānas they are distinguished from each other by a very significant structural difference. In the structure of the Jātaka, the past story, the real Jātaka, plays the important part in the absence of which the Jātaka no longer exists. But in some Avadānas there are no stories of the past; and this type of Avadāna has no counterpart in the Jātakas. All the Jātakas preserved in the Pali canon are ascribed to the Buddha; no one of them is categorized as a newly invented composition. But some Avadānas are believed to be newly invented stories. All existing Avadānas are divided into three categories, two canonical and one post-canonical.² As classified by J.S. Speyer who edited Avadānasataka in his outstanding preface to the second volume, the first category comprises Avadānas met with in the Vinaya or Sūtras by way of episodes or examples of rules or tenets taught.

1. Avadānasataka, II, Preface, pp.V - VI.

2. Avadānasataka, Preface, (II), p.XIV.

Collections of such portions are found in a work like Divyāvadāna which belongs to this category. The second contains the pure (independent) Avadānas, either single or gathered into collections, which belong to the Sūtrapitaka. The Avadānaśataka and the Karmaśataka are examples of this category. All the other Avadānas found in collections or as single works are categorized in the third type. This final category, as has been shown, comprises later compositions like the Jātakamālā³ of Āryaśūra and the Bodhisatva-avadāna-kalpalatā of Ksemendra which actually were composed after completion of the canon. The latter was composed as late as the eleventh century by a Kashmirian poet in verse. As is mentioned by Somendra, the son of Ksemendra who completed his father's work by adding one more Avadāna, there were a great number of Avadāna-mālās written in elaborated prose interspersed with verse.¹ But most of them no longer exist, though some are preserved in Chinese and Tibetan. Some eighteen works enumerated under the title of Avadāna are described by Rajendralal Mitra in his Sanskrit Buddhist Literature of Nepal.²

1. Avadānakalpalatā, ed. P.L. Vaidya (Darbhanga, 1959), II. pp. 565-566.

2. Rajendralalmitra, Sanskrit Buddhist Literature of Nepal (Calcutta, 1881).

Some of them which are mentioned as separate works are found in such collections as the Avadānaśataka and the Divyāvadāna under the same name but in different versions.¹ It seems that these Avadānas are arranged according to a set model which is more or less common to every tale. A somewhat stereotyped formula containing perpetual reiteration of phrases in descriptions of characters as well as situations can be seen in the outer framework of this model. The following string of epithets which is employed in order to describe the unparalleled greatness and spiritual power of the Buddha is found at the outset of every Avadāna in unaltered form:

"The Buddha, the Lord, venerated, highly respected, held in honour, and lauded by kings, ministers, men of wealth, citizens, artisans, leaders of caravans, gods, nāgas, yaksas, asuras, garudas kinnaras' and gigantic snakes, adored by devas, nāgas, yaksas, asuras, garudas, kinnaras' and gigantic snakes, the Buddha, the Lord, the Renowned, the Served, betook himself, accompanied by his disciples and provided with all the necessaries in clothing, food, bedding, covering, refreshments and medicaments in the shape of alms to... and was sojourning at..."

1. cf. Upośadha in Avadānaśataka and Upośadha in the Sanskrit Buddhist Literature of Nepal, pp. 265-267 & Āsoka in Divyāvadāna and Āsoka Avadāna in Sanskrit Buddhist Literature of Nepal, pp. 6-17.

Similarly every Avadāna ends with: "Thus spake the Lord and with ecstasy in their hearts the monks applauded the speech of the Māter". Apart from these traditional features of outer framework it seems that a very important place is given to the karma theory in the inner framework of most stories. The denouement or main incidents of each Avadāna are permeated by the effectiveness of karma which sometimes appears in a somewhat stereotyped form of phrase or verse.¹ In most tales they seem to be deliberately arranged so as to imply the miraculous power of the Buddha and the unfathomable compassion and illimitable love his heart was filled with for living beings.

In this respect, it is desirable to deal with some stories occurring in the Avadānas so that they may illustrate the main characteristics of the genre. The story of Dharmapāla in the Avadānaśataka, which is also narrated in a poetic manner in the Butsarana, shows simplicity of narration and of structure as well. It is stated that the story was related by the Buddha while dwelling in Venuvana near the city of Rājagrha in relation to a conversation of his disciples about the conspiracy of Devadatta to murder the Buddha.

1. Usually such a phrase begins: 'iti bhikṣava, ekānta kṛṣṇānām karmānāmekāntakṛṣṇo vipāka' etc. and in verse appears as: napranasyanti karmāni kalpakotīśatairapi sāmagrim prāpya kālañca phalanti khalu dehinām. See Avadānaśataka ed. P.L. Vaidya (Darbhanga, 1958) pp.34,37, 39,42.

The secret plan, which brought nothing other than discredit and blame to Devadatta, was exposed. The Buddha still had great compassion on Devadatta in spite of his hatred for him. The disciples' conversation on the subject paved the way for him to relate his past. According to the past story, which is rather different from its counterpart in Pali Buddhism,¹ once upon a time the Bodhisatva was born in the royal palace of Benares and was the only son of both the king and queen. The prince known by the name Dhārmapāla was a handsome, kind boy of good behaviour and beloved by all. He was learning with other fellow boys in a teacher's house. Once in the spring the king went to the royal park for games, together with women of his harem. While they were playing the queen Durmatī, who had an abnormal character which featured hatred, violence and revenge, became violently furious. She refused to drink what was left for her by the king saying: "If I am not permitted to drink the blood of Dhārmapāla I will not drink what you have left for me". The king who was overcome by lust granted what she asked for. The prince having heard of this sudden torture went to his parents with tears and begged them for mercy. Though the king wanted to give him mercy the queen, his mother, strictly refused to give way and asked for his blood.

1. Jātakatthakathā (SBH) (Culla Dhammapala) (5.1.8) ed. W. Piyatissa, Part III (Colombo, 1931), pp. 123-126.

The prince Dharmapāla, even at this fatal stage, never felt anger or hatred for his parents; instead, he remained loving and compassionate towards them. The executioner, ordered by the king, came to the prince, cut his throat and fulfilled the desires of the queen. Thus the Buddha exposed the past, and said that the prince Dharmapāla in the past story was he himself and his mother queen Durmatī was Devadatta. At the end, pointing out the moral of the story the Buddha advised monks to concentrate their minds on loving and compassion. The monks applauded what the Buddha preached, with great ecstasy filling their hearts.¹

This story, which bears a great resemblance to the structure of the Jātaka, differs somewhat in contents from its counterpart found in the Jātakatthakathā.² In the Pali Jātaka, which is named Culla Dhammapāla, the king Mahāpratāpa, father of Dharmapāla, plays the part of queen Durmatī in the Avadānaśataka. According to the Jātaka, the Bodhisatva's mother queen Candrā was engaged in lulling the little baby, seated on a chair.

1. Avadānaśataka, ed. P.L. Vaidya (Darbhanga, 1958) No.33, pp. 82 - 83.

2. Jātakatthakathā, ed. W.Piyatissa, part III, pp.123-126;

Jātaka Stories of the Buddha's Former Births, E.B. Cowell, (Cambridge, 1897) Vol.III, pp.117-120.

With her mind on her son, she did not stand up to respect the king when he came to her room. The king Mahāpratāpa was inflamed by fury and ordered the executioner to torture the little prince in defiance of the queen's cry for mercy.

As is evident from our discussion, the tenor of the story in both the Avadānasataka and the Jātakatthakathā shows nothing of difference but the characters. Both stories formulate the doctrine of love and compassion which motivated the life of the Bodhisatva so that he aspired to Buddhahood. The prince Dharmapāla symbolizes the great love and compassion of the Master for the world, in spite its response to himself in the opposite way. The queen Durmatī and the king Pratāpa, though they differ from each other in sex and name, characterize the immense force of the world's hostile response to love and compassion. Another aspect of the Avadānas comes out from the Prātihārya sūtra of Divyāvadāna.¹ The sūtra was actually designed for illustrating Buddha's miraculous powers. The outer structure of this sūtra is more or less the same as of the Dharmapāla story. The significant feature of this new model is that it confines the whole narration only to the present story - in other words, the past story which is always found in the Jātakas is not given any room in the sūtra.

1. Divyāvadāna, pp. 143-166.

As in other Avadānas, some stereotyped phrases recur frequently between narration of this sūtra too. In the course of its narration a number of subordinate incidents are related as they happened, perhaps in detail.

Nevertheless, the main theme, that is to say illustration of Buddha's miraculous powers, can be seen permeating every episode, subordinate or main, throughout the sūtra.

The first episode, according to the sūtra, took place in the city of Rājagrha while the Master dwelt in Venuvana. It begins with a short discussion of six ascetics well known at the time of the Buddha who actually appeared as rivals of the Master. Once the ascetics headed by Pūrāna Kāśyapa met together and discussed the situation they had to face under the circumstances that had led the Buddha to win much popularity and resounding glory. Finally they decided to make a public declaration saying that they would challenge the Buddha to show his miraculous power and they themselves would perform miracles twofold and threefold in response to the Buddha. The ascetics did not receive any support from Bimbisāra, the king of Magadha and went to the king of kośala and asked for his assistance. The second episode which took place in the kingdom of Kośala paves the way to some other minor incidents connected with the Buddha's superiority.

It describes Buddha's going to Srāvasti escorted by his disciples and king Kośala's visit to the Master to invite him to perform miracles. In the third episode the corporal punishment inflicted by the king on prince Kāla, the king's brother, and his miraculous recovery from suffering by the mysterious power of the Master are described in detail. Similarly the building of a pavilion to the Buddha where he was to perform his miracles, the gathering of many thousands to see this most significant event and Buddha's performing the miracles are detailed one by one in fascinating manner. It seems that special attention is paid in the narration to the sudden disappearance of Pūrana Kāśyapa when the Buddha reached the climax of his miracles. It is said that this ascetics who had failed to make good his declaration fled away from the spot and was drowned in a pond tied up to a pot filled with sand. At the final stage of the sūtra is described the most interesting miracle the Buddha ever performed, in which he created another Buddha precisely resembling himself and answered the questions asked by that Buddha. This sūtra ends with two verses which emphasize the greatness of taking refuge in the Buddha.

The Prātiharyasūtra, composed in elegant prose interspersed with a few verses of simple character, except in a few cases nearly always goes hand in hand with the description of 'yamakamahāpātihāriya' in Pali commentaries¹. The Pali works exclude the episode of kāla and add another episode which relates the story of Gaṇḍamba, the mango tree under which the Buddha performed his 'twin miracles.' The starting incidents in both cases took place in the city of Rājagṛha while the final one occurred in Srāvasti. Similarly, the kings Bimbisāra and Kōsala played their parts in much the same way. Mara's part which occupies an important place in the first episode of the Sūtra is excluded from the Pali sources. Though the drowning of Purāna Kāśyapa was described in the same way in both sources he was not given such an important place in the Pali works as he occupies in the sūtra. In both sources disciples and lay devotees who asked for Buddha's permission to perform the miracles were not allowed to. Among those who sought Buddha's permission Lūhasudatta, Cunda, Utpalavarnā and Maudgalyāyana can be identified in both sources. Vīrā in the Pali source replaces Rddhīlamātā in the sūtra.

1. Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā, ed. K. Ratanasara, (Colombo, 1922), pp. 446 - 452.

But no one appears there for Kāla occurring in the sūtra.

It is of note that the Butsarana which is interested in the miraculous power of the Buddha reproduces the whole story in a poetic manner. Its narration seems to have had a closer relationship with the Pali source than with its counterpart in the Sanskrit. But this does not mean that the Butsarana has had no relation at all with the above sūtra or that it did not receive any influence from the Sanskrit source. What we can see here, is that the main episodes of Tīrthakadamana in the Butsarana¹ are correlative with those of the Pali source. But its theme and the tone of narration seems to have absorbed much influence from the Prātihāryasūtra. Both the Divyāvadāna and the Butsarana lay their stress at length on the super-human powers of the Buddha. The author of each work had a great desire to detail every aspect of miracles or of trivial incidents connected with them, as if each intended to direct devotees, actuated by his descriptions, to take refuge in the Buddha.²

1. Butsarana, pp. 95 - 109.

2. The Prātihāryasūtra ends with following verses:
 dhanyāste puruṣā loke ye buddhaṃ saraṇaṃ gatāḥ
 nirvṛttim te gamiṣyanti buddhakāraṅkṛtau janāḥ
 yelpamāpi jine karaṃ kariṣyanti vināyake
 vicitraṃ svargam āgamyā te lapsyante mṛtam padam.
Divyāvadāna No. XI, 166.

Though these Avadānas were not quoted directly in our early Sinhalese prose works undoubtedly they must have had some influence on our authors. We have seen in a previous discussion how much our scholars of the Polonnaru period were interested in Sanskrit studies. It is therefore, permissible to think that authors like Vidyācakravartī and Gurulugomi were conversant with such an arresting feature of Sanskrit Buddhist literature as Avadānas. Nevertheless, as suggested by Sorata,¹ they always tried to be in line with the Theravāda tradition. It is of note in this respect that such stories as the subjection of Dhanapāla, Nandopananda, and Sakra occurring in the Amāvatura of Gurulugomi can be found in the Avadānakalpalatā.² The first and the second of these are elaborately described by Vidyācakravartī too. In the light of the foregoing discussion we will be able to reach a conclusion that the prose genre of those Sinhalese narratives received a substantial inspiration from such Buddhist Sanskrit works as Avadānas in addition to its close relation to the national literary tradition which includes the earlier prose works of Ceylonese writers in both Sinhalese and Pali.

1. Amāvatura, ed. Sorata, Introduction p.X.

2. Avadānakalpalatā, Nos. 28, 33, 78.

Dharmapradīpikāva

Some Sinhalese literary historians and critics have investigated the sources and relationships of the subject matter occurring in these early Sinhalese prose works. Most of their investigations seem to have been devoted to finding out the original sources of the works, that is to say - where each author drew his subject matter from. As has been shown, Vidyācakravartī turned to the Jātakatthakathā, Dhammapadatthakathā, Visuddhimagga, Vimānavatthu, Petavatthu and the Dīgha, Majjhima, and Samyutta Nikāyas in order to collect his materials.¹ Similarly, Gurulugomi drew his subject matter for the Amāvatura from various Pali works like the Jātakatthakathā, Dhammapadatthakathā, Papañcasūdanī, Manorathapūranī, Sumaṅgalavilāsini, Buddhavamsatthakathā, Visuddhimagga, Suttanipāta and the Nikāyas above mentioned.² Apart from these works, many other Pali and Sanskrit works were referred to by him in order to gather materials for his compendium of Buddhist doctrine, the Dharmapradīpikāva.³

-
1. Sinhala-Sāhityaya, (A.Kulasuriya), I, p.170.
 2. Amāvatura, ed W. Sorata (Colombo, 1960), p.224.
 3. A Critical Study of the Dharmapradīpikā, ed.M.Sri Rammandala, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, 1954, Introduction, pp. XLVI - LVI; also see C.E. Godakumbura, Reference to Buddhist Sanskrit Writers in Sinhalese Literature, UCR, Vol.1 (1943), pp. 86-93.

This work, the first composition of Gurulugomi, has taken the form of parikathā, a round about discussion of some Pali words, selected with intention to produce commentarial descriptions. He provides detailed explanations of some five hundred words selected from Pali Mahābodhivamsa. Not all the words selected by Gurulugomi were described at equal length or in the same way.

Sometimes his discussions are restricted only to grammatical or semantic problems while on several other occasions they are devoted to doctrinal matters. In a few cases his commentarial form gave rise to some pieces of excellent literary creation. As has been done by many Pali commentators Gurulugomi narrates some stories within his commentarial discussions to illustrate or to verify the facts he mentions. There is nothing to surprise us in this, for it is common in the Pali commentaries. The problem, however, is why he adapted this commentarial form to produce creative writings. Gurulugomi creates his literary masterpiece, the Sulukaliṅgudā which runs to (seven pages) seven printed pages, as a commentary to the clause: 'dantapure rājā hutvā'¹ (having become a king in the city of Danta).

1. Dharmapradīpikāva, ed. Dharmarama, p. 296.

Sulukaliṅgudā or Cullakāliṅgabodhi-jātaka, the subject of Gurulugomi's creation, was wholly narrated in the Jātakatthakathā while some parts of it were elaborated in elegant prose in the Pali Mahābodhivamsa. The theme of both works is to lay stress on the unfathomable efficacy and greatness of the Bodhi, the holy tree under the shade of which the Buddha was enlightened. The distinctive glory of Culla Kāliṅga and the invincible power of the Bodhi overwhelmingly dominate the story of both the Jātakatthakathā and the Mahābodhivamsa. Though the emperor Kāliṅga, as main character, plays a very important role, his childhood and the details of his parents were not given any significant place in the story of the Jātakatthakathā where they were narrated very briefly. The Mahābodhivamsa which elaborates the emperor's life from adolescence neglects his childhood completely. The Dharmapradīpikāva seems to have come to fill the gap left in both works, especially (Pāli) Mahābodhivamsa. However, it provided Gurulugomi with a fruitful field where he was able to bring his creative skill to fruition. The subject matter of Gurulugomi's composition, as mentioned above, was given only a little place in the Jātakatthakathā; its narration does not run to more than one printed page.

The Jātakatthakathā just narrates briefly the main events of the life of Culla Kāliṅga, the younger brother of king Mahā Kāliṅga. The prince, according to the Jātaka, fled away from the city before he was caught by the king and lived in a forest where he met accidentally a beautiful princess, the daughter of King Madhu, and got married to her. Afterward, they got a son who succeeded his uncle Mahā Kāliṅga and became the emperor.¹

Gurulugomi made use of this sketch for his artistic creation. He seems to have collected necessary materials from Sanskrit poetics and other poetical works of well known writers like Daṇḍin and Bāṇabhaṭṭa in order to build his poetical mansion. As we mentioned elsewhere, by this time the contemporary learned circles of Ceylon were inspired on a large scale by Sanskrit scholarship. It is natural to expect much influence of Sanskrit literature on most literary works of the age. In fact, the subject matter provided by the Jātakatthakathā must have been attractive to a poet like Gurulugomi who possessed the mentality of a scholar tempered by Sanskrit poetics.

1. The Jātaka (PTS), ed. V. Fausboll (London, 1963) Vol. IV, No. 479 pp. 230 - 236; Mahabodhiwamsa (PTS), ed. S.A. Strong (London 1891), pp. 66-82.

It is likely that when he referred to the Pali Jātaka in order to translate the necessary portion to meet the demand of his commentarial discussion about the clause quoted above, the aesthetic environment connected with the episode might have aroused his emotional world and persuaded him to create his prose poem.

There may be a psychological motive also which motivated Gurulugomi in creating such a tasteful composition. He will have noticed that Upatissa, the author of the Pali Mahābōhivamsa, in adapting the Cullakālīṅgabodhijātaka had applied various Sanskrit poetic devices. His indebtedness not only to the actual figures of speech but also to the whole style of such works as the Daśakumāracarita and the Kādambarī must have been seen clearly by Gurulugomi. So, when he began to write his compendium on the words selected from the Mahābodhivamsa, he might have intended to complete the preliminary part of the same story, which the original work left untouched, in the same poetical style.

The subject matter itself which Gurulugomi has chosen might strike the mind of any poet, especially one who was tempered by Sanskrit poetics.

It certainly provides a poet with many opportunities to make various picturesque descriptions of nature, as in the case of many Sanskrit prose works which belong to the post-Kālidāsan period. As Neeta Sharma rightly mentions, Sanskrit poets are very fond of drawing word pictures.¹ In the post-Kālidāsan period which was highly affected by Alankāra theory this tendency to draw word pictures increased to such an extent that some poets started to dwell on descriptions more than on anything else in their works. Sanskrit literature, therefore, is exceedingly rich in graphic descriptions of nature and other subjects. The Kādambarī of Bānabhaṭṭa, in this respect, excels all others of this kind. Bāna seems to show such an enthusiasm in delineation of nature he sometimes does not mind even the disproportion of his descriptions. Bāna who had minutely observed the glories of nature in its various aspects, seems to admire them greatly. He was imbued with the sensitiveness to appreciate the magnetic attraction of nature; its various colours, its sweet and soft music, its pleasant fragrances and gentle touches have all drawn him to it.

1. Neeta Sharma, Bānabhaṭṭa A Literary Study (Delhi, 1968), p. 155.

He turned various minute features of nature into word pictures and brought them before his readers. Bāna in Neeta Sharma's words, describes "forests with their trees, creepers and flowers, lakes with their swans, lotuses and humming bees, hermitages with deer, sages and holy fires, the seasons with their changing effect on the atmosphere, animals with their natural gestures"¹ which touched the poet's heart extensively.

It became a matter of course that most poets of the age including Bāna, his precursors and followers who belonged to the same school, should give an important place to the descriptions of nature and such requisite subjects in their narratives. They developed their plots and interwove their episodes as if they were seeking more and more scope and opportunities to intersperse them with more and more descriptions.² Gurulugomi, who was inspired by the poets of this school, sought to develop his story from the Jātaka in the same poetical fashion as that followed by Bāna and his colleagues. It is desirable, in this respect, to consult with his narration. The summary of Gurulugomi's

1. Bānabhatta, p. 157.

2. S.N. Dasgupta & S.K.De, History of Sanskrit Literature (Calcutta, 1962) pp. 236-237.

narration is as follows:¹

A prince called Sulukaliṅgu (Cullakālinga) of Dantapura fled away from the city in fear of his brother, the king of the same city who had ordered his arrest, and went to Himavat forest. He walked further inside the forest until he came across a suitable place to live in, admiring the beautiful scenery. He built himself a hut on the bank of a brook, put ascetic's garments on and lived there.

This portion of the story furnishes the author with adequate scope to describe various aspects of nature. Gurulugomi describes them elegantly as if they were seen by his main character, prince Sulukaliṅgu, while walking through the forest. Among the word pictures drawn by the author, the fighting of elephants in rut, clusters of blood-stained pearls falling onto the green sward from the foreheads of elephants which had been split by the claws of lions, siddhas accompanied by their beloveds, blossoming trees with humming bees can vividly be seen.

The next episode introduces princess Madhu, the second character, who also came to the same forest with her parents in fear of enemies who had surrounded their kingdom seeking her hand. This episode is narrated

1. Dharmapradīpikāva, pp. 296-302.

briefly without any rhetorical ornamentation. Thereafter, the rainy season, the autumn, and the spring are delineated picturesquely one after the other by the use of various figures of speech and highly ornamented style. However, the author was careful for his description of seasons to be kept close to the main character so that it would not obstruct the flow of the narration. This takes the reader to the very important turning point of the story where the prince and the princess meet together, for which this description provides an apt setting.

Gurulugomi begins his description of the rainy season by saying 'the rainy season came as though to comfort the younger prince Kāliṅga, who was oppressed by the fierce heat and far removed from the luxuries of Viceroyship.' And he ends it with 'altogether the rainy season brought no coolness for the younger prince Kāliṅga, rather it was as a great heat which scorched him.' Then he describes the autumn that brought him happiness and refreshment, and, thereafter the spring which gave him the unexpected chance to meet the princess Madhu. The spring, according to the description, adorned the world with its various aspects; it

painted the world with the pollen of various flowers; drove the cuckoos to song; made the flocks of intoxicated peacocks spread their tail-feathers and cry out; fulfilled the heart's desire of stag and doe, maddened the must elephants; caused the forest to burgeon with tender leaves and flowers; caused the bees to hum; caused the petals of fully blossomed water-lilies to be scattered by the rings of breaking waves which spread from the breasts of swans as they struck the water of the forest lakes; brought pollen to the mass of lilies and lotuses, drove the swarm of humming bees to the champak, hora and sai groves; united the separate; fulfilled the hearts' desire of the united and drove those in the prime of youth to the forest, mad for sport. By this time the princess Madhu, inspired by the fascinating beauty of the season, adorned herself with flowers and went for a walk through the groves while her parents were out searching for fruits. She gathered many beautiful flowers and fashioned them into a chaplet. Wearing the chaplet in her hair she climbed a mango tree, played there for some time and then floated the chaplet down the stream. She engaged herself in this game for several days. One day the chaplet of flowers which she threw thus on to the water floated

down stream and circled the younger prince Kāliṅga as he rose from the water after bathing. The prince, seeing the chaplet thought: 'This is the handiwork of a girl in her first youth.' Filled with curiosity to see the imagined maiden he set forth upstream looking at groves carefully, and eventually came across her playing on the mango tree. They talked to each other and understood that both belonged to the Ksatriya clan. He asked for her hand and she agreed; nothing obstructed their union.

The author here pays great attention to depicting their conversation dramatically. He delineated it by employing direct speech. Through this narration he is able to present both the prince and the princess before the reader in their persons. The princess was taken to a grove by the prince and was enraptured with his touch. At their first union they are enamoured with hearts touched by brand new romantic feelings. They embraced each other, overpowered by love, and stayed there for a while in the greatest ecstasy they ever experienced in their lives. The princess, enthroned in the heart of Sulukaliṅgu, was led back to her monastery and both waited there until her parents returned. She revealed every thing regarding their

first meeting before her parents and introduced her suitor. The parents greeted him, listened to his story and consented to their marriage. The new couple lived happily, blessed by the parents of both sides, and ten months later, they got a blissful son named prince Kāliṅga. He was nurtured delicately by both the parents and the grand parents. When he grew old enough to hold the burden of kingship he was permitted to proceed to his father's home country on an auspicious day. By this time the king Mahākāliṅga was dead and his ministers were searching for a prince to be crowned. When the young prince Kāliṅga arrived in Dantapura he was recognized by tokens by a former minister, an intimate friend of his father Cullakāliṅga, and was led to the palace in triumph. Thus the prince Kāliṅga succeeded his uncle in the city of Danta.

Guruḷugomi's narration of the above story not only furnishes the narration of the Cullakāliṅgabodhijātaka in the Mahābodhivamsa with a necessary prologue but also brings about a perfect artistic creation as a whole. He seems to have gained much inspiration from Sanskrit poetics as well as from influential Sanskrit writers like Daṇḍin and Bāṇabhaṭṭa. The Kādambarī of Bāṇabhaṭṭa might have strongly influenced our author

when he was writing Sulukaliṅgudā. Though it sounds ludicrous to compare this small piece of creative writing with such a voluminous work as the Kādambarī, a narration which interweaves a series of stories, episodes and descriptions, the fact that Bāna influenced Gurulugomi seems to us unmistakable. As in the case of Kādambarī the plot of Gurulugomi's composition mainly concerns a love affair of a prince and a princess. In the Kādambarī the love affairs of Candrāpīda and Kādambarī play the predominant role among its stories.¹ Candrāpīda, the son of king Śūdraka in Vidisā, met Kādambarī who lived at Hemakūta while he was travelling in the forest. Every major event of the narration took place in the forest, remote from the city. Bāna seems to have preferred to take away some of his characters, including Candrāpīda, immediately after their performing some duties in the city, to the remote forest with the intention of delineating nature, as well as to open the way for them to meet with other characters who inhabited the forest. Gurulugomi did the same as Bāna did. But all his characters came from cities. No character appears from the true inhabitants of the forest like Kādambarī, Mahāśvetā and so forth in the Kādambarī;

1. In the Kādambarī there are two love stories, viz., the episode of Mahāśvetā and Pundarīka and the episode of Candrāpīda and Kādambarī. See Kādambarī, translated, C.M. Riding (London, 1896), Introduction, pp. VIII-X.

none of them belongs to any species like apsaras or gandharva. All of them were human beings and members of the same ksatriya clan.

The story of the Kādambarī opens the way to its lovers to unite at the end in spite of various obstacles which prevent them from union; Candrāpīda marries Kādambarī and Fundarīka marries Mahāśvetā. We have seen that the lovers in Gurulugomi's composition also were led to a happy union, but without any obstacle. Since the Kādambarī provides the author with a large scope in time and space, he enjoys more chances than Gurulugomi and can delineate various aspects of the mental and physical actions of his characters. Bāna's narration which intertwines a series of stories and descriptions by employing a system of 'setting a story within a story'¹ is a very complicated one; it always goes on an oblique line; the reader finds it difficult to reach its main plot. In contrast to the Kādambarī, Gurulugomi's narration which does not entangle such a series of plots and characters proceeds rather quickly towards the main event as a one-act drama. Its main character is encircled by subordinate characters, though the story takes a sudden turn in the latter part of the narration

1. S.N. Dasgupta & S.K.De, op.cit., pp. 231 ff.

where the younger prince Kaliṅgu starts to play the predominant part. Bāṇa's characters, whether they are main or subordinate ones, appear to have behaved much more freely than Gurulugomi's.

As we have seen here, whatever differences between these narrations there may be, they do not damage their affinity which results from the same poetic background. Both works seem to have adopted more or less the same poetical devices and theories in order to develop their plots, to depict situations and describe nature and other requisite objects. As we mentioned elsewhere, a tendency for artificial decoration was increasing at the time of Bāṇa. It gave rise to a highly ornamented kāvya style which was rightly called 'vicitra-mārga' by Kuntaka.¹ In this kāvya style a short plot of a poem is elaborated to a large extent, by inserting detailed descriptions of nature and otherwise. As a result of this, the delineation of nature and other objects may occupy a considerable part of the work while the actual plot becomes secondary. Besides long descriptions, there is a continuous effort to adorn the subject matter through various other poetic skills. Bāṇa undoubtedly must have been influenced

1. Vakrokti-Jivita, ed. S.K.De (Calcutta, 1961) vv.34-43, pp. 34-35.

by the current literary tendency of his age, whereas Gurulugomi who lived some five centuries later might have been inspired by the same literary concepts through the works of Bāna and other writers of the same school.

The main plot of Gurulugomi's composition contains the accidental union of Cullakālinga and the princess Madhu caused by fate or daiva.¹ Two-thirds of the composition is devoted to elaborating this short plot while the rest is occupied by the story of the young prince Kālinga who became emperor after his uncle's death. Gurulugomi who was fond of highly ornamented descriptions in accordance with the so-called vicitra-mārga developed this plot by inserting various descriptions in it. Though he was engrossed in giving fanciful descriptions he was careful that the story did not lag behind. Gurulugomi was always true to his main plot and he never neglected its important parts. At the very outset of the composition the author removed his main character from the city and took him to the forest so as to pave the way for the description of nature. The peculiarity of his narrative system, however,

1. Gurulugomi quotes a verse from the Ratnāvalī to imply that it was a meeting that took place by chance. Dharmapradipikā, p.300.

rests on his skilful continuous effort to keep the descriptions close to his characters and to make them remain within the intended limits. Unlike Bāna, Gurulugomi had a very good sense of proportion. Though his descriptions are decorative and full of conventional figures of speech they do not halt the movement of his story. The author appears to be so skillful that his descriptions move onwards hand in hand with his characters. The descriptions of nature, seasons and male and female beauty are not seen as patches artificially inserted into the plot. They appear to be attached intrinsically to the body of the prose poem.

Suppose one should say, disagreeing with the way of Gurulugomi's narration, that his descriptions of seasons are not merged into the main plot and that they can be removed easily without doing any damage to the flow of narration. Our answer is no; they are inserted into it in an appropriate way, the removal of which halts the normal flow of the story. Our answer is given for two reasons; first, they furnish the plot with a suitable atmosphere which nurtures the main characters, especially the character of Sulukaliṅgu, and secondly, they open the way for us to enter into the mental world of the characters nurtured by that

atmosphere. The first is concerned with the design of the author and the second with the aesthetics. Gurulugomi, through his descriptions of seasons, seems to have thought to imply the sojourn of Sulukaliṅgu in the forest, sunk deeply into loneliness and overpowered by natural human feelings. The gloomy rainy season symbolizes loneliness, the grim life filled with sorrow and grief which Sulukaliṅgu had to face just after his arrival in the forest, deprived of princely life. The impressive atmosphere of the spring, on the other hand, arouses the feelings of the lovers which led them to union.

Further, from the point of view of Rasa theory, these descriptions play an important role in the development of rasa as intended by the author. According to the rasa theorists the erotic (śṛṅgāra) is one of the foremost among all rasas. It is the chief sentiment of Gurulugomi's prose poem. The love episode of Sulukaliṅgu and the princess Madhu makes up the main theme of this composition. Love is the permanent mood (sthāyībhāva) of the erotic. This main rasa is divided into two classes, love in union and love in separation (sambhoga and vipralambha). The first of these two

sorts is successfully depicted by Gurulugomi. The delineation of the first union of the lovers on the shore of the stream surrounded by charming scenery conveys the climax of 'union in love'. As far as rasa theorists are concerned there are two excitants (vibhāvas) which awaken or foster the sentiment of love in the hearts of lovers or of connoisseurs, namely the substantial (ālambana) and the enhancing (uddīpana).¹ The characters of the lovers in this composition serve as the substantial excitant, while their exceeding beauty and the spring with its various impressive features play the part of the enhancing excitant. Gurulugomi's delineation of the heightened beauty of the spring in which his lovers met each other prepares an apt environment to increase the emotion of love in both the lovers and the connoisseurs. On the other hand, Gurulugomi seems to have attempted to convey 'love in separation' through the delineation of the rainy season which affected the main character deeply and caused him to feel grief and loneliness.

1. According to Bharata the unity of vibhāva, anubhāva and vyabhīcaribhāva gives rise to rāsas or sentiments. (vibhāva-anubhāva-vyabhīcāri-samyogāt rasanispattiḥ). See Nāṭyaśāstra, ed. M. Ramakrishnakavi, (Baroda, 1926), p. 274.

Here, the poet was able to depict the tormented mentality of the prince Sulukaliṅgu by delineating his mental and physical changes which coincided with the changes of weather in the rainy season.

This discussion shows how nicely Gurulugomi has inserted his descriptions into the main plot and in doing so how far he had been inspired by the works of Bānabhaṭṭa and the literary tendencies they exemplified.

Amāvatura

We do not find any other prose poem which follows the line of Sulukaliṅgudā in its spirit and style, among the stories related by Gurulugomi. He made no attempt to carry this new mode of writing which appeared in the Sulukaliṅgudā any further or to exercise it more effectively in his second work, the Amāvatura. Instead, there he seems to have exercised his inventive skill in a rather different way. The construction, style and the language of the Amāvatura, in fact, display a vast difference when they are compared with those of the former work. Nevertheless, no one can say that they are exclusively invented for the purpose of the Amāvatura because they could be seen in a somewhat immature form in stories other than the Sulukaliṅgudā of the Dharmapradīpikāva.¹ The simplicity, straightforwardness and vigour that lie in the language and the style of those stories in the Dharmapradīpikāva seem to have been developed to a great extent by the author when he was writing the Amāvatura.

So much has been written about this work that one can hardly add any thing new to the assessment of its literary merits. Some literary historians and critics

1. Sinhalese Literature, p. 59.

tend to appraise the work as a perfect creative writing, disregarding its interpretative aspect, while others consider the matter differently.¹ It seems to be still disputed whether this work should be regarded as a translation or a perfect artistic creation. In fact, one cannot deny either its interpretative aspect or at the same time its creative aspect. It is, however, desirable in this respect to pay our attention to the latter part of this problem first, since we shall deal in detail with its role as a translation later on.

The Amāvatura, as we have mentioned earlier, was written for an edifying purpose - that is to say to benefit the readers, in the author's words 'less learned virtuous or intelligent people',² with devotional faith towards the Buddha which, as he thought, should be based on the proper understanding of the Master's unparalleled virtues. By his own account at the outset, he pays special attention to extolling one aspect of Buddha's virtues, namely his quality as 'purisadammasārathī', one of the nine virtues vested

-
1. M.Wickramasinha, Sinhala-Sāhityaye Nāgīma (Colombo, 1945), pp. 82-96;
Butsarana, ed. W.Sorata, Introduction, p.II.
 2. A.Kulasuriya interprets the word 'noviyat' as the common people who do not know Pali and Sanskrit but only Sinhalese.
See Sinhalasāhityaya, I, p.139.

in the Buddha which is said to have empowered him to tame beings of hardened disposition. Under this theme he outlines the whole life of the Buddha and various important incidents connected with it. Of the eighteen chapters the work consists of, the first three, which are devoted to narrating briefly the whole life of the Buddha beginning from his first assurance (of becoming a Buddha) from the Buddha Dīpaṅkara up to the attainment of Parinirvāṇa. These chapters are entitled respectively: the taming of the stubborn (durdānta-damana), the taming of one's own mind (svasantāna-damana) and the taming of the minds of others (parasan-tānadamana). Thereafter, he narrates stories meant to be illustrative of Buddha's ability to subjugate beings of hardened disposition including various types of human beings, devas, brahmas, nagas, yakkhas and asuras. Gurulugomi made use of this theme to link up the chain of his stories. As Martin Wickramasinha pointed out, the Amāvatura bears a unity of construction and purpose from beginning to end which is certainly lacking in many Sinhalese works. ¹

Though Gurulugomi drew his materials from canonical works and commentaries he has made a certain attempt to

1. Simhalasāhityayē Nāgīna, p.87.

give each of his stories individuality and a new look through his own genius, experience and distinctive skill in using the language. In the Amāvatura the author seems to have exercised two ways of narrating the subjects selected, viz., abridged form and descriptive form. Sometimes he preferred to give only the abstract of what he has drawn from the Pali sources by avoiding details, no matter how far the Pali was lengthened by elaborate descriptions. This form of narration can be seen in the first three chapters where he narrates the life of the Buddha very briefly. In the first chapter he provides a summary of two hundred and eight Jātakas¹ in order to illustrate how the Buddha while yet a bodhisatva tamed stubborn beings of various categories and set them on the right path. The second and the third chapters are devoted to narrating the life of the Buddha. There he so abridged the life story of the Buddha which had been elaborately described by the Pali commentators as to accommodate it within a limited number of pages by paying special attention to the incidents which showed how the Buddha tamed his own mind and the minds of others. Gurulugomi's version of Buddha's life, though

1. Amāvatura, pp. 1-5.

it is true to its Pali source, strikes the readers as an independent new production. He narrates what he draws from the Pali in a manner of charming simplicity as if he were producing a creation of his own. Sometimes his characters and situations which are saturated with his personal touch may be vividly present before the reader and seem more lively than their original forms.

Here we refer to a piece of his narration which may show something of the way in which he dealt with the subject. The following passage is cited from his description of Prince Siddhārtha's great renunciation:

' ekalhi diva-saran baṅḍu satalis-dahasak naluvo sav-baranin sādī pasaṅgaturu gena mahapurisā pirivarā nātun gaṅḍāv pāvāt-vū-ha. ekenchi maha-bōsatānō nidanta van-ha. ovun nidana sē dāka taman, taman gat pasaṅgaturuyehi vātira heva nidanta van-hu. ekalhi maha-bōsatānō pibida yahana-mattē palak bāṅḍa hunnāhu gaṅḍa-tela diliyena pahanin nidi gat māgamun nāhā, haṅḍavanuvan miyen vāhena kelin tet-siruru ātiya-vun dat kanuvan yala-kāta ātiyavun kasnavun valapnavun no muvaha-rahas-piyes ātiyavun dugaṅḍa-vā vihidunavun, dāka sanvēga koṭa śakra-bhavanayak bandu mahal-talaya amu-sohonak sē vatahā giya-kalhi mulu-tun-lev gini gat geyak sē dāka ada mā pāviji vannata giya mānavā yi yahanin nāgī gos hini gēhi hot san-maha-āmattā pobayā gena asakku sadā gena enu koṭa as halata naṅgā yavū-hu.¹

1. Amavatura, ed. Sorata, p. 11.

' At that time forty thousand dancing girls resembling divine damsels began dancing and singing in the presence of the Bodhisatva playing with five kinds of musical instruments. The Bodhisatva fell asleep. The dancing girls too noticing that the prince was fast asleep fell on their instruments and began to sleep. The Bodhisatva got up after a while and sat on the bed and saw them sleeping in the light of the oil lamp; some were making noises with their noses; others were wet with the spittle dropping from mouths; some were grinding their teeth; some had their mouths opened; some were coughing and groaning; others had uncovered genitals, and some were breaking wind. Seeing them the Bodhisatva was filled with apprehension and perceived that the three worlds are like a burning house, regarding his own palace as a cemetery with corpses cast there unburied. The Bodhisatva having decided to renounce the worldly life on that day asked one of his ministers by name Channa who was sleeping in a chamber (where the ladder or stairs are) to bring a horse.'

Comparing this version of Gurulugomi with that of the Jātakatthakathā,¹ it is reasonable to feel that

1. Jātakatthakathā (SHB), ed. W.Piyatissa (Colombo, 1926), Part I, pp. 59-60.

Gurulugomi portrays the situation in a more lively way than the author of the latter. Gurulugomi who concentrated on the abstract of what its original says was not enslaved to the words of it. And at the same time he did not distort the meaning. What he has actually done is to leave some words and clauses out which he felt were less necessary or less important and to reproduce the same situation in his own words by entering into it through his mind's eye. The author of the Jātakatthakathā describes Bodhisatva's sleep by these words: 'bodhisatto kilesesu virattacittatāya muluttam niddam okkami'. 'The Bodhisatva slept for a while because he was of a mind detached from worldly pleasure.' The author of the Amāvatura who leaves out a part of the Pali sentence abridges it in a very short simple sentence; it reads: 'ekenehi mahabōsatānō nidanta vanha'. 'At that moment the Bodhisatva began sleeping'. Some one who isolates this sentence from the context might accuse Gurulugomi of distortion of the original sense. But there appears little justification for such an accusation. Gurulugomi might have been of the view that the Bodhisatva's indifferent attitude towards worldly pleasure would not

be worthy of mention here, for this idea was conveyed through the preceding incidents. The author who was keenly interested in the straightforwardness of his writing might have preferred to give the whole sense in just a few words but charged with meaning. It seems that the indifferent attitude of the Bodhisatva is so left as to suggest itself.

The second aspect of his narration, the descriptive form, is evidenced by almost all chapters other than the first three of the Amāvatura. The main characteristic of this narrative form is to furnish the story with more and more details as far as he could gather them from different sources. He develops the story by inserting those details in an appropriate way. He does not allow them to overshadow or to distort the main story. Nor are they allowed to occupy it disproportionately. It is of great significance that though he was interested in this method of narration he never adapted the descriptive style of narration exercised in the Sulūkalingudā in order to enlarge the stories in the Amāvatura. Gurulugomi, avoiding that ornamented kāvya style, appears to have attempted to relate them more realistically so that they may

strike the hearts of his readers, the less learned virtuous or intelligent people. The incidents which have been given the most important place in his narration are drawn from different sources. Sometimes Gurulugomi's desire to provide more details may damage the artistic value of the narration.¹ For instance, in the story of converting Aṅgulimāla where materials are gathered from the Aṅgulimāla-sutta in the Majjhima-nikāya, the Papañcasūdanī, its commentary, and the Manorathapurānī, Aṅgulimāla's whole life is narrated from beginning to end. If the author had really been true to his main theme he should have stopped the flow of the story just after the main incident, viz., the subjection of Aṅgulimāla, has come to the climax. But Gurulugomi carries it further till nearly the end of Aṅgulimāla's life by relating many incidents concerning his attainment of arhatship, some immediate effects he had to cope with as a consequence of his own karma and his treatment to pregnant women. Gurulugomi's enthusiasm for developing stories in this way can also be seen in the story of Upāli the house-holder, where he narrates a series of stories including the episode of Ditṭhamaṅgalikā. This form of descriptive narration

1. A.V. Suravira, Simhalasāhitya-Sampradāya (Nugegoda, 1966) p.114.

however, seems to be inspired by the traditional way of relating stories.

Butsarana

The Butsarana of Vidyācakravartī on the other hand, though it belongs to the same category as the Amāvatura differs from it in many ways despite certain similarities. As we have seen earlier some of his subject matter has been drawn from much the same sources. Like Gurulugomī, Vidyācakravartī too meant to write his work for the benefit of ordinary Buddhist devotees.¹ The structural design of the Butsarana also corresponds with that of the Amāvatura. But Vidyācakravartī's approach to his work by which he intended to reach the hearts of his readers shows a remarkable distinction from Gurulugomī's. His setting and style as well as language show Vidyācakravartī's effort to invent a new approach which appears to be more effective than the other on later prose writers. His new approach, which was probably a derivative form of the current literary tendency of his age, would have had much appeal for many readers and hearers among congregations gathered in preaching halls where it was read aloud by monks rhythmically. The auditory pattern —

1. Vidyācakravartī employs the word 'satpurusa' (virtuous people) in order to denote his readers and hearers.

Butsarana, pp.1, 291.

the melodious texture, one of the main characteristics of this approach — itself shows that the text was meant to be read at gatherings of worshippers, whereas Gurulugomi's approach appears to be more fitting for readers than hearers. The high ornamentation and verbosity, as opposed to the simplicity and straightforwardness of the Amāvatura, are more effective on the emotional who admire it for arousing their emotional feelings. Undoubtedly this kind of approach can be applied more appropriately in a devotional work like the Butsarana.

Unlike Gurulugomi, Vidyācakraṃvartī provided much space in his work to the descriptions of different aspects of Buddha's ninefold virtues, though the significance of the single word 'Buddha' permeates them throughout. By the help of this internal coherence he no doubt intended to retain the unity of his different subjects described in the work. All the main descriptive passages and stories of the Butsarana are ended by repeating the words: 'budun sarāṇa yemi'vi butsarana yāyutu!', 'it is meet to take refuge of the Buddha, and so saying I take refuge in the Buddha', as if following the same lines as the Amāvatura where each

chapter ends by reminding us of the main theme of the author, namely, the epithet 'purisadammasārathī' This feature of the Butsarana which runs from beginning to end not only keeps the unity of its subjects but also prevents it from falling into the category of 'catalogue of powers and virtues of the Buddha', which is what Wickramasinha accused it of being.¹

Vidyācakravartī's descriptive passages, full of oft-repeated expressions and strings of consciously chosen epithets in praise of the Buddha, are really reminiscences of the 'stotra' form that we dealt with earlier. These passages which have nothing in common with the Amāvatura in their spirit or form, undoubtedly accord with the main purpose of the author, though they sometimes seem to damage the unity of the work as a whole. Such passages, in contrast with the praises put into the mouths of his characters, are neither particularly effective nor rich in sentimental value. Let us compare such a descriptive passage with a eulogy put into the mouth of a character:

'dora dora nāṅgi saṅḍak sē hāma satun tamatamā
jīvitayak sē no hākila pipivanin siṭinā ratpiyumak
sē kararasa nāti va amarasa gat mahamuhudak sē

1. Simhalasāhityayē Nāgīma, p.102.

'hāmakalhi ma aḍu no va siṭṭinā pun saṅḍak sē
 panupilavun no van mihivadayaḥ sē senabhaya
 nāti mahamēkuḷak sē.....marukatarehi duṭṭu
 mahavilak sē mululovaṭa amutu va duṭṭu mihiri
 budun sarāṇa yemi yi butsarāṇa yā yutu.'¹

'It is meet to seek refuge of the Buddha saying
 I take refuge in the Buddha for he can be
 compared to a moon that has risen over every
 door, a life which belongs to the whole world
 of living beings, an eternal full-blown golden
 lotus, a sea of ambrosia devoid of salt water,
 an eternal full moon (that does not wax or wane),
 a honey comb devoid of worms and maggots, a great
 cloud without thunderbolts,.....a huge lake seen
 in an arid desert, the sweet Buddha who looks
 ever miraculous.'

The string of similes employed in this long passage
 of one sentence which is rather a production of
 intellectual power than of creative skill is not rich
 enough in vitality to give a gentle shake to the heart
 of the reader or hearer, although the vividness of some
 of these similes and the suggestive power they generate
 do throw a dim light upon the object that is to be
 compared. Instead of deep devotional feelings as
 intended by the author the whole passage merely conveys

1. Butsarāṇa, p.4.

a superficial and slight sense of respect to the Buddha mixed with pleasant and sweet feelings of affection.

But Vidyācakravartī's true and real devotional faith in the Master is seen portrayed vividly in some passages attributed to his characters. Following is such a passage cited from the story of converting Aṅgulimāla:

'datimi svāmīnī, hāṅḍinnemi svāmīnī, mahāmāyā-
dēvinvahan sēgē putanuvanvahansē nuṃba da?
suddhōdanarajjuruvanvahansēgē putanuvanvahansē
nuṃba da? gāttavu karana pav svamīn āsata penini
da? metek tān vāḍiyē hudakalā gāttavu kerehi kalā
karuṇāyen da? divi pamanin sarana vanmi āsa nivī
giyē sita sānahī giyē kalā pav gevī giyē gāttavuta
karuṇā kota vadāla mānava.'¹

'I know thee Lord, I know who thou art. Art thou not the son of Mahāmāyā? Art thou not the son of king Suddhodana? And doth the Lord see the sins that his servant committeth? And hath the Lord come so far out of love for his servant? With all my life I fly to thee for refuge. The fire in my eye is cooled. My heart is calm. My sins have been forgiven me. Be thou kind to thy servant.'

1. Butsarana, p.65.

This praise strikes our heart not simply because of its being narrated by direct speech but because of its sincerity, humility and propriety to the place and the character. Aṅgulimāla who is employed to express the author's own fervent devotion to the Buddha was essentially a man of honest and innocent character as his name Ahimsaka itself suggests though he became a cruel murderer owing to the environment he had to live in. He who had pursued the Buddha first, and had it in mind to murder him and to cut off his fingers eventually reveals naively his genuine feelings mixed with humble respect and affection just at the moment when he realized the great loving kindness and compassion of the Master as contrasted with his own hatred and oppressive feelings. This short passage which may be described as a 'self revelation' of Aṅgulimāla does not contain any sophisticated usage or any figurative devices. No extraordinary epithet is used to extol the Buddha. But every single sentence of this paragraph, though simple and naive in character, as if reflecting those same qualities in the character to whom those words are ascribed, pours forth a sense of respect towards the Master. Here some words like

'svāmīni' (lord) and 'gāttavun' (servant) can be seen repeated. This does not do any damage to the meaning but strengthens it exceedingly. It shows Aṅgulimāla's trend of feeling and behaviour, imbued with respect, affection and fear. The last three sentences of this passage, as their whole meaning and sound themselves suggest, throw a flood-light on the heart of Aṅgulimāla which was experiencing the sentiment of tranquility as a result of extinguishing the internal fire.

This same occasion is pictured by Gurulugomi in these words:

' me vāni siḥhanādayek anekak'haṭa vammē no veyi.
mē mahamāyādēviya putu siddhat mahānara jahuge
garjanā ya mam tiyūnūvāna āti sammāsambudun
visin daknā lada bandemi.' ¹

' Such a majestic sound belongs not to any but to the son of the lady Mahāmāyā; It is the trumpet call of the royal ascetic Siddhat. I am indeed a man who has been visited by the All-Buddha, of piercing wisdom.' ²

It seems that this Gurulugomi's expression which closely follows the original source is not so effective

1. Amāvatura, ed. Sorata, p.92.

2. Anthology of Sinhalese Literature, p.61.

as that of Vidyācakravartī in depicting specific feelings regarding the 'great confrontation' which might stir the pulse of Aṅgulimāla intensively. It does not show a devotional feeling sunk into the depth of his heart, but a superficial magnificence which he imposes on the Buddha. The majestic figure meant to be created through pompous words like 'sinhnādayek' and 'garjanā' soon collapses when it is not supported by the words nearby and the suggestive power of the sentences. Gurulugomi added nothing and created nothing when he was portraying this event but simply translated what the commentator produced.¹ Vidyācakravartī on the other hand, stands on his own feet, though he too turned to the Pali source for his subject matter. What he has created here is his own property.

It seems to be helpful to make a general observation on some peculiarities in the narrative art of Vidyācakravartī in order to distinguish him from Gurulugomi. It has been pointed out that the narration

1. Cf. 'tato coro mahāyam sīhanādo mahantam gajjantam naidam aññassa bhavissati; mahāmāyāya pana puttassa siddhatthassa samanarañño etam gajjitam. ditthovata 'mhi maññe tikhina cakkhunā sambuddhena.'
Papañcasūdanī (PTS), ed. I. B. Horner, III (London, 1933), p. 333.

of Sulukaliṅgudā of Gurulugomi and the narration of Vessantara-jātaka of Vidyācakravartī, though each differs from the other in language and style, have followed one and the same traditional system, that is to say, the Alankāra theory which nurtured Sinhalese poetry for centuries as a main discipline borrowed from Sanskrit poetics.¹ We find that both stories were composed in accordance with this convention. We have seen in our previous discussion of Sulukaliṅgudā how far Gurulugomi was influenced by the convention of the Alankāristas when he was writing his work. He expanded his short plot to such an extent that it runs to more than seven printed pages, by inserting various poetical descriptions into it. Did Vidyācakravartī too follow the same poetical system so as to expand his plot drawn from the Jātakatthakathā or did he try to invent his own system ?

It is necessary in this respect to lay emphasis first of all on the fact that the author of Vessantara-jātaka always gives the most significant place to his story, whereas the reverse is true of Sulukaliṅgudā in which, as in the case of our classical poetry, poetical descriptions occupy more than two-thirds of

1. Siṃhalasāhityasampradāya, p.120.

the work. Similarly, Vidyācakravartī in his stories follows more closely the Pali sources and the conventional material of the Pali commentaries than the conventions of the Alaṅkāristas. This of course does not deny his interest in the Alaṅkāras and the inspiration he received from Sanskrit poetics and Alaṅkāra theory. It is, however, true that he inserted certain descriptive passages into the story when he came to mention certain places and persons of significant character. Such a description can be found at the very outset of the story just after we read the name of Jayaturā, the city where the Bodhisatva's father, king Sañjaya, reigned according to the ten royal virtues. The passage reads:

epura sampatti nāmāti mahamuhudamāda biṅḍena raḷapeḷa
 sē nirantarayen divannā vū panannā vū aśvayangē hēṣāra-
 vayen ēkakōlāla ya. esē ma nānāprakāra vū varṇakambala
 atulā vū noyek rathayehi cakranādayen hā hasti nādayen
 hā saṅkhanādayen hā ekanāda ya. santuṣṭa vū strīpuruṣa-
 yangē nānāprakāra vū maṅgalayehi hā nr̥tyagītavādyapra-
 saṅgayehi gasanalada mihiṅguberohi gambhīradhīranādayen
 'sravaṇaramaṇīya ya. pravīṇavīṇākārayangē vīṇāsvarayen
 sādambara vū nānāprakāra vēsa hā bhūṣaṇayen yukta vū
 sampattīn anūna vū yauvanayen uddāma vū rūpayen manōhara
 vū kulayen anindita vū vidyāyēn parisuddha vū sārasmhi

tanvāsi vū keliyehi vidagdha vū antaraṅgabahiraṅgakār-
yayehi pramādayak nāttā vū gāṇun hā pirimin visin
gāvasīgattē ya'.¹

'This city resounded with the neighing of horses that ceaselessly ran and jumped, like breaking waves in the midst of the great sea of its wealth. It reverberated also with the sound of conches and the trumpeting of elephants and the noise of the wheels of many chariots, spread with blankets of many colours. Pleasant to hear was the firm deep note of the drums beaten at many a festivity and many a festival of dance, songs and music where men and women made merry. Proud were the notes of the lute in the hands of the skilled lute-players. The city was crowded with men and women, decked in manifold array and with many jewels, of much wealth, fiery with youth, of pleasing beauty, of impeccable family, of clearest knowledge, skilled in adornment and skilful at play, not lacking in respect of anything within or without.'²

Anyone who just reads this passage may certainly incline to suppose that Vidyācakravartī had intended to expand his plot within the framework that had been established by the Alaṅkāra convention. There are a few clauses and phrases in this passage which also find their place in the description of Viśālā,³ the city of the Licchavis, which was clearly influenced

1. Butsarana, 291.

2. An anthology of Sinhalese Literature, pp.130-131.

3. Butsarana, pp.154-157.

by the current literary tendencies and conventional modes of thinking. One may think that Vidyācakraṇavartī had a definite picture of a wealthy city in mind that could be employed in any description of a city with slight changes. It is, however, difficult to determine whether his mental picture was given that definite shape by the so-called Alāṅkāristas' conventions or by the traditional thoughts of the Pāli commentators. The construction and the contents of this description, whatever method was employed for the narration of Gaṅgārohaṇakathā, may lead us to think that it is more akin to the tradition of the commentators than to the conventions of Alāṅkāristas, by comparison with a real poetical description. This description, which is designed to depict the richness and the happiness of the city and its people, reminds us of similar descriptive parts in some Pāli commentaries.¹

Vidyācakraṇavartī's description here, like that of commentators, is not highly ornamented with imagery and hyperbole. His description of the forest Himavat put into the mouth of Madri, the consort of Vesaturu (Vessantara), also does not show any relationship with

1. Jātakatthakathā, pp. 2-3;

Madhuratthavilāsinī (Buddhavamsatthakatakā) also gives a traditional description of a city. See op.cit (SHB), ed. Y.Pannananda (Colombo, 1922), p.55.

the Alaṅkāra convention, whereas it is a reproduction of the thoughts of the commentator who described it in the same way.¹ No other evidence (except a very few expressions² that could be found abundantly in any poetical work) is available from the whole narration of Vessantara to testify that this Alaṅkāra convention had influenced the work at all deeply. If Vidyācakravartī really had been so interested in the Alaṅkāra theory as to narrate his story in accordance with it he would not have restricted himself only to these few descriptive passages; undoubtedly he would have adopted other devices too that were followed by the poets of that school in order to decorate it more fascinatingly. And if so, the narration of Vessantara would have abounded with highly ornamented superficial descriptions and various poetical usages that might dominate the real story. As it is, the real story of this narration proceeds onwards as designed, with a substantial power unhampered by irrelevant decorations.

1. The Jātakatthakathā describes it in 23 verses; the description begins as follows: 'evaṃ vatvā puna sā (maddī) diṭṭhapubbaṃ viya himavantappadesaṃ vannaṅṅī āha.'

See op.cit. (SHB), ed. W.Piyatissa (Colombo, 1939), Part VII, pp. 435-436.

2. Butsarana, pp. 293-301.

Vidyācakravartī seems to have created his own narrative diction expressly for relating stories drawn from the Pali works, having received substantial inspiration from the traditional thoughts of the Pali commentators and the current literary tendencies of his age. Both these would have played their parts equally in fostering this diction even though the first aspect is seen more vividly than the latter. However, in some narrations like the description of the dance of Māra's daughters and the preliminary part of the Gaṅgārohanakathā the inspiration of contemporary literary tendencies, especially the Alaṅkāra theory, does take a prominent place. Of these descriptions the first, which seems to be reminiscent of the Sulukaliṅgudā of the Dharmapradīpikāva, is one of the most striking episodes of the Butsarana. Not only its language but also the poetical conventions involved convey some close resemblance to the other. This composition which is intended to depict one of the three main virtues of the Buddha, namely the quality of 'virāga', the extinction of desires that cannot be changed by any kind of enticements worldly or otherwise, is so

arranged as to afford excessive erotic feeling through the loveliness of the surroundings and the fascinating beauty as well as the playful behaviour of the three divine damsels, the daughters of Māra. Purposely at its close an emphasis is laid on the firmness of that virtue in defiance of such an exciting enticement of the damsels. The frequency of images and the exuberance of emotional feeling invested in this description, which give it a poetical shape in accordance with the Alaṅkāra theory, make the occasion more sharp. Although he appears to borrow some ideas for this composition from the Samantakūṭavannaṇā of Vedeha, Keshava showed his skill as a poet to fashion everything he observes and imagines into a tasteful creation within the framework of that literary convention.¹ But he, like Gurulugomi, did not like to apply this narrative form as a usual method for relating stories.

Vidyācakravartī's narrative art that can be found employed in most of his stories, as we mentioned earlier, is his own invention. Indeed it is not a simple mixture of the commentators' tradition and the

1. cf. Samantakūṭavannaṇā, ed. C.E. Godakumbara (London, 1958), vv. 419-462 and Butsarana, pp. 21-23.

Alaṅkāra theory. It is an embodiment or collective form of three main forces, namely the current literary tendencies of his time which comprise scholastic speculations and the conventions of Sanskrit poetics, the tradition of the Pali commentators and the motifs of folk lore. Contemporary scholarship, except in few cases, was more or less affected by the radiation of these current forces. Vidyācakravartī, no doubt, was a very erudite scholar, well versed in many subjects of art and science as far as his knowledge could get; not only the works of doctrine and philosophy but also those on poetics and many other subjects written in Pali and Sanskrit, that were known to the contemporary learned circles, must have been studied by him. Similarly he must have received much inspiration from his surroundings - that is to say, from the common folk among whom he was actually born and nurtured, and lived until his death. Vidyācakravartī's narrative art was the result of his erudition and originality combining under the influence of these current forces. Gurulugomī's narrative art on the other hand, which was hardly penetrated by the vital features of folk lore, tends to proceed on a scholarly

or more sophisticated line. The real face of this narrative art with its spirit and vitality can be seen in the Sulukaliṅgudā of the Dharmapradīpikāva while its modified form is available in the stories of the Amāvatura.

Unlike Gurulugomī, Vidyācakravartī nearly always consciously or unconsciously widened his scope and seems careful to take account of his own experience and the inspiration received from folk lore within his narrations in the Butsarana. The following short passage may illustrate how widely this inspiration of folk lore was effective in the construction of his narrative art:

'pavkiḷiya, tō dat'hunu naramahallakūṭa mehe kerēyi da? mē kadadat mahallāṭa tī dun tigē demavpiyō tīṭa satura van-ha. tī unṭa apriya vana niyā ya. tō pin no kaḷa pāvattiyaka bandehi. tī giyajātiyehi kavuḍuvanṭa piṇḍu dun-kala tī lū bat kāyē mahalu kavuḍuvaku vana. esē heyin (vada) tī mē nara mahallāṭa aṃbu vūye? yehēli mesē vū jaraham mahallā hā ek va pañcakāmaṣa-yehi kavara nam ālmek da? ohu kadadat dalvā gena sena vēlehi tīṭa kavara nam samādhiyek da? kiṃbul-piṭak sē korasādi vū ugē 'sarīrayehi gāvī kavara āsvādayek da? soṇḍura, tigē molok vū 'sarīraya mirikā e bamuṇu kanāṭuvāṭa mehe koṭa duk no gena tī sē vū abhirūpa vū ladaru sāmiyaku soyā gana.'¹

1. Butsarana, pp. 311-312.

'Wretch, do you serve an old gray-beard with no teeth? Your parents who gave you to this toothless old man certainly did you an ill deed. They must have hated you. You are a wretched girl, without merit. When you gave food to crows in your past birth, it must have been an ancient crow who ate your morsel. This must be why you have become wife to this old gray-beard. Friend, what pleasure is there in fleshly delights with such a wrinkled old man? When he smiles his toothless smile, what peace can it bring you? What enjoyment can there be in touching his body that is as rough as the back of a crocodile? My dear, do not trouble yourself to serve this old lump of a brahmin and tire your tender body, but find yourself a handsome young husband like yourself.'¹

These abusive words aimed at Amittatāpā, the wife of the Brahmin Jūjaka, are put into the mouths of village maidens who gathered at the well. They have the naive and real flavour of the common folk. At the same time they high-light Vidyācakravartī's virtuosity that was tempered and experienced in this field. The intonation of this conversation which accords with the mental process of his characters, and the naivety of similes and expressions, as well as the straightforwardness and tangibility of many

1. Anthology of Sinhalese Literature, p. 147.

words in this passage have much in common with folk-sayings and display some of Vidyācakravartī's materials out of which his narrative art was made. Though it does not need a commentary to this passage in order to show its close relation with country folk, there is one expression which should be paid special attention. The phrase which is intended to set out the concept of karma and rebirth casts light on a new aspect of the author's skill. According to the village maiden who was involved in this dialogue, the marriage of Amittatāpā to such an ugly creature as that old Brahmin Jūjaka was a result of her past karma. The food she had given to crows in her past birth had been gobbled by an old crow.¹ In fact, all these suppositions and beliefs that have sunk into the depth of the Sinhalese mentality which has been disciplined by Buddhist thought for centuries, must have been well understood by the author. The withering sarcasm in some words and expressions in this passage remind us of the naivety and crudeness of ironical usages abundantly found in common intercourse. This shows how far Vidyācakravartī was inspired by the motifs of folk-lore in addition to his inspiration from the other literary traditions.

1. This supposition is absolutely Vidyācakravartī's own creation. Nothing resembling this expression can be traced in the episode of Jūjaka of the Vessantarajātaḥ in the Jātakatthakathā.

See Jātakatthakathā, pp.458-459.

Chapter V

A Comparative Study of the
Sasadāvata and the Muvadevdāvata

(a) An observation on the Concept of Poetry :

It seems necessary to make an observation on the concept of poetry by treating the views of the exponents of Indian schools of poetics, with special reference to Sinhalese literary traditions as a means of understanding of Sinhalese poetry. The Siyabaslakara, the earliest work on poetics written in Sinhalese, which followed closely the theories expounded by Dandin, the author of Kāvya-darśa, laid down that poetry (kāvyā) is divided into three, namely verse, prose and mixed.¹ This classification clearly shows that our earliest rhetorician, like many other literary critics, acknowledged the term poetry as a generic usage that could be commonly employed to denote every poetic expression despite its various genres or categories. In fact, he did not give any definition to the term, yet he hastens to define its body. The body of poetry, according to him, consists of a series of words calculated to convey aptly a

1. Siyabaslakara, edited by H. Nanatilaka and H. Nanasiha (Colombo, 1933), ch.1, v.12.

desired meaning.¹ And at the same time he holds the view that this body of poetry differs from the alaṅkāras, the figures of speech which embellish the poetic expressions.

It is of note in this respect, that this metaphorical expression 'body of poetry' with its implied 'soul of poetry' plays an important part in Sanskrit poetics throughout its history. S.K.De is of the opinion that this conception takes its origin from the allegory of the 'Veda Puruṣa' in the Rgveda, on the analogy of which Rājasekhara, the author of the Kāvya-Mīmāṃsā, has created his 'Kāvya puruṣa'.² According to Rājasekhara, the body of 'kāvya puruṣa' is composed of words and meanings while moods and sentiments make up its soul.³

It seems that almost all literary theorists in Sanskrit poetics were unanimous when they postulate the body of poetry. The postulate of the soul of poetry however, brought about different views among them.

-
1. Siyabaslakara, ch.1, v. 11.
 2. S.K.De, History of Sanskrit Poetics (Calcutta, 1960), Part II, p.35.
 3. Kāvya-Mīmāṃsā, ed. Gangasagara Rai (Varanasi, 1964), chapter 3, pp. 16 ff.

Vāmana, the author of the Kāvya-lankāra-Sūtra, made 'Rīti'¹ (style or diction) to be the soul of poetry while the Dhvanikāra laid down Dhvani or 'vyāgyārtha'² (suggested meaning) as the soul. Viśvanātha who rendered the final contribution to this metaphorical concept comprehended all the elements of poetry discussed by the previous writers. According to him, word and meaning are the body of poetry while sentiments are the soul.³ Some early writers like Bhāmaha and Dandin did not give any definite view on this conception of 'soul' though they seem to have discerned it vaguely. Bhāmaha proposed to take vakrokti as the underlying principle of artistic expression⁴ on which Rājānaka Kuntaka based his new theory of vakrokti. Dandin, going a step further, designates the gunas as the prānas or life-breath of diction which is, in his view, an integral part of poetry.⁵ The author of the Siyabasilakara also preferred to use the term pana (Sk. prāna) instead of guna in the

-
1. Kāvya-lankāra-Sūtra-Vṛtti, ed. Narayana Nathaji, Kulkarni (Poona, 1927), p.4.
 2. Dhvanyāloka, ed. Jagannatha Pathak (Varanasi, 1965), p.8 ch.1, v.1.
 3. Sāhitya-Darpana, ed. P.V.Kane (Bombay, 1923), ch.1, p.3. 'kāvyaśya śabdārthau sarīram, rasādiścātma, guṇāḥ saur-caryādivat, doṣāḥ kaṇṭādivat, rītayovayavaḥ samsthāna viśeṣavat, alāṅkārah kaṭāka-kunḍalādivat'.
 4. Kāvya-lankāra, ed. P.V.Naganatha Sastri (Delhi, 1970), p.49, v.85.
 5. Kāvya-darśa, ed. S.K.Belvalkar (Poona, 1924), ch.1, v.42.

Kāvya-darśa.¹ It is however, difficult to decide whether he used the term consciously to connote a special significance concerning the metaphorical conception of poetry or otherwise. But it is worthy of note that there was an attempt among some literary theorists to postulate another concept - what we call the life of poetry. Ksemendra, the systematiser of the theory of Aucitya who wrote the Aucityavicāra-Carcā for this purpose, laid down that aucitya or propriety is the life (jīvita) of poetry. He emphasised its essentiality saying: 'Enough with alaṅkāras; of what use are the gunas if there is no life there? Ornaments are ornaments; excellences are excellences; but aucitya is the life of rasa-ensouled kāvya'.² Kuntaka on the other hand, was considering the vitality of vakrokti as the underlying animating principle of poetry. He set up it to be the life of the vicitra-mārga, one of the three dictions or modes of writing expounded by him.³ Prāna or jīvita, in the above cases more or less equivalent in meaning, seem to have differed from ātman or the soul. Whether those who did not give any definite view on the concept of the soul of poetry accepted rasa as the very soul of

1. Siyabaslakara, ch. I, v. 32.

2. Aucitya-Vicāra-Carcā, ed. Acarya Sri Brajmohan Jha (Varanasi, 1964); p. 4, vv. 4-5.

3. Vakrokti-Jīvita, ed. S.K. De (Calcutta, 1961), p. 57, v. 42.

poetry is not clear. As we have seen in the foregoing saying of the Aucitya-Vicāra-Carcā special stress is laid on the rasa of poetry by Ksemendra. Whatever may be the value of this metaphorical conception, one point is clear, viz., that sabda and artha (word and meaning) form the central pivot round which all the theories of Sanskrit poetics move to cope with some deep problems of poetry. Sabda and artha, or more technically vācya and vācaka (expressor and expressed) which, as S.K.De has pointed out¹ originated from grammatical speculation, were taken for granted by many early literary theorists like Bhamaha and Rudrata as an essential part of poetry. Bhamaha's well known view of poetry, viz., 'sabdārthau sahitau kāvyam'² which is followed by Rudrata's saying, 'sabdārthau kāvyam', shows clearly their great attention to the subject. Kuntaka describing Bhamaha's view, stated emphatically that poetry lies neither in sabda nor artha alone, but in both, as in the case of sesamum oil which pervades everywhere in that seed.³ It is perceived that both must be united and are not separable. This is

1. S.K.De, Some Problems of Sanskrit Poetics (Calcutta, 1969), p.2.

2. Kāvya-lankāra, p.6, v.16.

3. Vakrokti-Jīvita, p.7.

revealed not only by literary theorists but also by grammarians and poets. Kālidāsa, the illustrious Sanskrit poet, conveys this inseparable unity of śabda and artha in his meaningful simile in which Pārvatī and Parameśvara are compared to the 'vāk' and the 'artha' respectively.¹

What is really meant by the unity of śabda and artha? What is the peculiar connexion it has with poetry? The unity of śabdārtha indeed is a grammatical fact, common to all utterances, literary and otherwise, and connected with all human activities. So why did Bhāmaha and the like hasten to specify the unity of śabdārtha as poetry? Did they not perceive the differences between poetry and ordinary utterance? As is evident from early Sanskrit rhetorical works, they tried to distinguish poetry from ordinary utterances, especially from the works of śāstra. Bhāmaha at the outset of the Kāvya-lai-kāra, emphatically pointed out: 'unlike the study of śāstra which can be done on the instructions of a teacher by even the dull-witted, poetry is impossible for all but those who possess poetic intuition'.² Further, an

1. Raghu-Vaṃsa, ed. M.R. Kale (Bombay, 1922), ch.1, v.1.

2. Kāvya-lai-kāra, p.2, chapter 1, v.5.

attempt was made by him to distinguish poetry from mere ordinary utterances — what we call vārtā. He emphatically denies vārtā's being poetry, saying: " 'The sun has set; the moon shines, the birds are winging back to their nests.' What kind of poetry is this? This is called vārtā." ¹

Though this view of Bhāmaha was denied by some later writers, ² it is interesting to make a brief note on this point. What Bhāmaha really meant by the term vārtā is still not clear. There is considerable room for doubt whether this refers to mere ordinary utterance and information or expression bereft of vakrokti — 'that is to say, jāti or svabhāvokti'. As has been pointed out by Raghavan the term vārtā was used loosely as a synonym of jāti or svabhāvokti. ³

The Jayamaṅgalā, a commentary on Bhaṭṭi where the term is apparently used as a synonym of svabhāvokti, says: " 'vārtā' is natural description; it is divided into two, visiṣṭa and nirvisiṣṭa; of these, the first is called svabhāvokti; the other is just called vārtā and is not alankāra." ⁴ But in Bhāmaha vārtā is distinguished

1. Ibid., p.50, ch.2, v.97.

2. Kāvyaṅuśāsana, ed. R.C.Parikh & V.M.Kulkarni (Bombay, 1964), p.286.

3. V.Raghavan, Some Concepts of Alankāra Śāstra (Adyar, 1942), p.96.

4. Bhaṭṭi-kāvya (with Jayamaṅgalā), ed. V.N.Sastri & W.L.S.Pansikar (Bombay, 1920) pp.279-280.

from svabhāvokti.¹ The term vārtā and its derivative form 'vārtā' can be found in the Kāvya-darśa and Siyabaslakara respectively.¹ Dandin and the author of Siyabaslakara employed the term when they were discussing a literary excellence called kānti (Sin-danakal).² As is explained by them, the so-called 'kānti-guna' is met with in 'vārtā' and in descriptions. It is mentioned further, that this literary excellence is agreeable to the whole world because it does not transcend reality or the natural order of the world.² It is however, not quite clear from this context whether this refers to ordinary utterance or to a figure of speech as illustrated by Bhatti.

S.K.De is of the opinion that both Bhāmaha and Dandin allude to a figure called vārtā which, according to him, was included in the scope of svabhāvokti.³ Raghavan does not agree and emphatically denies that the term occurring in Bhāmaha refers to an alaṅkāra known by the name of vārtā, which he concludes was used to denote a bold communication of facts.⁴ On the other hand Premacandra,

1. Kāvya-darśa, ch.1, v.85; Siyabaslakara, ch.1, v.53.

2. Ibid, ch.1, v.85.

3. S.K.De, op.cit, part II, p.86.

4. Some Concepts of Alaṅkāra Sastra, p.100.

a commentator of Kāvyaḍarsa, says that this term in Daṇḍin signifies friendly enquiries (anāmaya priyālāpa). He also gives another meaning to the term in some others' views, 'historical description' (itihāsa varṇanā) which means description in harmony with reality.¹ As is implied by the example itself in the Kāvyaḍarsa, vārtā in Daṇḍin seems to differ from a bald communication of facts since the expression in the example is striking though it is not marked by any conventional alaṅkāra.

Now it is evident from the foregoing argument that while Bhaṁaha refers to the term with derision as a name for insipid detailing of some facts, Daṇḍin includes it in poetry and appreciates it greatly. The latter illustrating 'jñāpaka hetu alaṅkāra' quotes the very words of Bhaṁaha's example, considering that alaṅkāra, as 'uttamabhūṣana' or a highly valued ornament.² This subtle argument which involves the chief theorists of Sanskrit poetics shows that from early times there had been certain attempts to define poetry and to determine its demarcations, but that they failed to achieve an unanimous definition. Whatever may be the term used by

1. Kāvyaḍarsa with the Commentary of Premacandra, ed. Kunud Ranjan Ray. (Calcutta, 1956), p. 75.

2. cf. Kāvyaḍarsa, ch. 2, v. 244; Kāvyaḍarsa, ch. 2, vv. 86-87.

them to denote non-poetical expression, all of them seem to have been unanimous on one point, viz., that exquisiteness of word and meaning forms the essence of poetry. This exquisiteness of word and meaning in poetry again, paved the way to the different schools of poetics known by the name of the theory formulated by each protagonist, such as Alankāra, Rīti, Dhavani and so forth. Each school tried to expound its theory based on what each had conceived and regarded as the prime element of poetry. For instance, Bhāmaha, Udbhata and Rudrata were of the opinion that the so-called exquisiteness was caused by the figures of speech, while Vāmana and the Dhvanikāra laid down that it came about as a consequence of diction and suggested meaning respectively. All of them postulated the importance and the necessity of sentiments and literary excellences inherent in poetry as well as the absence of flaws — what we call kāvya-dosa. None of them completely denied or refuted the theories of other schools saying that they do not bring about any extra beauty to poetry, though each judged poetry from different points of view. Actually, their controversy over the problem of poetry was not on the matter of determining the presence

and the absence of the principle element of each theory but on the matter of value-judgement, that is to say, on the point of which should be given the preference in the problem of poetry, or on the point of how the terms should be defined.

Ānandavardhana, for instance, who expounded the Dhvani theory, referred to other theories before he distinguished his own theory.¹ He divided it into three, namely vastu-dhvani, alaṅkāra-dhvani and rasa-dhvani, and made it clear that dhvani predominates in dhvani kāvya.² He also showed that suggested vastus alaṅkāras and rasas bring about more charm to poetry, than those which are bereft of suggestive power. It is of note in this connexion that Ānandavardhana put a special stress on rasadhvani which seems to afford the most weighty criterion by which a poem is to be judged.

As is evident from the above discussion, almost all the theorists we have referred to in one way or another, were of the opinion that the exquisiteness of word and meaning whether it is caused by the Alaṅkāra, Riti, Rasa, Dhvani or any other elements, constitutes the nucleus of poetry. According to them poetry consists

-
1. Dhvanyāloka, ed. Jagannatha Pathak (Varanasi, 1965), p. 17.
 2. Ibid, p. 51.

of word and meaning on the one hand, and of the underlying principle which is meant to bring about embellishment or extra beauty to it, on the other. The problem of the underlying principle of poetry again, which was subjected to even more exhaustive and subtle speculation than the other, played a very important role throughout the history of Sanskrit poetics. Whatever may be the results those speculations brought to the understanding of poetry, they seem to have afforded more and more subtlety and profundity to the field of poetics. However, the problem of poetry remained unsolved. Some later writers who did not expound any specific theory but contributed some interesting works to the field seem to have been inspired and affected by almost all the early theories when they confronted the problem of defining poetry. Jayadeva, the author of Candrāloka for instance, defines poetry by summarizing elements of early theories and says:

' nirdoṣā lakṣaṇavati sarītir guṇabhūṣaṇā
sālakṣaṇararasāneka-vṛttirvāk kāvyanāma bhāk ' ¹

' The word devoid of flaws and consisting of lakṣana, rīti, guṇa, and rasa etc. is called poetry. '

1. Candrāloka, ed. Ananta Rama Sastri Vetal (Benares, 1933), p.4, ch.1, v.8.

Now it is necessary to make an enquiry into the problem of poetry from the standpoint of early Sinhalese literary theorists. The Siyabaslakara, which followed very closely the line of Kāvyaḍarsa, formulated more or less the same views on poetry as its Sanskrit counterpart had done. We have seen at the beginning of this discussion that the author of the Siyabaslakara laid down two main divisions of poetry, viz., the body of poetry, a series of words determined by desired meaning, and alaṅkāra, ornamentation which lends beauty to the poetry. What the author of the Siyabaslakara really meant by the term 'kāmatiya at' (desired meaning) is not quite clear. No doubt he must have used it as a synonym for 'iṣṭārtha' in the Kāvyaḍarsa. An ancient commentary on the Kāvyaḍarsa describes the term 'iṣṭa' in the following words: 'iṣṭatvaṅca saḥityasāstre camatkārapurvakavarnanābhilāsaḥ; camatkārasca lokottarāhladaḥ'.¹ Here the meaning of the term 'iṣṭatva' is the desire for making descriptions marked by sublime delight. It is difficult to know whether our earliest rhetorician knew of this commentator's exposition. But no matter whether he knew or not. Undoubtedly he must have discerned exquisiteness of meaning in poetic expression.

1. Kāvyaḍarsa with original Commentary, ed. Vidyabhusana Pandit Rangacarya Raddhi Sastri (Poona, 1938), p.8.

He knew not only the old metaphorical sense of the body of poetry but also appears to have had some acquaintance with 'jīvita', the life-breath of poetry. He employed the term ('pāna' (Sk. prāna) to denote the literary excellences which were designated as 'guṇa' by Dandin and the like when he was dealing with the 'mārgas' or dictions. The term itself suggests that the author has drawn some inspiration from Vāmana whom he has referred to at the very beginning of the work. As we know Vāmana was the father of the Rīti theory in which he considered Rīti the soul of poetry. In the Kāvyaḍarśa two mārgas were distinctively described, namely Vaidarbha and Gauḍa, the first being given much admiration and priority. Ten literary excellences were also elaborated there as the principle elements of dictions. The Siyabaslakara which consciously left three of them undescribed saying that they were not found in Sinhalese poetry,¹ also gives admiration and priority to the first diction. It really makes us think that the author of the Siyabaslakara was of the opinion that the first mārga was more suitable to Sinhalese poetry than the other. Though the Siyabaslakara like its counterpart is mainly concerned with 'guṇa', 'alaṅkāra' and 'doṣa', it does not neglect the vitality

1. Siyabaslakara, ch.1, v.62.

and essentiality of 'rasa' and 'dhvani',¹ which came to prominence in later times. The term 'rasa' is mentioned there several times with a special stress as if it is an intrinsic element of poetry. The Siyabaslakara speaks of it for the first time when it deals with the characteristics of a 'mahā-kāvya' (long or great poem). As is laid down, the mahā-kāvya should be pervaded throughout with poetic sentiments and moods.² Further, it notes that though such a poem is imperfect in certain aspects it acquires the title of 'mahā-kāvya' if its varieties of sentiments strike men of taste.³ Rasa again, is postulated as an underlying characteristic of 'miyuru pana' (Sk. Madhura Prāna) where it is divided into two, sada-rasa and at-rasa based on alliteration of sounds (srtyānuprāsa) and absence of vulgarity (agrāmyatva) respectively.⁴ At the same time eight kinds of rasas are described briefly, illustrating 'rasavat alaṅkāra'.⁵ It is evident from these views that the author of Siyabaslakara was of the opinion that the rasa in poetry plays a vital part as a means of striking

1. Siyabaslakara, ch.3, vv.402-409.

2. Ibid, ch.1, v.25.

3. Ibid, ch.1, v.27.

4. Ibid, ch.1, vv.35-41 ff.

5. Ibid, ch.2, vv.272-275.

connoisseurs. Its absence according to him brings about mere vulgarity.¹ It is true that rasa is not given such detailed treatment as alaṅkāra in the Siyabaslakara. But it is worthy of note that the treatise emphatically laid down : Granted that each and every figure imbues the meaning with sentiment.² This is a direct and more convincing indication of the main purpose and objective that every poetic expression is ultimately meant to be aimed at.

Apart from this concept of rasa the author is said to have been conversant with the dhvani and aucitya concepts which were no doubt in their embryonic stage.³ He spoke of two kinds of meaning inherent in word, namely 'penerat' and 'at belen ena arut' (primary or denotative meaning and secondary or implied meanings). The first, according to him, is the meaning understood as soon as a word falls on the ear while the latter is considered the meaning conveyed by the light of inference, as in the case of seeing a pot in the light of a lamp. Both meanings are illustrated by the following examples: 'This fat man does not eat during the day-time.' Here the fact that he does not eat during the day is the expressed primary meaning. That he eats at night is the

1. Siyabaslakara, ch.1, v.41.

2. Ibid, ch.1, v.39.

3. A.Kulasuriya, Siyabaslakara Hā Parani Sinhala Kavi Samaya, University of Ceylon Review, 1956, Vol.xiv, pp. 77-78.

meaning implied.¹

These remarks in the Siyabaslakara concerning the twofold meaning of a word, which have no parallel in Dandin, throw light on a new turn of poetic speculation. Do they bear any similarity to the theoretical writings of the Dhvanivādins? It is known that Ānandavardhana, the formulator of the Dhvani theory, based his new theoretical scheme on the function of word and meaning in poetic expression. The function of words as he analysed it becomes effective through a threefold process called 'abhidhā' (denotation), 'lakṣanā' (indication) and 'vyañjanā' (suggestion).² Of these the first and the second are considered drawn from ancient grammatico-poetic speculation of pre-dhvani theorists. The third and by far the most interesting is regarded as his own invention. The explanation of 'abhidheyārtha' (denotative meaning) in Ānandavardhana leads us to think that the denotative meaning and the 'penen'at' in the Siyabaslakara are identical. But the second meaning, viz., the implied meaning or 'at belen ena arut' in the above context cannot be identified either with 'lakṣyārtha' or 'vyangyārtha' in Ānandavardhana, though some extraneous

1. Siyabaslakara, ch.3, vv.397-399 ff.

2. Dhvānyaloka Locāna however describes fourfold functions together with tātparya. op.cit., p.60.

affinities between them which appear on a cursory view make us feel its identity with one or other of them. However, a word used in order to explain the above-mentioned 'atbelen ena arut' may cast some light on what the author of the Siyabaslakara meant by it. In the author's words it is the meaning conveyed through inference (anumenen dānena). It is of note in this respect that there was a poetic theory called 'anumiti' (inference) which became popular among some Sanskrit critics and on which the Vyaktiviveka of Mahimabhatta was based.¹ This theory as is evident from the Vyaktiviveka, acknowledges only two meanings of a word, namely 'vācya' (expressed) and 'anumeya' (inferable), the latter including both the indicative and suggested meanings of the dhvani theory.² Hence, as Wijayawardhana rightly concluded, the implied meaning occurring in the Siyabaslakara subscribes to some rudimentary theory of anumiti.³ Nevertheless, the twofold meaning referred to in the Siyabaslakara clearly shows its author's interest in postulating a meaning of words transcending the primary meaning in poetic expression.

1. History of Sanskrit Poetics, II, p.155.

2. Vyaktiviveka, ed. Sri Madhusudana Misra (Benares, 1936), pp.39,40.

3. G. Wijayawardhana, Siyabaslakara and a Theory of Suggestion, University of Ceylon Review (1964-65), Vol. XXIII, p.27.

Kulasūriya is of the opinion that the author of the Siyabaslakara was conversant with a concept of aucitya too.¹ As he pointed out, the work furnishes some clues to this when dealing with a figure called bhāvika. In characterizing the bhāvikālaṅkāra, it stipulates that the poet should abstain from employing inappropriate description, indistinct expression and localism.² It is, accordingly, not unjustifiable to surmise that the author had a dim knowledge of aucitya which was developed by the later writer Kṣemendra.

When all these facts are taken into consideration, it is justifiable to conclude that the Siyabaslakara, being a treatise on poetics which is mainly concerned with the alaṅkāras as principal elements of poetry, more or less accepted the vitality and essentiality of poetic sentiments in literary creation. Similarly it postulated an implied or secondary meaning, no matter which term was used for it, and also a propriety in poetic expressions.

Thus, having detailed some poetical concepts formulated in the Siyabaslakara, we shall now proceed to examine their role in the process of disciplining the Sinhalese poetry that falls within our period. It is postulated at the outset of the work that the life of the Buddha

1. UCR (1956), Vol. XIV, p. 79.

2. Siyabaslakara, ch. 2, v. 339.

should be in verse while works on rules of conduct and custom (or lives of others?) in prose.¹ Does this formulation really become effective on the poets of the subsequent period, or is it ignored? It is considered that our early 'gī' poems which drew their subject matter from the Jātakas may reflect the above convention.² As we know the Jātakas really describe the past births of the Buddha, yet their starting point is his present life. Apart from the Sasadāvata wherein two stories, present and past, are described, the other surviving two such works deal only with previous stories. It is therefore, worth saying that they do contain the life of the Bodhisatva rather than the life of the Buddha.

As is apparent from the Kavsilumina which is based on the Kusajātaka, a new convention, namely that of describing the life of the Bodhisatva in verse (rather than the life of the Buddha) appears to have been held in high esteem by early Sinhalese poets.³ Buddha's real life on the other hand, has been taken as subject matter for our early prose poems, the Amāvatura and the Butsarana. We have seen in a previous discussion that these two works contain the Buddha's whole life, describing his past life too in its appropriate place, while the first

1. Siyabaslakara, ch. I, v. 20.

2. Sinhalaśāhitya, pt. I, p. 223.

3. Kavsilumina, ed. W. Sorata (Colombo, 1946), ch. 1, v. 4.

has been given the sub-title Buddhacarita¹ (life of the Buddha). It is however, difficult to surmise, due to lack of evidence, how and when this modification of the convention proclaimed by the Siyabaslakara took effect on our literature. At the same time it is a matter of conjecture whether the phrase 'life of the Buddha' in the above-mentioned reference conveyed no substantial difference between his present and past to early Sinhalese poets, owing to their equal reverence for both the Master and the Great Being.² But it must be noted that the convention might have been strictly observed in the literature of the pre-Polonnaru period. Some evidence of Sinhalese poems ascribed to that period, which were probably based on the life of the Buddha, can be traced from some Pali commentaries,³ and some fragmentary verses surviving among the examples of Elu-sandaslakuna and the Sidatsaṅgarāva.⁴ Of the prose works attributed to that period, the Sikhavalāṇḍa and its Vinisa are indeed compatible with the convention which says: 'works on rules of conduct should be in prose'. This convention might have been modified by the writers of the Polonnaru period who sought to describe the Buddha's life

1. Amāvatura, ed. W. Sorata, p. 97.

2. A view on this is discussed in an essay written by A. Kulasuriya. See UCR (1955), Vol. XIII, p. 202.

3. Paramatthajotikā (PTS), ed. Helmer Smith (London, 1917) Vol. II, 2, p. 397.

4. Elu-sandaslakuna, ed. A. Pannananda (Colombo, 1938), p. 12, vv. 59, 61; Sidatsaṅgarāva, ed. R. Tennakon, p. 376.

in prose.

The Siyabaslakara again, following the Kāvyaḍarsa, outlines the main characteristics of a mahākāvya. A mahākāvya, according to it, is a composition in cantos. It begins with an indication of the subject matter, a benediction or a salutation. Its subject matter is based on history or some other story. It aims at the fruition of the fourfold ends and its hero is a noble person. A prescribed list of necessary descriptions is also furnished in accordance with the practice of Sanskrit mahākāvyas.¹ These characteristics with a slight modification caused by either addition or omission seem to be applicable generally to Sinhalese poems whether they are mahākāvyas or khandakāvyas. However, a distinction between a mahākāvya and a khandakāvya which principally depended upon the division into cantos is taken for granted from early times up to the end of the eighteenth century. Thus the Kavminikōḍola of Pattāyamē lēkam of the eighteenth century does not acquire the designation of mahākāvya though it contains almost all the characteristics of the so-called mahākāvya except the first. The Kavmutu-^{of}hara of Sāliālē Maniratana, on the other hand, a work | the same type but divided into cantos, finds its place among the mahākāvyas.

1. Siyabaslakara, ch.1, vv.21-25 ff.

Those characteristics with a few modifications made by adding new features could be found most completely in the Kavsilumina, our earliest surviving mahākāvya. Each canto of this work ends with a couplet in a different metre; this characteristic is, however, not enumerated by the author of the Siyabaslakara.¹ Similarly, its opening is not in harmony with the postulate laid down by either the Siyabaslakara or the Kāvyaḍarsa.

The khandakāvyas like the Sasadāvata and the Muvadevdāvata which are designed to narrate in much the same way as a mahākāvya contain many descriptions from the prescribed list. But they appear to avoid deliberately some descriptions like sporting in gardens, or in water, festivals of drinking, love in separation, marriages and battles which are considered to find a place only in stories designed for mahākāvyas. In the same way, the formulation of interesting alaṅkāras and rasas demanded in mahākāvyas seems to have been acknowledged as an inevitable element of poetry by both genres, mahākāvya and khandakāvya. Poets of both categories gave a prime place to the alaṅkāras in their kāvyas; sometimes they

1. The Kāvyaḍarsa laid down that each canto should end with a verse of different metre. Kāvyaḍarsa, ch. 1, v. 19. cf. Siyabaslakara, Ch. 1, vv. 21-27.

were in such enthusiasm and such a hurry to employ figures of speech that they neglected their responsibility for keeping those ālaṅkāras appropriate to the subjects, characters and situations they selected.

Again, of the two aspects of ālaṅkāras, viz., svabhāvokti and yakrokti,¹ the latter appears to have been held in higher esteem than the first in both kāvyas. A similar attention to sabdālaṅkāra, a particular manner of arranging syllables, is also given by both sides.²

The Sasadāvata and the Kavsilumina indulge in the display of their author's skill in using the sabdālaṅkāra, rightly called verbal gymnastics, whereas the Muvadevdāvata does not show any interest in them.

These poetic conventions laid down by the Siyabaslakara must have been primarily adopted by verse writers. No evidence is available from our early sources to surmise whether they were applied generally to prose works too. It seems from the Sikhavalānda-vinisa and some paragraphs of the Dhampiyā-atuvā-gātapadaya that the prose writers of the pre-Polonaru period might have preferred to apply to their works a more straightforward narrative form with less figures of speech. Evidence for such literary

1. Siyabaslakara, ch.2 , v.337.

2. Sasadāvata, vv. 75,76,92,93,111,112,131,132;
Kavsilumina, ch.9 , vv.19-21,23,27,38,39,41-45.

simplicity may also be provided by some prose narratives of the subsequent period, especially by the Amāvatura. But this realistic form of narration might have faced a drastic change owing to the new inspiration engendered by the above-mentioned poetic convention. It is obvious from our sources that such an attempt to adapt the narrative form of the above-mentioned metrical compositions to prose works is made by our prose writers of the Polonnaru period. We have seen in our discussion of the Dharmapradīpikāva, Amāvatura and the Butsarana how far those authors made efforts to develop their short plots by adding various descriptions as in the verse poems compatible with the works in verse during the period. They not only added such descriptions as occur in the verse poems in accordance with the framework laid down by the Siyabaslakara but also indulged in various figures of speech, including hyperboles and such a poetical language as is normally found in metrical compositions alone. This discussion shows how far and how strongly the poetic convention established by the Siyabaslakara was effective on Sinhalese literature, especially on poetry, and helps us to understand the background of the Sinhalese poetical works of the Polonnaru period.

(b) A general consideration of the Sasadāvata and the Muvadevdāvata

The earliest extant specimens of Sinhalese poetry which display the direct influence of the Sanskrit poetries that came to be known through the Siyabaslakara can be found in the Sasadāvata and the Muvadevdāvata of unknown authors. Due to the lack of evidence, it is however difficult to determine their chronological order. As we have seen elsewhere the Sasadāvata was written during the latter half of the twelfth century. On the other hand, tradition ascribes the Muvadevdāvata to some early part of the same century.¹ Both works, whatever may be their chronological order, seem to be modelled on much the same poetical framework which is in conformity with many Sanskrit verse poems. They have been subjected to severe criticism such as calling them mere imitations of 'decadent Sanskrit poems'.² Even though the so-called imitative manner has been severely criticized by many of our critics, it must be stressed that this imitation or, more specifically inspiration received from 'those Sanskrit works of decadent age' or other sources, has still

-
1. Sinhalese Literature, p.146 & Simhala-sāhitya-vamsaya, p.90.
 2. Simhalasāhityayē nāgīma, pp.28,36,38.

not been studied deeply and critically. It is accordingly, interesting to have a perspective on this matter.

It is undeniable that the authors of these two works turned to the Sanskrit poems that were known to them for structure as well as other poetical devices, while they borrowed the subject matter from the Jātakas so as to be in harmony with the Sinhalese poetic convention. None can reasonably assert on this ground alone that those works are mere imitations of 'decadent Sanskrit poetry' unless they have an exact knowledge of the works imitated. Before reaching such a conclusion it is desirable to make a thorough inquiry into different sources well known or less known which are supposed to have inspired these two works.

The wish to extol the life of the Buddha and the Bodhisatva had been popular among Buddhist writers, especially those who came under the influence of the Mahāyāna, from early times. The Jātakamālā of Āryasūra for instance, brings out quite a number of Jātakas decked with poetic devices, for the first time in the history of Sanskrit literature. Similarly the Avadānaśataka of unknown author, the Jātakastava of Jñānayaśas and the Avadāna-kalpalatā of Ksemendra describe the life of the Buddha, paying profound homage and praise to the Master.

These works which abstain from the ornate kāvya style are always true to a simple and realistic diction of poetry. The first and the second of these are written in prose and verse - in what we called campū-kāvya - while the latter two are only in verse. It is not unlikely that these compositions of Sanskrit Buddhist writers achieved a fair reception from scholars of both Mahāyāna and Theravāda, in India as well as in Ceylon. We have discussed the dominant role played by Sanskrit scholarship among the learned circles of Ceylon during the Polonnaru period elsewhere in our research. Thus it seems not improper to surmise that the author of our early gī kāvyas might have been given the impetus to extol the life of the Buddha, more rightly called the life of the Bodhisatva, by the spirit of the times which was dominated by Sanskrit scholarship as well as fostered by Buddhist culture, more or less backed by Mahāyāna teachings.

According to the postulate of the Siyabaslakara they ought to have selected the life of the Buddha as subject matter for their compositions. But they preferred to extol the life of the Bodhisatva instead. The reason for this modification of subject matter might have been

either the indiscriminate attitude of authors towards both the Buddha and the Bodhisatva or the high esteem for the Bodhisatva that resulted from the constant relation with Mahāyānism.¹

It is of note in this respect that all other well known Jātaka poems in Sinhalese except the Muvadevdāvata and the Kavsilumina deal with both aspects, the present and the past stories of the Jātakas. The conventions of Jātaka poets before the Polonnaru period are beyond our reasonable approach due to the lack of evidence. To two poets who were reported to have lived during the time of king Akbo I (A.D. 575-608), namely Sakdāmala and Asakdāmala,² are ascribed the authorship of two Jātaka poems supposed to be called the Sakdā and the Asakdā, yet nothing is left behind but a few fragmentary verses.³ But in some earlier sources written in Pali and Sanskrit like the Jātakatthakathā and the Avadānasataka both stories, present and past may be delineated as if they were two intrinsic episodes of the same story. While the Jātakatthakathā almost

-
1. S. Paranavitana, Mahāyānism in Ceylon, Ceylon Journal of Science, Section G. Vol. II 1933, pp. 43, 67-70.
 2. Nikāyasāṅgrahaya, p. 17; Pūjāvāliya, ed. Medhankara, ch. XXXIV, p. 19.
 3. An attempt to make a survey of the Asakdākava, has been made by John Siriman de Zoiza. See Sāhitaya, IV, 1958, pp. 12-16.

always deals necessarily with both stories of the jātaka the Avadāna-sataka in many cases delineates only the past story. The Avadāna-kalpalatā, a voluminous metrical composition ascribed to the eleventh century,¹ follows the same line as the Avadāna-sataka. The Jātakamālā of Āryasūra on the other hand, which is concerned only with past stories of Jātakas, makes no reference to their present stories. Accordingly, it is probable that our early Sinhalese poets were, in one way or another, affected by these Sanskrit works and the writings of their kind in addition to the Pali sources in designing their poems. Thus, the author of the Sasādāvata followed the former tradition of the Jātakatthakathā and the Avadāna-sataka with the intention of having equal opportunity to praise the Buddha as well as the Bodhisatva while the other two poets preferred to follow the latter line in accordance with the Jātakamālā which extols the life of the Bodhisatva alone. However, the tradition reestablished with the emergence of Sasādāvata made its way through the centuries in the history of Sinhalese Jātaka poetry.

It is reasonable to believe that the reason for selecting the subject matter and the design of the

1. Avadānakalpalatā, ed. P. L. Vaidya (Darbhanga, 1959), I, Introduction, p. VIII; History of Indian Literature, II, p. 293.

early 'gī' poems was not only the desire of our poets to be in harmony with Sanskrit poetics on which many of our literary critics lay their stress. Apart from 'poetic purpose' religious purports too played an influential part in the discipline of poetry in every period of our literary history. This twofold literary discipline may be designated as 'poetic path' and 'doctrinal path' or path of discourse, of which the first reference could be traced in the Kāvyaśekharaya of Śrī Rāhula in the fifteenth century.¹ The combination of these two paths exercised by Sinhalese poets probably met with general acceptance from the contemporary readers including poets and critics, since the first furnished the sentimental requirements of the reader while the other imparted the spiritual requirements. In fact, they seem to call for an inseparable combination in their application to a literary work, so as to give artistic coherence. Accordingly, though they were to be applied intrinsically to the poetry they are easily recognizable.² Thus, we often meet portions exemplifying both paths in our poetry.

1. 'Kivilakara hā banamaga'. See Kāvyaśekharaya.
ed. Dharmarama (Colombo, 1915), ch.1, v.26.

2. These two paths are compared to the ornaments and the body of a king respectively. Kāvyaśekharaya, ch.1, v.26.

This sort of poetic diction which combines both paths could be traced to such works of the remote past as Asvaghosa's Buddhacarita¹ and Saundarananda.² It also seems to be exercised in the Jātakamālā of Āryasūra. It is likely that the Sinhalese 'gī' poets were influenced by the poetic tradition of this Buddhist Sanskrit (religious) poetry apart from the later 'alaṅkāra' tradition known to them when they became obsessed with poetic discipline. Therefore, the allegation made by some critics against our 'gī' poems, that they are strings of verses written in illustration of the rules of alaṅkāra,³ is not fully justifiable. It must be mentioned that those who make such allegations consciously or unconsciously neglect the service rendered by the early Buddhist poetic tradition in the formation of poetic discipline which became effective in our early poetry.

Some discussion is needed therefore, on the question of what influence Sinhalese 'gī' poems actually did receive from early Buddhist Sanskrit poetry. The Sasadāvata refers to two occasions of the Bodhisatva's practising charity⁴ in past births which are not traceable

1. Buddhacarita, ed.G.R.Nandargikar (Poona,1911), ch.IV, vv.63-100.

2. Saundarananda, ed.E.H.Hohnston (London,1928) ch.VIII, vv.14-62.

3. Simhalasāhityayē nāgīma, p.32.

4. Sasadāvata, vv.275,276.

in the Pali Jātakas, when it is dealing with the eulogy by Śakra in connexion with the Bodhisatva's (the hare's) self-sacrifice in the fire to feed the Brahmin enfeebled by hunger, thirst and weariness. The occasions however, correspond to Maitrībala and Hasti Jātakas in the Jātakamālā.¹ This mention occurring in the Sasādāvata presumably reveals its author's familiarity with the Sanskrit poem of Āryasūra. Whatever may be the method applied to the first part of the poem in order to expand its short plot, the author of the Sasādāvata undoubtedly must have received considerable influence from the Jātakamālā in designing its latter part.

The past story of Sasajātaka is elaborately described in both the Jātakamālā and the Jātakatthakathā; both works are probably based on the same plot, perhaps derived from the Jātaka Pāli.² Four verses occurring in the Pali source allude to a certain discussion between a Brahmin and four other characters who are identified in both works, respectively as an otter, a jackal, a monkey and a hare, the last being the Bodhisatva. There is another version of this story, probably originating from the

1. Jātakamālā, ed. F. Max Müller; Translated by J.S. Speyer (London, 1895), Nos. VIII, XXX.

2. Jātaka Pāli, ed. Narada, I, Catukkanipata (Colombo, 1944), pp. 568-571.

same source but reading rather differently, in the Avadāna-sataka and the Avadāna-kalpalatā,¹ which does not accommodate any character other than the hare and the Brahmin and shows no connexion with the works above mentioned. The past story of the Sasadāvata on the contrary, always goes hand in hand with the same story of the Jātakamālā and the Jātakatthakathā.

The Jātakatthakathā deals with the story in a simple and more or less realistic manner while the other proceeds with it by indulging in poetical imaginations. In the former work no space is reserved for elegant descriptions of nature or such other subjects, but only for narrating the incidents of the tale.² The latter work, on the other hand, accommodates some poetical descriptions within the sphere of its narration in so far as they do not damage the coherence of the story.³ Thus, we meet at the very beginning of the Sasajāta in the Jātakamālā a short poetic description of a forest where the Bodhisatva and his three friends lived together. Then there emerge gradually a discourse of the Bodhisatva an imaginative description of the surroundings and a

1. Avadānasataka, P.L.Vaidya (Darbhanga, 1958), IV, No. 37,

Avadāna-kalpalatā, ed. P.L.Vaidya, II, No. 104, pp. 556-557.

2. Jātakatthakathā (SHB), ed. W.Piyatissa (Colombo, 1931), Part III, (4.2:6) pp. 36-40.

3. Jātakamālā, No. VI.

eulogy of Sakra on the Bodhisatva. In the description of the surroundings the poet portrays, in less figurative but more charming words, the imagined delightfulness of atmosphere caused by the great ecstasy the Bodhisatva's heart was full of due to his final decision to entertain any guest with his own body. As discerned by the poet the rejoicing moment of nature is put into a poetical expression by these words: 'Then the earth along with the mountains shook, with her silken garments, the oceans, being tossed, as though in delight; the sounds of celestial drums spread through the sky, and the quarters shone with tranquillity. Clouds smiling with encircling flashes of lightning, and with gentle rumblings of thunder, showered on him flowers whose pollen dust was scattered all round by their mutual contact. The wind with majestic gait, carrying fragrant pollen dust of flowers of various trees, worshipped him with pleasure as though with fine silken pieces with uniform designs.'¹

The delineation of the same situation occurring in the Sasadāvata must have received substantial inspiration from this piece of poetic creation of Āryaśūra. Though

1. Ibid., (selection), ed. R.C. Dwivedi & Bhat (Delhi, 1966) pp. 24-25, vv. 19-21.

it is not impossible that the author of the Sasadāvata was motivated by his own personal and individual poetic intuition, inspired by constant contemplation on the magnanimous sacrifice of the Bodhisatva, without indebtedness to earlier writers when he himself engaged in composing the description, nevertheless some similar ideas in common with both descriptions make us think that there is a greater possibility that he was inspired by Āryasūra. Despite the slight difference concerning the setting of the two descriptions and their length, many materials employed in them and the tenor of each bear a great affinity to each other; in the Jātakamālā the description is found before the act of sacrifice took place, while in the Sasadāvata it occurs after it had happened. In the same way the description occurring in the Sasadāvata is four times as long as that of the Jātakamālā.¹

The Sasadāvata, on the other hand, bears no relation here to the Jātakatthakathā, which does not find room for such a situation. The next and the final important incident, after the magnificent sacrifice of the Bodhisatva, in the Jātakatthakathā is Sakra's adorning of the lunar disc with the sign of a hare in order to

1. Sasadāvata, vv. 282-293.

proclaim the heroic action.¹ Though the Avadānaśataka and the Avadāna-kalpalatā just mention a sudden pouring of rain which caused the end of a long-standing drought as a mark of great respect of the gods to the Great Being, they devote no further space to it.² But the Sasadāvata being inspired by the Jātakamālā deals with the matter at considerable length. It musters all the miraculous happenings it could mention, in respect of the homage paid to the Bodhisatva throughout the world at the time when Śakra held him on his head, and describes them in a poetic manner. It is desirable to cite some interesting verses from the work, in this connexion, in order to make it easy to understand its relationship with the Jātakamālā:

' tahavuru dāgum vat - nohāra nāṭumē piyalet,
 beren'obala sāna mihikat - dāriya-no-hī niti gugulev.
 visuḷa daḷa hela hāli - saḷu kuḷu atin tanavā
 dalañindu rudu raṅgora - giriraja naḷu vilas gat.
 nirada hivi gigum, - ulāṅgāsi hovamni,
 daḷa raḷa atneni - kemāli puḍaṭa haḷa meni.
 suran kān vuhutu - kokum kesaru saṅḍun sunu,
 turuṇu rivi vidunā - hima musu meni meraja raja.
 gugule muru bera - dili veṇa liya'nurāv gat,
 tan tanhi ruvan - viduriṇdu nubē sasalota.' 3

-
1. Jātaka Stories, ed. E. B. Cowell (Cambridge, 1897), III, No. 316, p. 37.
 2. Avadānaśataka, IV, No. 37, pp. 93-95; Avadāna-kalpalatā, No. 104, pp. 556-557.
 3. Sasadāvata, vv. 285-287, 289, 291.

' While all phenomena of the universe, mobile and otherwise, engaged in rejoicing play (as though paying their respect to the Great Being), the Earth herself shook and cried as if she was tired of their heavy burden. The royal Mount (Meru) took the form of a dancer on the stage of the ocean taking her white silken garment of streams and shaking them by her hands, the mountain summits. As if wishing (him) long life with its loud noise (caused by the motion of waves) the Ganges, the king of rivers, spread its flower-like foam in order to worship (the Great Being) with its hand-like waves. Pollen dust of saffron flowers and sandal powder spread by deities were like the rays of the rising sun passing through the snow. Celestial drums resounded; lutes played themselves rhythmically; lightnings occurred in the sky; jewels shone everywhere.'

These few verses clearly show the influence of the Jātakamālā. Though the imageries created by each poet are not identical, much the same materials employed by them unmistakably display the latter's inspiration from the former. For instance, the earth's shaking, the spread of flowers and pollen dust as a mark of worshipping the Great Being, the resounding of celestial drums in the sky and the flash of lightning were mentioned by both of them. Even though some materials including Hindu myths, possibly drawn from later Sanskrit poetic convention, have taken abode in the Sasadāvata's description and affected it

rather more than the former, they cannot destroy the relationship. On the other hand, the similarity of these materials, however close it may be, certainly does not lead us to conclude that the latter is an imitation or a translation of the former; it is rather an individual creation.

It is, however, probable that the author's knowledge of the Jātakamālā may have fired him to compose such a description where he desired to use some materials which occurred in it. Perhaps he considered that they would fit easily and beneficially into the story in the latter work.

More or less similar deductions could be reached in regard to the poetic convention in which the Muvadev-dāvata was designed and its sources in spite of similar serious criticism as the Sasadāvata encountered. As a matter of fact, the Muvadevdāvata like the Sasadāvata had a notable inspiration from the early religious poetry written in Pali and Sanskrit, which again is not taken into account thoroughly by its critics. It seems therefore, unreasonable to rule out or ignore the important role played by the religious poetic convention in the process of poetic discipline that affected the Muvadev-

dāvata and to stress only the so-called Sanskrit ornate poetic convention, however predominant a place it occupied in the contemporary Sinhalese poetry. The creative writer is always attached inseparably to his psychic world wherein his aesthetic experiences played an important part. When he is actually engaged in a creative process he submits himself consciously or unconsciously to the repercussion of the past experiences in his mental world. Thus nearly every poetic creation in one way or another, comes out as representation of past experiences resulting from the sources the author has to draw upon throughout his life, no matter whether the sources be literary or otherwise.

As we have seen in the case of the Sasadāvata which shows the considerable influence of early sources not only on the subject matter but also in the poetic discipline, it will also be apparent from the following discussion how far the early sources were influential on the emergence of the Muvadevdāvata, in spite of the simultaneous effectiveness of the so-called Sanskrit ornate poetic convention.

It seems inevitable that one should think that the author of the Muvadevdāvata designed the latter part of Makhādeva's character within the framework of the narration of Vessantara occurring in the Jātakamālā and the Jātakatthakathā, when one goes through these three compositions with careful observation. The parallelism of some events met with in the latter part of both stories certainly leads us to think of one's inspiration from the other. King Vessantara as narrated in the above mentioned works was in exile owing to the extremes he went to in practising charity; he left for the Himālayas where he lived an ascetic life. Makhādeva, in the other work, abdicated on seeing a grey hair on his head, safely bestowed the royalty upon the eldest son and left for Himavat to lead an ascetic life. The similarity of the two characters found in the latter parts of both stories might have been taken into consideration by the author of the Muvadevdāvata when he designed his narration.

Undoubtedly it must have provided a profitable chance to add a poetic description of beautiful sceneries in the forest glade that the king came across on the way to Himavat.

In both the Jātakamālā and the Jātakatthakathā there could be found poetical descriptions of the forest

Vessantara had to pass by on his way to Himavat.¹ The Jātakatthakathā, giving full details of his long journey, describes some interesting places in verse as well as prose in a realistic manner. Though it strikes us as a natural description of simple character, it displays a certain lack of poetic imaginations. But the Jātakamālā, avoiding details, gives a lovely description adorned with poetic imagination, using more or less the same materials as found in the Jātakatthakathā but in a different way. This piece of poetic creation presumably inspired the author of the Muvadevdāvata in designing his description of Makhādeva's journey to Himavat. When the latter is compared with the former their close relation will be clear. One part of the journey of Vessantara is pictured by Āryasūra in these charming words:

'The trees, stretching out to him their branches adorned at their ends with charming fruits, invited him, as it were, to enjoy their hospitality; and paying homage to his merit-obtained dignity, bowed to him like obedient disciples, when they got sight of him. And, where he longed for water, in those very places lotus-ponds appeared to his eyes, covered on their surface with the white and reddish-brown pollen fallen down from the anthers of the lotuses shaken by the wing-movements of the swans. The clouds overspread him with a beautiful canopy; there blew an agreeable and odoriferous wind; and his path was shortened by Yaksas, not enduring his labour and fatigue.'²

-
1. Jātakamālā, Translated by J.S. Speyer, No. 9, pp. 81-83. Jataka, Translated by E.B. Cowell, Vol. VI, No. 547, p. 269. In both the Jātakamālā and the Jātakatthakathā is found a lovely description of the forest, put into the mouth of Madri. See Ibid. pp. 79-80 and pp. 268-269.
 2. Jātakamālā, pp. 82-83, vv. 49-51.

The echo of these words could be heard in the following verses cited from the Muvadevdāvata:

'samāga guvana gana - valā vālakī hiru teda
hāmī maṇḍa nala suvaṇḍa - muva raṇḍa ron salā dī.

maṅgatehi lela liya - vamiyo kusum netneṇ
bālūhu lō himiyā - sarā sisi biṃbu somiyā.

pālaṇḍa rusiru lela - tisara kaḍā mal kaḍā
diṭi vana vil vamiyan - taraṅgatni vaṇḍanā van.' 1

'Shadowing him, dense clouds in the sky screened him from the fury of the sun. A gentle breeze, lavishing breaths of the fallen flowers blew upon him. Woodland winds, like sweet girls on the way, looked at the king mild as the disc of the autumn moon, with their eyes, full-blown blossoms. He gazed on forest pools like girls worshipping him with their wave-like hands and wearing the shining chaplets, lovely swans.'

On even a cursory glance at these two descriptions, one would incline to think of their textual similarity, and to take seriously the affinity of some ideas and materials in common to them. But nobody could find the latter an exact imitation or copy of the former. Each picture shines with its own individuality in spite of one's inspiration from the other. Yet whatever may be the difference between those pen-pictures they are combined together by the same underlying principle. This underlying force, in fact, is connected with the psychological world of the two poets rather than with the actual facts

1. Muvadevdāvata, ed. M. Kumaratunga (Colombo, 1931)
vv. 136, 137, 141.

or materials of their descriptions. This mental relationship between the two poets could be illustrated by outlining the psychological background of Āryasūra, which gave him impetus to create that description.

It is likely that Āryasūra who was deeply in sympathy with the Bodhisattva's pathetic situation caused by his devoutness in practising virtues might have imagined the supernatural powers by which he provided the Bodhisattva with necessary facilities. The idea of supernatural power which seems to have prevailed in the later Buddhist tradition might have incited the author of the Jātakamālā to imagine such a scene. The same idea which is distinctly echoed in the above cited verses presumably inspired the author of the Muvadevdāvata too. After all, both poets employed natural phenomena in the service of the Great Being when he was in need of such service, and deserved to have it. It seems that both of them were of the same view on the Bodhisattva's worthiness to receive veneration and attendance not only from living beings but also from all natural phenomena of the world. This short account may throw light on the influence of the Jātakamālā on the Sinhalese Ġgī poems.

Now it seems necessary to have a glance at the normal structure of the Jātakamālā, which each story is

designed to follow, and to inquire into the question how far it was effective in our 'gi' poems. Generally speaking, each narration of the Jātakamālā can be divided into two parts, namely prose and verse. The verse or metrical part again, as has been pointed out by Max Müller in his introduction to the Jātakamālā, admits of a four-fold division. The first according to him, contains the laudatory verses praising and pointing out the virtues of the hero which are commonly found in the preamble of the tale. The second division consists of descriptive verses carrying poetic pictures of fine scenery or of natural phenomena. The third contains religious discourses which are sometimes put into the mouth of the Bodhisatva. This feature as he says mostly finds its place at the end. The fourth and the last consists of verses treating of facts in the story.¹

These characteristics of the structure of the metrical part of the Jātakamālā could be found to be more or less in common with our early 'gi' poems. Considerable space has been given in our discussion to the second of these features, and we have seen there how enthusiastically the authors of both languages, Sanskrit and Sinhalese, engaged themselves in the delineation of

1. Jātakamālā, ed. F. Max Müller (London, 1895), vol. I, Introduction. p. XXVI.

nature where in fact the Sinhalese poets showed more enthusiasm than Āryasūra did. The first in the above division, the laudatory verses, are adequately featured in both 'gī' poems. Sometimes these praises are put into the mouth of a character while sometimes they emerged from the author's own narration. There could be found in the Sasadāvata quite a number of laudatory verses which are connected with either the author's own narration or his character's. Āryasūra as well as the author of the Sasadāvata praised the Bodhisatva or his magnanimous sacrifice through the mouth of Sakra, one of their characters, just after the Great Being fell into the midst of the flames.¹ Similarly, the third and the fourth characteristics are also features in common with the Sinhalese 'gī' poems, where the third, religious discourses, plays the most significant part. Both the Sasajātaka of the Jātakamālā and the Sasadāvata contain an elaborate sermon of moderate length which emerges from the same situation of the story and is ascribed to the main character, the Bodhisatva. The 'sasa' according to the narration gave a sermon in the company of his friends describing the importance of performing religious duties and observing precepts.² In the same way the Muvadevdāvata

1. Jātakamālā, No. 6, pp. 44-45; Sasadāvata, vv. 274, 281.

2. Ibid., pp. 39-40 and vv. 242, 252.

carries a religious discourse of king Makhādeva who gave his sermon in the council of ministers, ambassadors and the royal chiefs.¹ From this discussion, it is clear how those characteristics occurring in the structure of the metrical part of the Jātakamālā are closely connected with the structure of our 'gī' poems.

On the whole, the foregoing comparison would permit us to conclude that the Sinhalese 'gī' poems had a notable inspiration from the early Buddhist poetry in spite of their undeniable indebtedness to the so-called Sanskrit ornate poetry. This ornate poetic tradition, indeed, appears to have played a distinctive role in the formation of structure and the formulation of poetic discipline for our poems; but since the matter has been treated at length by many hands there is no need to repeat the details.² But it must be stressed in this context, that this poetic tradition, enjoying wide application in a vast field of Sanskrit poetry, includes the great poems of Asvaghosa and Kālidāsa as well as some works of second-rate poets

1. Muvadevdāvata, vv. 100-105.

2. Ananda. W.P.Guruge, Simhalaya Hā Samskr̥taya (Colombo, 1954), pp.49-70; D.Pannasara, Sanskrit Literature (Colombo, 1958), pp. 248-253; A.V.Suravira, Simhala-sāhitya-sampradāya (Nūgegoda, 1966), pp. 49-84; G.H.Wijayavardhana, Kāvyaavicāra-gavesana (Colombo, 1968), pp.112-133.

like Māgha¹ and Harsa.² Whatever may be their poetical merits, all these works are linked by the same chain - what we call the ornate poetic tradition. Though our 'gī' poems, as a matter of course, tended to the alāṅkāra convention of later ornate court poetry they are not by any means deprived of the heritage of its other links; in other words, they might have drawn some inspiration from the works of first-rate poets. Among the verses of the Sasadāvata and the Muvadevdāvata there are some poetic thoughts, the sources of which could be traced to the Raghuvamśa and the Kumārasambhaya of Kālidāsa, and to the Jānakīharana³ of Kumaradāsa.

-
1. The influence of Māgha's work, the Sisupālavadhā, on the Sinhalese 'gī' poems is often mentioned by our critics. See Siṃhala-Sāhityaye Nāgima, pp. 25, 26, 30 and Siṃhala-sāhitya I, p. 267; The old Sanne of Sasadāvata also cites some verses of Māgha, pp. 16, 46.
 2. Harsa, the author of Naisadhīya, is said to have lived in the second half of the 12th century. History of Indian Literature, III-1, p. 56.
 3. The old Sanne of Sasadāvata traces the subject matter of some verses in the text to their Sanskrit sources. See Sasadāvata-sanne, pp. 52, 79, 38, 41. Kumāranatunga cites quite a number of Sanskrit verses from the Jānakīharana in order to show their relationship with the Sinhalese verses. See Muvadevdāvivaranaya, pp. 38-39, 49, 62, 78.

For instance, the following verse occurring in the Muvadevdāvata appears to reflect the shadow of a pen picture drawn by Kālidāsa:

' diti āl geviyan - tamā yasa gī gānā
karalbara āl ket'hi - siya tanhi no varadavā. 1

' He (Makhādeva) beheld women, who in strictest measure were chanting songs in his praise in the rice fields where the paddy spikes sagged with grain. 1

The supposed Sanskrit source of this verse is found in the Raghuvamśa as follows:

' iksuechāyāniśādinyastasya goptur gunodayam
ākumārakathodghātam sāligopyo jagur yāsaḥ

' Women engaged in protection of paddy fields, seated in the shadows of canes, were chanting songs in praise of the king (Raghu), that described his glorious life from princehood. 1

The poetic thoughts of these verses seem to be closely related as if one is motivated by the other, though the context of each is clearly distinct; the first speaks of Makhādeva's journey to Himavat to become a hermit while the latter deals with the victorious journey of Raghu to become an emperor. Poetical thoughts and imaginations of this nature - what may be called textual similarities —

1. op.cit. v.139.

2. Raghuvamśa, ed.K.S.Adhikari (Katmandu,1958),ch.4,v.24.

could be abundantly found in the Sasadāvata and the Muvadevdāvata, and their subject matter can be traced to such Sanskrit works of various categories as the Raghuvamśa,¹ Kumārasambhava,² Meghadūta,³ Jānakī-harana,⁴ Sisupālavadhā⁵ and so forth. These sources clearly show how closely our early 'gī' poems are related with those Sanskrit works of various standard, and the whole field, out of which the Sanskrit ornate poetry is compiled, must have inspired Sinhalese 'gī' poetry in one way or another. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of the inspiration the Sinhalese 'gī' poetry received from the first-rate poems mentioned above, appears not to have afforded it the vigour and vitality or the soul of those great poems.

-
1. Sasadāvata-sanne, pp. 16, 79.
 2. Ibid., pp. 38, 41.
 3. Ibid., pp. 25, 39.
 4. Muvadevdā-vivaranaya, ed. Munidasa Kumaranatunga, (Colombo, 1931), pp. 38, 39, 49, 55, 62, 78.
 5. Sasadāvata-sanne, pp. 16, 46.

(c) A comparison between the Sasadāvata and the Muvadevdāvata

In the foregoing discussion we have dealt with some problems concerning the genesis of the early Sinhalese 'gī' poems. Now we proceed to evaluate their literary merits. As we have mentioned earlier these two poems purport to achieve a twofold merit, religious as well as literary, by using a religious story so adapted as to accord with contemporary poetic tradition. Both poems therefore, which are sketched out within a framework provided by the poetic tradition, contain religious discourses and poetic descriptions of cities, kings, seasons and other aspects of nature. Even though these features, discourses and descriptions, are adequately accommodated in both compositions they show lack of coherence; in other words, they are not interwoven intrinsically. For instance, in the Sasadāvata two cities, namely Sāvāt (P. Sāvātthi) and Baranās (P. Bārānāsī) are described at considerable length; the first is connected with the present story while the latter finds its place remotely in the past story. According to the poem the main event which caused the Buddha to relate his past took place in the city of Sāvāt where he used to live.

Though in the past story all incidents, main and subordinate, took place in a remote forest, the city of Baranās is described at the same length as the description of Sāvāt. The city of Baranās has no connexion at all with the incidents but, being the capital of the country which the forest belongs to, the poet had to make a special attempt to link up the description with the story; so he describes the king of Baranās, and, appearing in his own guise, says that the Bodhisatva was born as a hare in a beautiful forest glade while the king Bāmbadat (P. Brahmadata) was reigning in Baranās.¹

Had he not expressly said so not only the description of the city but the description of Bāmbadat as well would not make any sense to the poem. However, the device used by the poet in this connexion appears to be artificial and does not bring about much profit to the work as a whole as expected by the author. Such descriptions, which are not intrinsically related to the main incident or character, can be seen in the Muvadevdāvata too. The description of the 'sarat' season (autumn), the evening, the night and the dawn

1. Sasadāvata, v. 218.

occurring in that work show the normal trend of its structure where the poetical convention appears to dominate the real story. Accordingly, it is not unreasonable to say that each poet handled the story in such a manner as to give more and more accommodation to poetical descriptions which are intended to meet the sentimental requirements of readers of each composition, without due consideration of their propriety and coherence.

The desire to adorn the story with poetical accounts is neatly expressed at the outset of each work; the Sasadāvata compares the relating of the story in detail to the painting of a picture in a variety of colours; for the Muvadevdāvata, it is like making a full-grown tree with its leaves, flowers and fruits, whereas its summarized plot is compared to a small plant.¹ Thus each composition necessarily makes way for a series of descriptions within its story. This trend can be made clear by treating the way the plot is expanded by each writer. The Sasadāvata for instance, so expands its short plot as to accommodate certain poetical descriptions. Its plot unfolds as follows: Once the Buddha

1. Sasadāvata, v.17; Muvadevdāvata, v.7.

was dwelling in the Jetavana monastery in Sāvāt. The Master was venerated not only by human beings and gods but also by nature; six seasons came bringing with them a variety of offerings to him in the shape of manifold flowers of the various times of the year. This is how the author of the Sasadāvata paved the way for his descriptions of Sāvāt, Devram and the six seasons. The poet then continuing his story that was held up to add those descriptions says that one day the Buddha was invited by a lay devotee, and the following morning the Master with his disciples was taken in procession to his house where they were offered food. The Buddha having received all due hospitality agreed to preach the Dhamma in the evening of the same day. The Buddha reveals his past in the course of his sermon. This sketch accommodates the descriptions of the morning, the variety of offerings and the evening. In the same way the past story also includes a series of poetical descriptions.

Similarly the Muvadevdāvata which deals with only the past story of the Makhādeva-jātaka reserves much room for such poetical accounts. Thus we come across the descriptions of the city of Miyulu (P.Mithilā), of the

king, of the autumn season, the evening, the night, the dawn, the royal park and finally the forest Himavat. Now it is apparent how far our 'gī' poets tended to embellish their plots with various poetical accounts which are loosely connected with one another. They seem to have played such a vital part within the structure of each poem that there would be no longer a poem if they were removed, that is to say, the real story is overshadowed by somewhat extraneous poetical embellishments. This actually does not mean that the story is entirely ignored. The core of each story proceeds from beginning to end despite the interruption of the descriptions. Furthermore, a certain attempt is made to recall the story within those descriptions, though as a whole it is not a successful device.¹ Since the optimum delineation of sentiments in poetry is postulated by almost all poetic traditions in one way or another, the utility of those descriptions as a means of enhancing the projected sentiment or sentiments may well need some explanation. As is implied by the introductory verses themselves in the Sasadāvata and the Muvadevdāvata as well as the denouement of each

1. The Sasadāvata mentions the Buddha again and again throughout its descriptions of six seasons. See op.cit., vv. 52, 64, 66, 73, 79, 80, 88, 90, 93.

story, the underlying principle of both poems is to lay stress on the practice of certain religious virtues such as charity, observation of precepts and asceticism¹ through the poetic medium. No doubt both poets might have been motivated by a fervent devotion towards the Buddha, which probably made them select these Jātakas containing the above mentioned religious theme. The Sasadāvata lays stress on the practising of charity through its main character, while the other poem elaborates asceticism through Makhādeva's character. This religious theme must necessarily be conveyed throughout the poems, in other words, each and every part, viz., descriptions and narrations, incidents and situations, and the characterization of the poem, should be so arranged as to convey the main theme.

As formulated by Ānandavardhana in a work as a whole, the delineation of a single sentiment as a predominant one will endow not only novelty of content but also abundance of charm.² This formulation, which does not deny the delineation of a variety of sentiments in a poem, emphatically calls for their subordination to the principal rasa.³ According to this the subordinate

-
1. Both stories of the Sasajātaka in the Jātakatthakathā mainly deals with the virtue of charity. See Jātakatthakathā, ed. W. Piyatissa (Colombo, 1931) II, pp. 36 - 40.
 2. Dhvanyāloka, ch. 4, p. 570.
 3. Ibid., ch. 3, v. 24, p. 420.

rasas ought to be subsidiary to the main rasa. Now the question may naturally arise what the principal rasa of our 'gī' poems would be. The sentiment of tranquillity or pathos (sānta or karuṇā) has been postulated as the probable predominant rasa of these poems by some modern critics.¹ It appears that these critics were mainly concerned with the apparent or most common characteristics of the works, viz., the glorification of the Buddha, when they were dealing with the rasa conveyed by the poems. The term 'karuṇā-rasa' in one of these critics does not appear to mean what it originally connotes in its traditional theoretical sense, for neither of the subjects of the two poems has any connexion at all with sorrow as the permanent mood.

However, it is justifiable to postulate the 'sānta-rasa' as the predominant sentiment and final emancipation as the foremost human value (purusārtha) in the Muvadevdāvata because its introduction as well as the denouement convey the idea of renunciation of worldly pleasure and put the emphasis on asceticism as a means of emancipation. But such a conclusion cannot be reached safely in regard to the subject of the Sasadāvata mainly

1. Simhalasāhityayē nāgīma, p.40; Simhala-sāhityaya, I, p.252.

for two reasons. First, the poem predominantly delineates the glorification of the Buddha in its present story while dealing with the incident of charity practised by a lay-devotee, which undoubtedly plays an important part in this portion though actually it is not given such a significant place in the poem. Secondly, while the first part of the past story conveys the idea of asceticism or observing precepts, its second part and the main incident delineates the heroic self-sacrifice of the Bodhisatva. This dilemma makes it difficult for us to decide its principal rasa and highest human value. How should we tackle this problem? The traditional analytical treatments of rasa and rasadhvani concepts would provide the necessary clue in this dilemma.

The Sāhityadarpana of Viśvanātha formulates some rudimentary facts regarding the identification of each rasa in poetry while the Dhavyāloka sketches an approach to the principal and subordinate rasas in a literary work as a whole. According to Viśvanātha the distinction between the śānta and the vīra-rasas is very clear. The śānta rasa as formulated by Viśvanātha has sama or repose resulting from freedom from mental excitement as its permanent mood, while heroic or vīra-rasa has energy (utsāha) as its permanent mood. Both moods are deemed

those of the noble or best of men (uttamaprakṛti). The essential excitant of the śānta-rasa is emptiness or vanity of all things by reason of their not being lasting, or else it is a form of supreme spirit (paramātmā). The essential excitants of the heroic on the other hand, are held to be persons that are to be conquered. The enhancers of the śānta-rasa consist of holy hermitages, sacred places, places of pilgrimage, pleasant groves and the like, or the society of great men; while its ensuant is horripilation and its accessories are self-disparagement, joy, remembrance, resolve and kindness towards all beings. But the enhancers of the vīra-rasa are the behaviours of the persons to be conquered; its ensuant is the seeking for allies while its accessories are firmness, resolution, pride, reminiscences, reasonings and horripilation. The vīra-rasa is divided into four kinds, namely heroism of liberality, heroism of duty, heroism of war, heroism of benevolence (dāna, dharmā, yuddha, dayā).¹

The characterization of the śānta-rasa in this analysis is more or less common with that of the Dhvanyāloka.² If one takes this subtle classification

-
1. Sāhityadarpana, ed. by P.V. Kane (Bombay, 1923), ch. III, pp. 39 - 42.
 2. Dhvanyāloka, ch. IV, pp. 573-576.

of Visvanātha as an authoritative identification of each rasa in a literary work one might perhaps incline to decide on sānta as the predominant rasa in the Sasadāvata by paying more attention to its religious trend than its heroic trend. But then, the question of the Sasa's heroic sacrifice which predominantly occupies the main body of the poem still remains unresolved. It is likely that the division of heroic sentiment into four kinds in the reference cited above could provide some light by which we would be able to reach a reliable solution. It seems that the heroic sacrifice of the Sasa is more or less the same as the heroic liberality described in the Sāhityadarpana. The latter part of the poem makes a good field to produce the heroism of liberality in a prolific way. To be in harmony with the sub-classification of Visvanātha, here the permanent mood of the sentiment is the Sasa's great energy to give himself in sacrifice without any affection for his body; the essential excitant is the Brahmin recipient, the king of gods who came in that guise; the enhancing excitants are the goodness and determination of the benefactor; the ensuant is the relinquishment of his whole possession, the body, while the accessories are

his cheerfulness and firmness in giving himself.¹

Accordingly, it is not unreasonable to conclude that vīra is the principal rasa of the Sasadāvata, or more specifically of the main body of the poem.

It is of note in this connexion that, according to the arbitrary theoretical analysis, the śānta-rasa consists only in the extinction of the egotism,² which on the other hand, nurtures the vīra-rasa. The hero of the past story of the Sasadāvata cannot be rightly called devoid of egotism. As is apparent from what the Sasa has said in response to Śakra, he appears to be very proud of his own magnificent charity which is put into these words:

' madan'adahasa balata - tā tabā hāma tīlo'vāsi
nissek lova madassek - sadissek novana nomāti.'³

' Oh! Śakra, neither you nor anybody in the three worlds certainly would be able to inquire into my desire of practising charity; no one surpasses me, no one even can be compared to me in this respect.'

The blissful feelings embodied in these words seem more close to a rather worldly pleasure sprung from splendid valour than spiritual pleasure touched by calmness or repose resulting from a fulfilling religious duty.

-
1. Sāhityadarpana, ch. III, p. 40; also see The Mirror of Composition (Sāhityadarpana) translated by Pramada Dasa Mitra (Bombay, 1956) p. 126.
 2. Ibid., ch. III, p. 44; Dhvanyāloka, ch. III, pp. 403-434.
 3. Sasadāvata, v. 274.

After all, the verse as a whole implies that the hero's mentality is filled with pride of his own generosity and a desire to surpass the world by this virtue. This is corroborated by successive poetic descriptions too, viz. the eulogy of 'Sakra and the world's paying homage to the hero. Besides, the poet himself appears to have intended to extol the hero's magnificent endurance in liberality when he composed the poem. Probably he hinted at this intention in the introduction when he summarized the whole subject in a single couplet which says: 'Buddha, the hero, in his birth as a hare gave himself in sacrifice in the fire to a Brahmin and was drawn on the lunar disc.'¹ It is not unlikely that the word 'vīru' (hero) used in some verses as an epithet of the hare might denote the poet's intention of delineating the heroic sentiment as the principal rasa through the main part of his poem.²

By taking these facts into consideration, if we conclude that the vīra and the sānta are the predominant rasas in the Sasadāvata and the Muvadevdāvata respectively, it will then be necessary to explain the functions of subordinate rasas in heightening the principal rasa.

1. Sasadāvata, v. 16.

2. Sasadāvata, vv. 231, 242.

Of the poetical accounts occurring in the first part or present story of the Sasadāvata the description of Sāvāt, which shows its prosperity and portrays imaginary scenes of the city and of the splendid lives of its youth, does nothing much to highlight the main character, the Buddha, of that portion or to convey the sentiment that is intended to be delineated. On the contrary, the erotic feelings prevailing in some verses make no sense as an enhancing of the sentiment conveyed through the successive descriptions. All the other descriptions of this portion seem to be so designed as to glorify the Buddha as the principal theme, though their course is interrupted by some irrelevant poetical imaginations frequent in the description of the six seasons.¹

Nevertheless, many of them arouse the devotional feeling of the reader in an artistic manner. The description of Devram, for instance, pervasively conveys the author's intention to glorify the Buddha. The tranquil atmosphere of the temple where the Master used to live is pictured in such an impressive way that one would incline to think that everything, animate and inanimate, in the environment shares the excellent calmness of the Buddha and is touched by his spiritual virtues. As discerned by the poet the courtyard of the temple, spread with white sand,

1. Sasadāvata, vv. 51, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64.

seems to symbolize his purity while full-blown trees reveal the loving-kindness of the Buddha.¹ In the same way the author's devotion towards the Master is conveyed through the description of the six seasons where he makes use of natural phenomena in worshipping the Enlightened One. Even though his desire to delineate nature may overshadow his intention to glorify the Buddha some pen pictures drawn by him bring about the intended results. The following verses from the description show how successfully it conveys the author's devotional feeling towards the Buddha:

' muniñduhu dākṃaṭa - serenā maligiya liyan
 gāvasi pipi kusum lū - manahara uturu saḷu van.
 no patala da muniñdu - savanak ras pabasarā
 nūmba mañdale baṇḍa sura sāv - kale lo baṇḍādili mudun.
 nava sadala nil diyul - ratinḍu gov vāla mevul
 mihikata muñindu pudev gata - kānahilla mal semarev.
 raṅgota malu'turehi - sikiñ'ambala pil pilsak
 digu kata inḍu nalat - salana miñi tal vāta van.
 midel mevul dam - nava nī kusum paskān
 sādi vana siri vāñdi ev - muni rajū palu dala'tnen.²

1. Sasadāvata, vv. 42, 46.

2. Ibid., vv. 52, 67, 73, 74, 80.

' Jasmine flowers full-blown on the jasmine creepers are like the upper garment worn by damsels who kept coming to see the Buddha. Even though sometimes Buddha's six-coloured rays are not spread, the rainbow shining in the sky makes the world clasp hands on heads (in order to worship the Buddha, thinking that it was his six-coloured rays). The Dame Earth, wearing a dark garment of fresh green sward and decked with a girdle of red beetles, took the fan of 'kānahilla' flowers to worship the Buddha. Tails of the dancing peacocks on the sandy court-yard resemble fans made of blue sapphires, waved by the damsel of the region in her hands, the eastern wind. The damsel of the woods, decked with girdle of 'midel' flowers and wearing ear-rings of 'nīpa' flowers, as it were, worshipped the Buddha with hands of leaves. '

These images, though they do not reach the level of first-rate poetry, are sufficient to convey the devotional fervour of the author. The most commendable thing here is his skill to utilize nature for that purpose. In every trivial phenomenon of nature he appears to have seen with the mind's eye a certain liveliness filled with devotion towards the Buddha. By ascribing life to inanimate things he must have thought of suggesting that the spiritual powers and virtues are felt not only by living beings but also by each and every phenomenon of the environment. In the same way

all the successive descriptions of the present story are intended to glorify the Buddha. Descriptions like the preparation of the devotee's house for alms-giving, the Buddha's walking to his house for alms, accompanied by monks and the Buddha's preaching the Dhamma in the evening, are exclusively devoted to this purpose, though the attempt at conveying the same idea through the description of the morning and the evening does not turn out profitably.

When we take these facts into account, we would necessarily incline to conclude that the first part or the present story of the poem is so designed as to convey the sānta as principal rasa and that the heroic in liberality which is predominantly delineated in the past story has here been given a very remote place. This portion as a whole does nothing in heightening the principal rasa of the main portion. If so, this would be a case of conveying two independent rasas in the same poem that has been condemned by Ānandavardhana.¹ This actually ought to be regarded as a poetic fault² of the author caused by carelessness in securing coherence of the setting of the main and subordinate parts.

1. Dhvanyāloka, ch. IV, p. 470.

2. Siyabaslakara, ch. III, v. 338.

The descriptions of the past story again, needs some explanation of how they, on their part, make a meaningful service to heighten the principal sentiment. This portion of the poem begins with an elegant poetical account of a city called Baranās and then we come across another description which contains praise for Bāmbadat, the king; both of them are not intrinsically connected with the main character. At the end of these descriptions the poet directs the way to the real point by saying that there was a beautiful forest glade in the Himālayas while this virtuous king was protecting the world by his mighty arm.¹ In the description of the forest he delineates two aspects together, attractiveness on the one hand and horror on the other. The usefulness of this description as a means of enhancing the main rasa will be perceived when the reader comes to the next item, where the Sasa plays an active part amongst his fellow animals though he himself is a tiny hare. It is described how the whole animal world in the forest lived in friendship with one another and developed the loving kindness within them by the power of the hare's immense kindness to the world. Wild animals who engaged themselves in practising this friendliness not only abstain from eating others

1. Sasadāvata, v. 217.

but also took care of them. In the course of this description, the poet says: 'A leopard who saw a deer caught by forest creepers came out from its place and cut the creepers with its teeth and let it free.'¹

This poetical account which contains many such occasions highlights the Sasa's virtues, loving kindness, mercy and the like and brings about a suitable environment which would enhance heroic sentiment, the predominant rasa due to be delineated in the next descriptions.

Here, the hare seems to be regarded as a hero in mercy.²

He himself behaves as an energetic figure full of endurance and self-confidence. He not only preaches mercy, kindness, asceticism and charity for the edification of others but at the same time engages himself in practising what he has preached. That is why he came to the decision to feed anybody in need with his own flesh. All this, in one way or another, throws light on the heroic sacrifice occurring in the denouement.

Advising his friends and leading them to observe precepts plays the part of 'seeking for allies' and becomes the ensuant of the rasa.³

1. Sasadāvata, v. 236.

2. Sāhitya-darpana, ch.3 , p.40.

3. Ibid., ch. 3 , v.233.

The climax of the rasa is correlated with the moment of the hare's self sacrifice in the fire to feed the hungry Brahmin, Sakra. The poet, at this stage, creates an appropriate background to illuminate dynamically the most important situation of the story. Until then the flow of the story is sluggish and is often interrupted to give more room for poetical episodes within the structure. But now there opens a conversation between the hare and the Brahmin, the donor and the recipient. This brief and straightforward dialogue which throws light, from its every corner, on the main point comes to an end very quickly. The poet recounts their conversation after describing their accidental meeting in the forest. As he describes it, the hare, seeing the Brahmin oppressed with fatigue and hunger, kindly asks the reason for his coming. The Brahmin replies :

' sādūkin āyem - topa dunu vatak ada biṅda
me vene davas'arinata - upavas itā risiyem.'¹

' In fatigue and hunger I came here to eat whatever you give, and wish to stay here observing the precepts of uposatha.'

1. Sasadāvata, v. 266.

The hare replies:

' apa bodun tana mut - kisi tala muṅgu mat nāt
biṅda risi se tapa kara - me āṅga pirunu mas āt. ' 1

' I have no sesames nor even green grain but grass,
my food. Nevertheless, I have this body full of
flesh; you may live an ascetic life depending on
it.'

Saying this, the hare asks him to kindle a fire with wood
and makes primary preparations to sacrifice himself.

This crucial moment is so turned into a poetic picture
as to illuminate the character and the principal rasa
connected with it by these words:

' guṇa gāmiṇi huna - tosa raḷa bavāga aga pat
siya kuḷunu sayure - salamutu sunera gira men. ' 2
e vip nuduru tāna nimā nosaras gini rās
diyunamni bōsat - muhunehi bālī somnas. ' 3
gini kaḷa bava'tbav - lada ladimi dāna hāṅga
siradahu vilasin dalamāda hebi giri sire. ' 4

' The waves of great ecstasy of his ocean-like
kindness rose to such a lofty place as the
summit of the universe. The hare, the abode
of virtue, sat there immobile like Mount Meru.
The Brahmin, who kindled the fire very soon near
by, looked at the face of the Bodhisatva that
glittered with ecstasy. Knowing that the fire was
burning the hare who perceived his own sacrifice
as the fruition of his life made himself shine
amidst the flames as a king of lions on a
mountain summit. ' 1

The first of these verses embodies the hare's immense pleasure in his heart and the insuperable determination in his decision to give himself as a morsel to anybody in need. The metaphor 'ocean of kindness' occurring there refers to his unfathomable kindness towards the world. Similarly, the immeasurable height of its waves represents his great ecstasy caused by the contemplation on the opportunity of performing the virtue that had been admired and longed for so heartily. And 'Mount Meru' in this reference symbolizes his courage and the firmness of his desire to practise charity. In the next verse these characteristics are further heightened through the second character, the Brahmin. From his point of view, as described by the poet, no wavering, hesitation or disappointment could be noticeable on the Bodhisatva's face, but only glittering pleasure. The third verse illuminates further the mind of the Bodhisatva. By this time he is assessing his self-sacrifice which is due to take place within the next few seconds. This self-sacrifice, as he describes it, is the foremost value of his life. Enjoying the great pleasure caused by this understanding, he faces the situation without any fear or wavering. Accordingly, the simile 'as a king of lions' in the verse

is precisely appropriate to the character and it carries the desired meaning; it exposes the energy, endurance and perception that were shining within his soul. Thus, the most important incident of the story has come to an end. The main complex of the plot has unfolded. What is to be specifically mentioned here is that each and every word as well as poetical usage of this delineation is artistically arranged, so that each of them plays its part meaningfully in order to convey the intended heroic sentiment. Though it is now virtually over, the poem itself proceeds a little further; it continues with another two poetical episodes; one contains Sakra's eulogy and the other the world's homage to the Bodhisatva. Both of them appear to be related to the main incident intrinsically. The sentiment which reaches its climax in the sacrifice follows calmly and gently to the termination. Until the very end, it invariably receives sufficient backing from these descriptions. Sakra's eulogy is mainly concerned with a recollection of past experiences of the Bodhisatva where he practised charity at the same level as this, or more highly. Since as a whole it delineates the energetic power of the main character, it serves to heighten the vīra-rasa. But

the final description which contains various manifestations of respect that the Bodhisatva received from the world, including both animate and inanimate phenomena, appears to convey the sentiment of the marvellous, for it mainly deals with the marvellous manifestations of nature caused by the incredible sacrifice.¹ Here the marvellous (adbhuta) being the subordinate rasa plays its part as a subsidiary to the principal rasa. The description, as a whole, illustrates the magnificent sacrifice which causes the world to pay its fervent respect and honour to the hero.

From the foregoing discussion, it is now clear that the Sasadāvata conveys separately two rasas, sānta and vīra, through its present and past stories respectively, vīra being the predominant rasa. Since the vīra-rasa delineated in the main body of the poem is conveyed through the energetic activities of the hero, the Bodhisatva, the sānta-rasa dominating the present story neither does much damage nor yet supports the principal rasa. Thus, each portion shines with its own light; they are not correlated with each other intrinsically nor are they reciprocal either.

1. Sāhityadarpana, ch.3, p.42, vv. 242-244.

But for the Muvadevdāvata, the facts are not the same as in the Sasadāvata. Unlike the Sasadāvata it appears so designed as to convey the 'sānta-rasa predominantly. The subject matter of the poem, the story of Makhādeva itself which is drawn from the Jātakas, is intended to stress asceticism¹ as an underlying principle. This theme becomes clear not only from the denouement but also from the introduction. In an introductory verse where the whole story is summarized into a couplet the main turn of the story is outlined by these words: 'apa muñindu ek kalak isa narak duṭu kenehi isives ris vī'² (once our Lord seeing a grey hair on his head longed for asceticism). Makhādeva's relinquishment of the throne from aversion to worldly pleasure, fundamentally relates with the 'sānta-rasa. The aversion to worldly pleasure, again, that is traditionally considered futile and temporary is one of the basic temperaments which constitute the sentiment of tranquillity. As is laid down in the Sanskrit poetic tradition, the essential excitant (ālambana-vibhāva) of the 'sānta-rasa is the emptiness or vanity of all

1. Jātakatthakathā (SHB), ed. W. Piyatissa (Colombo, 1926), I, (1.1.9), pp. 125-127.

2. Muvadevdāvata, v. 6.

things by reason of their not being lasting.¹ The idea of the futility of worldly things and the longing for ascetic life as a means of attaining final emancipation, the highest human value, are pre-eminently conveyed through the latter part of the poem.

The poet seems to have designed his work with a view to throwing light on this main theme or principal rasa from a threefold distinctive division of the main story. As the poem itself shows, the first division is concerned with the most luxurious life of the king. The second deals with the conflict of abdicating the throne from aversion to worldly pleasure, which resulted from the appearance of a grey hair on the head, the symbolic figure of decay, and describes how he went to the royal park to live an ascetic life. And the third consists of the journey to the Himavat, concentrating on the final emancipation by breaking the last and only remaining link with worldly life. Each description of the second and the third divisions plays its part very convincingly so that each may heighten the 'sānta-rasa'. In this respect we need some explanation how this rasa is worked out through its various channels.

1. Sāhityadarpana, ch.3, p.42, v.243.

Ānandavardhana dealt with this as the main element of 'sānta-rasa' when he reached the conclusion that the Mahābhārata conveys the 'sānta' as the principal rasa'. See Dhvanyāloka, ch.4, pp.573-574.

In the poem, the most important part or climax of its story is Makhādeva's abdication in spite of the earnest request of the council of ministers to remain on the throne. His abdication is caused by aversion to sensual pleasure on the one hand and the aspiration for final emancipation on the other. This is apparent from his discourse to the councillors who were summoned to receive the announcement of the abdication. In the course of his self-revelation he emphatically expressed his great dissatisfaction with the luxurious life he had experienced up till then, and repeatedly praised the ascetic life as a means of attaining emancipation. The kingly life indulging in every sensual pleasure, according to his own perception and assessment, is just a 'living in the dark'. His new vision resulting from the past experiences is rightly conveyed by these words:

' pamayin bāṇḍa vadā - daḷa pem videv diviyata
gālī metek kalhī - visīmi sāpat āndurē. '

' I have been far too firmly bound to life that is compared to a flash of lightning, and have lived heedlessly till now sunk in the darkness of pleasure. '

'paradi behevin - balata sāpat'hi lāgi lov
pavasin pānā yi - miriṅgu sililata davana ḷavehel. '

'If one rightly observes how the world is bound fast to delights, it would seem sillier than the fawn who kneels from thirst at a mirage, thinking here is water. '¹

1. Muvadevdāvata, vv.100-101.

The idea of the emptiness in worldly pleasure, abundant in the first part of this discourse, serves as the essential excitant to heighten the 'sānta-rasa', while the latter part of the same discourse which is devoted to stressing the authenticity of final deliverance and the importance of asceticism as a course leading to that destination supports the sentiment by providing its most essential source, that is to say, quietism, the permanent mood. So the following verses which again and again praise asceticism, as opposed to the sensual indulgence subjected to a thorough disdain in the first part of this discourse, throw light on the intended rasa:

' osu visā vasāṭa - kelesa'ndaraṭa sarā hiru
 sasara gimāṭa sē turu - pihiṭa sura lō yaturāṭa
 vene vāsā tava gat - bav nivan totaṭ'eka maṅga
 vasan muhudaṭa pasuru - pamā liyaṭa tiyūnu kaga
 ebāvini dān gos - ramanī pul vana gele
 tava koṭa sāhā nitten - yehen vesem āmātneni.'

' To become an ascetic while living in the forest is the antidote to the baneful joys of sense, autumn's moon against the darkness of evil, shade-tree in the heat of existence in 'saṃsāra', firm bedrock for the pilgrimage to the world of the gods, ferry over waters of sorrow, sole path to emancipation or Nirvāṇa and the sharp sword to the creeper of heedlessness. Hence, dear ministers, I shall set out to the sweet forest glade, become a hermit without delay and live there untroubled.' 1

1. Muvadevdāvata, vv. 104-106.

Further, the next description, put into the mouth of a minister, which is intended as a response to the king's discourse also gives substantial support to the same sentiment, though it is so designed as to persuade the king to remain on the throne. The description which is mainly concerned with the fame and admiration the king received from the world and his subjects makes a flash-back to the righteousness of the king's past life. Accordingly, it supports the principal rasa as a congenial accessory and at the same time it renders its service in heightening the rasa as a resistant force which demands an extra reaction from the other side, the main character. That is why the king says these somewhat determined words that put emphasis on asceticism in reply to the minister:

' ebāvin dān gora - maranāt'hu at'hi tamā
no het ma gos valhi - tava gat bav dinū bav.
mā navatannaṭa - piyō piyā āmāṭṭeni
heta heta kavuru valakāt - yugaṅḍuru pokuru dāliyen.'

' Thus, going now to the forest and becoming a hermit before falling into the hands of the dire elephant of death will be victory over him. Ministers, give up your attempt to dissuade me. How can one prevent disaster with a lotus-stalk when the mountain Yugāṅḍuru is falling? ' 1

The strong feelings reflected in these words, motivated by the aversion to sensual pleasure as expressed

1. Muvadevdāvata, vv. 118-119.

in the first part of this discourse, perhaps quicken the king's departure for the forest. The straightforwardness and seriousness of the expression contained in these verses more potently convey the sānta-rasa. The last line of the first verse which says: 'tava gat bav dinū bav' (to become an ascetic is victory) suggests the king's present views on human values. According to his new conviction he no longer believes in victory over worldly enemies so as to widen the frontiers of his kingdom. Now his entire hope relies upon asceticism. How firmly he was fastened to the decision of leaving for the forest is apparent from the metaphorical utterance: 'heta heta kavuru valakat yugaṅduru pokuru dāliyen'. All this readily assists in heightening the rasa. Through the king's realization the poet helps the reader to relish the intended sentiment.

The poet proceeding on the projected structure turns to the next stage. In accordance with his poetic structure, the king put the burden of kingship upon his elder son, left the court and hastened to his park where he engaged himself in meditation. Though his departure actually brought about a sorrowful moment within and outside the court the poet seems to evade it skillfully, for the occasion is not suitable to the sentiment of

pathos.¹ So he lets everything connected with this situation come to a sudden end,² and proceeding with the same sentiment of tranquillity, comes to the next turning point of the poem. There he delineates nature impressively, with special reference to its quietude and calmness caused by the spiritual power of the sage Makhādeva. In this description the pleasing groves and bowers are so artistically controlled as to convey the 'sānta-rasa'. Here we see the poet's skill in conveying such an atmosphere as is aptly congenial to Makhādeva's ascetic life.

At the end of this description the poet speaking of Makhādeva's moral achievement says:

' somi ramāṇi val - uyanhi vesemin mesē
dahamak seyin ves gat - niriṇḍu mulu lō sit gat.³

' The king who had won the whole world's heart became the very embodiment of dharma and thus spent his days in the fair enchanting forest glade.'

The poetic usage, 'the embodiment of dharma' in this verse suggests the king's pre-eminence in morality as a hermit. The last line of the same stanza refers to his fame spread all over the world and the admiration he

1. Though the final speech of the minister which is intended to dissuade the king contains some sorrowful thoughts it seems to focus on the strong decision of the king and certainly does not subdue the main rasa.

2. Op.cit., vv. 125-127.

3. Muvadevdāvata, v. 133.

gained (which were undoubtedly not expected by him) for his detachment to the world. That must be the reason for his decision to leave the royal park. This turning point of the main character seems to be made use of to convey the same sentiment further. The moment of leaving the royal park and the temperament which caused him to reach such a decision are expounded in these words :

' mehi vasata kavara - pura isuru mā duhuyē
vī e purusnā len - bihi va supul vana gelen
tava nadan himav - vana yā gat guna nadan
sanahamini men maṅgahi - vadan amayin duṭuvan.'¹

' Thinking: "what are the city joys that I renounce by remaining here" he felt distaste in his heart for life in woodland parks and left that forest. He, a treasure-house of good, delighting all he met abroad with the nectar of his speech, left for the forests of Himav, rich of penance.'

Makhādeva's departure from the royal park which marks his second renunciation stops entirely every remaining fringe of relationship with his kingdom as well as with worldly life. It presupposes his disinterestedness in sensual pleasure on the one hand, and his aspirations to attain high dignity of spiritual purification or humility, on the other. Thus by turning the hero to the path towards an exalted state of mental purification, the poet sharpens

1. Muvadevdāvata, vv. 134-135.

the emotional feeling of the reader so that he may relish the intended sentiment.

The next description contains Makhādeva's journey to Himavat from the royal park. It delineates how the sage proceeds through the forest watching the sweetness of nature with delight and reaches Himavat, where he saw the hermitages. There he lived till the very end of his life enjoying the great ecstasy, dissociated from worldly desires, which he has attained through meditation. The poet however aptly conveys the 'sānta-rasa throughout the description, unobstructed by any subordinate rasa. The poet seems to be able to connect every part of the description, in one way or another, with the principal rasa and to support it by furnishing it with appropriate accessories. In the same way the final description of the unprecedented friendliness amongst the animal world in the forest, caused by the loving kindness of the ascetic, also plays its part in heightening the same rasa.

Now it is evident from the foregoing discussion that the second and the third divisions of the main story abundantly convey the intended rasa. We need some explanation here of what could be the effectiveness of the first division in heightening the principal rasa. As we have mentioned earlier, in this division Makhādeva's

kingly life has been given a very important place. No doubt Makhādeva would have indulged in luxurious life as a young king. The poet, therefore, must have delineated his joyful life purposely with a view to putting stress on the idea of renunciation that was due to take place in the next stage of the same character. So he describes the king's life elaborately in this section which contains in addition to the praise of the king, the descriptions of Miyulu, the city, the autumn, the evening, the night and the morning. Of these, the description of Miyulu, which delineates the prosperity and the playfulness of the citizen and the sweetness of the city within and without, makes a suitable ground for the next descriptions. The description of the king elaborately praises him for his various qualities, his fame and valour and his virtues such as charity, mercy and the like.

In the same way all the other poetical features of this portion are intended to delineate the loveliness and joyfulness of the city life including that of the king. When all of these descriptions are collectively taken into consideration, despite some defects in their setting, they throw light in one way or another on the luxurious life of the king; in other words, this division mainly concerns the erotic sentiment. If so, what would be the

support it affords to heighten the principal rasa?
Would it not be a hindrance to that rasa?

It is true that quietude and erotic sentiment are regarded as mutually opposed in the Sanskrit poetic tradition. So then, how does this portion serve as a subsidiary to the 'sānta rasa', predominantly delineated in the second and the third divisions? In this respect, the Dhvanyāloka would furnish us with necessary guidance to resolve this question. In Ānandavardhana it is regarded as a hindrance of sentiment when after portraying a person as spiritually minded, the poet makes the same person appear in the role of a romantic lover abruptly.¹ According to this theory such hindrance of sentiment is caused by a defect in setting the plot. Since the author of the Muvadevdāvata made his setting the other way round, as opposed to the case above mentioned, by delineating the erotic sentiment first, and the quietude sentiment next, it cannot reasonably be regarded as a hindrance to the sentiment. It is of note that here, even though the main character, Makhādeva, indulges in a luxurious life in the first stage of his character as a young king, his later behaviour as an ascetic in the next two stages is entirely devoid of every worldly pleasure. So it seems unreasonable

1. Dhvanyāloka, ch. 3, p. 317.

to accuse the poet of causing a hindrance to the principal rasa by delineating an opposed sentiment first, for this does not contradict either the poetic postulate or the natural behaviour of a human being.

Further, no formulation is laid down to prevent the poet from delineating various rasas in the same poem. The Dhvanyāloka which propounds the theory of a single sentiment in a poem as the predominant one while others are subsidiary to it also formulates: ' If the subsidiary sentiment happens to be an opposed one, it should be carefully depicted only as lesser than the principal sentiment. For example, if quietude is the principal sentiment, the erotic should be lesser in importance.'¹ Though in comparison with the other two divisions this whole portion occupies nearly half of the poem, the erotic sentiment conveyed appears to be lesser in importance. The description of the night² is the only place where the erotic sentiment is conveyed directly and abidingly throughout this portion. It is also not directly related with the main character; it is delineated just as a part of the joyful life of the city. The erotic sentiment conveyed through this portion certainly does not reach such a prominent position as to

1. Dhvanyāloka, ch. 3, p. 424.

2. Muvadevdavata, vv. 70-84.

overcome the principal sentiment, the quietude. It is also laid down that this delineation of an opposed sentiment as subsidiary one should be intended to heighten the predominant sentiment¹ and that such hindrances will serve as foils or ancillaries only when they are positively overcome by the intended sentiment.² It is however not unjustifiable to say that the sānta rasa delineated abidingly through the latter half of the poem has reached such predominant rank as to overcome the erotic sentiment conveyed through this portion. In fact this portion may serve to the principal sentiment as a resistant element, enticing the main character into enjoying worldly pleasures so as to highlight his reaction which resulted in the reverse course; in other words, it implies, in a suggestive way, what a great endeavour the king has fulfilled by relinquishing a kingdom full of luxuries to become an ascetic. Now it is clear from this discussion that, while the Sasadāvata delineates two individual rasas in its present and past stories respectively, the Muvadev-dāvata conveys a singular predominant rasa throughout the poem which accommodates varieties of rasas, ancillary to the principal sentiment in the course of its descriptions.

1. Dhvanyāloka, ch. 3, p. 424. (yirodhinastu rasasyāngī-rasāpekṣayā kasvacinnyūnatā sampadaniyā).

2. Ibid., ch. 3, p. 402.

CHAPTER VI

A Study of the Art of Translation

(a) Some Aspects of Literary Translation During the Period

As we have mentioned elsewhere, Gurulugomi and Vidyācakraṅvartī drew their subject matter for the Amāvatura and Butsarana from various Pali sources. It has also been pointed out that both authors sometimes treated the same subject, but in different ways. These different manners of treatment were probably caused by various reasons such as personal interest, artistic conceptions, individual perception of arts and literary experience, the authoritative efficiency in languages possessed by the authors, and finally the purpose which the works were written for. Many Sinhalese literary critics have shown Gurulugomi's achievements as a translator rather than as a creative writer and others have hastened to appreciate his endeavour while disregarding its interpretative aspect. On the other hand, Vidyācakraṅvartī's achievements as a creative writer very often seem to have received many appreciative comments. Neither side tried to make a thorough enquiry into the

interpretative aspects of each work. In fact, Vidyā-cakravartī's work as a whole takes an entirely different path from Gurulugomī's composition, and in some cases it is very different from an ordinary translation. In this respect, we may well need some explanation of the theory of translation that was in practice among the ancient Sinhalese writers with special reference to these two authors.

From very early times Sinhalese literature had a close connexion with Pali and later with Sanskrit literatures. Pali, the main vehicle of Theravāda Buddhism, introduced to the Sinhalese the Buddhist literature originating in India about the third century B.C., which was brought by the first Buddhist mission dispatched by the Emperor Asoka. As is evident from our sources, the earliest Sinhalese literature comprised the translations of (Pali) commentaries. The Dhampiyā-Atuva-Gātapadaya and the Sāratthadīpanī, a subcommentary Dhampiyā- to the Samantapāsādikā of Buddhaghosa, mention that the commentaries to the Pali canon, which were assigned to the Buddha's time, were brought to Ceylon by the venerated Mahinda and were translated into Sinhalese by native scholars.¹ Another such event is recorded in the

1. Dhampiyā-Atuvā-Gātapadaya, ed. D.B. Jayatilaka (Colombo, 1932), p. 6; Sāratthadīpanī, ed. B. Deva-rakkhita (Colombo, 1914), p. 16.

Mahāvamsa. According to the chronicle, a learned thera called Mahā Dhammakathi who lived in the reign of king Buddhādāsa (A.D. 340-368) translated the Sutta-Pitaka into Sinhalese.¹ Similarly, the Cūlavamsa speaks of Vijayabāhu's translation of the Dhammasaṅgani.² Since none of those translations survive, it is impossible to determine the actual nature of their interpretative art.

Buddhaghosa, who translated some of those Sinhalese commentaries into Pali somewhere around the fifth century A.D., outlines the main principles of his rendering. By way of illustrating the principles here we cite two passages in translation from Buddhaghosa; one from the Samantapāsādikā, a commentary to the Vinaya-Pitaka, and the other from the Dhammapadatthakathā, commentary to the Dhammapada of Khuddakanikāya. The first of these is a work of instruction containing the rules of moral conduct or discipline; the other is a work of literary merit. In the introductory verses of Samantapāsādikā, he states: 'From these (Sinhalese) commentaries after casting off the language, and condensing detailed accounts but including all authoritative

1. Mahāvamsa, ed. H.Sumangala & D.A.De Silva Batuvantudawa (Colombo, 1908) ch. 37, v. 175.

2. Cv. ch. 60, v. 17.

decisions, and without overstepping any Pali idiom,
I shall proceed to compose my work'.¹

This statement speaks of a fourfold characteristic that he intended to aim at in his work, namely, casting off the original language, abridgement of detailed accounts, inclusion of all decisions and keeping in harmony with idiomatic usage of the receptor language. As is implied by these determinant words, Buddhaghosa was not considering a sort of word for word or perfectly literal translation: rather he seemed to have had some attraction towards the sort of free translation which is entirely accurate in meaning. Much the same method, but enjoying more latitude and flexibility, appears to be applied in his literary translation, the Dhammapadatthakathā. In the introductory verses of this work he says: 'Here I shall cast off that (Sinhalese) language and syntactic peculiarities and render it into Pali, the beautiful language'.² Further, he says: 'I shall explain only words of the verses which were not explained there (in the original work) and I shall simply render into Pali everything other than this according to the meaning of the original'. As far as these words are

1. Samantapāsādikā, ed. Baddegama Piyaratana and Walivitiye Sorata (Colombo, 1929), I, p. 1.

2. Dhammapadatthakathā, ed. Kahave Ratanasara (Colombo, 1922), I, p. 1.

concerned his version should differ from the original in two points, the language and the additional explanations of certain verses. At the same time, a special stress is laid on the identity of meaning in both the original and the translation. Though this method of translation sounds somewhat distinctive in contrast to that used in Samantapāsādikā it, also, does not claim to provide a simple literal translation. The idea behind this conception of translation may become clearer from a commentarial explanation occurring in the Dhampiyā-Atuvā-Gātapadaya, an old Sinhalese paraphrase to the Dhammapadatthakathā. Commenting on those words of Buddhaghosa, the work says: 'arut visin me kiyanemi. pada visin no kiyanemi. padavisin magadhabasin kiyanemi.'¹ 'I shall render it in meaning but not in words (of the original). I shall compose it in words of Pali.' This makes clear the translator's intent to preserve the content of the source language without making change or distortion other than the casting off of the language. As the Sinhalese originals are lost, the translating process adapted by this celebrated Pali scholar is hardly to be determined and we are not quite sure whether it would be reasonable to compare this with

1. Dhampiyā-Atuvā-Gātapadaya, p. 8.

the generally accepted hypotheses describing translating as the decanting of a liquid from one vessel to another, or as the pouring of an old wine into a new bottle. It is pointed out that both metaphors suggest that there is a single content, the original one, representing one thing or substance remaining unchanged in the translating process.¹ However, it is difficult to surmise how much of the total content of the original work is spilled or lost during the operation of decanting or pouring into the new container.

No doubt several other Pali scholars of later times who tried their hand in rendering Sinhalese works into Pali must have adopted much the same principle as this. Or perhaps some of them would have preferred a further modified method with more freedom to decorate or recreate the subject matter of the original work. We find three Pali works with literary merit, two in prose and one in verse, namely, the Mahābodhivamsa, Thūpavamsa and Dāthāvamsa, which perhaps exemplify a new process of literary translation that appears to have enjoyed much latitude in handling the subject matter. All three compositions acknowledge their

1. Renato Poggioli, 'The added Artificer', On Translation, ed. R.A. Brower (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1959), p. 140.

indebtedness to original works in Sinhalese which were probably known by the same name as the new version in Pali. But none of them directly expresses that they are dealing with a translating process. Each author appears to prefer to denote his work as a new production rather than a translation.¹ Unlike Buddhaghosa none of them makes any comment on the authenticity or faithfulness of his composition in respect to the original work. The subject matter extracted from the original work may have been lavishly elaborated in accordance with poetical and stylistic devices. It may not be unjustified to suppose, under such circumstances, that the subject matter of the original did meet with additions and changes, possibly engendered by the author's individual urge and originality. However, it must be stressed in this connexion that we are not in such a position as to reach a definite conclusion concerning the nature of these versions, for none of their original works is extant.

1. Upatissa, the author of Mahābodhivamsa, uses the word 'racayanto' to denote that he is composing the work in Pali whereas Buddhaghosa translating into Pali says 'tantibhāsam āropayitvā'. Mahābodhivamsa, ed. Sobhita (Colombo, 1890), p. 1, and Dhammapadatthakathā, p. 1.

There are quite a number of Sinhalese paraphrases to Pali and Sanskrit works, literary or otherwise, which actually constitute the earliest or primitive form¹ of translation in Sinhalese. Though they are known by different terms, namely, gātapada, sanna and pitapot,² in fact they are nothing but glossarial works or works of word for word translation. The earliest survival of the kind is the Dhampiyā-Atuvā-Gātapadaya, which is reputed to have been written by the king Kassapa V. The work, also called the Dhampiyā-Atuvā-Sannaya, furnishes Sinhalese equivalents to the words selected from the original text that were probably considered difficult of comprehension or obscure, in addition to giving some detailed descriptions or annotations in commentarial character. Then we find another two important works of this category, viz., the Vesaturudā Sanna and the Mahābodhivamsa-granthipada. They seem to have selected more words for exposition from original texts in addition to giving various

1. Theodore Savory, The Art of Translation (London, 1968) p. 51.

2. An attempt is made by D.E. Hettiaratchi to distinguish the meaning of these terms. See Vesaturudā-Sanna, Introduction, (Colombo, 1950), pp. 72-78 ff.

annotations, grammatical and otherwise. The Mahābodhivamsa-Granthipadaya is abundant in such annotations, contrasting with the other two works. Apart from the formal word-by-word paraphrase it accumulates quite a number of commentarial details in which it tries to trace the source of the original where it needs such explanations. It is of note that none of these early exegeses provides the meaning of every word in the original work. They furnish meanings to selected words only. However, a great improvement in this process appears in Sinhalese paraphrases which came into circulation from the late Polonnaru period onwards. The works which came to be known by the fixed term 'sanne' contain a complete word-for-word translation of the original.¹ For this sort of paraphrase, good examples are the Meghadūta-Sanne and the Janakīharana-Sanne which are assigned to the later part of the Polonnaruva period.² As is apparent from the existence of an old Sasadāvata Sannaya this sort of paraphrase became so popular among the Ceylonese scholars as well as students that some scholars produced such works even to poems written in Sinhalese.

-
1. Vesaturudā-Sanne, ed. D.E. Hettiaratchi, Introduction, p. 76.
 2. Sinhalese Literature, pp. 140-141.

The purpose of paraphrases, whether they be gatapadas, pitapotas or sannes, is quite clear. All of them were intended to facilitate the study or understanding of the originals in their real form. No doubt this purpose must have resulted more effectively from sannes or complete verbal paraphrases than from the other two sorts, for they convey all the word-for-word meaning of the original texts as well as giving necessary annotations in suitable places. All these categories, whatever may be the fundamental differences in the nature of their paraphrasing, seem to be connected inseparably to their originals. Each certainly calls for intimate acquaintance with the source language in which the original is written. Accordingly, the underlying principle of these paraphrases must be perfect literalness or faithfulness to the original work. Under this method, the author of the paraphrase might have thought of avoiding every distortion or change of the subject matter in the source language. Since the author of the paraphrase had every opportunity also of providing all sorts of explanatory portions pertinent to the perception of the student of the translation, he must have achieved

at least the greater part of the intended result. Actually the main purpose of such a paraphrase is to make the reader reach the original work by improving his knowledge of the source language. However, under this method, bringing the subject matter of the original text to the realm of the reader's own language by removing the language barrier inevitably became subsidiary to the teaching of the original language. It consisted on the reader's studying the original language instead of just facilitating his reading of the matter of the original in his own language. Thus, this type of paraphrase imposes a very heavy burden on the reader which makes him thoroughly exhausted and it takes him long to complete the reading of the original text.

However, certain attempts were made by Sinhalese writers to remove this burden by breaking the language barrier. The first surviving example of such an attempt is the Siyabaslakara, the earliest extant work on Sinhalese poetics, which closely followed the Kāvyaḍarsa of Daṇḍin. As is asserted in the introduction the work is intended to meet the demands of those who did not know earlier works on poetics and those who did not

study Sanskrit.¹ The work makes no mention regarding the translating process. Neither does it comment on its original work. Similarly, it does not acknowledge indebtedness to any such work directly, though it mentions such names as: Mahabāmba, Sakā, Surāājara, Kasubu, Vāmana, Daṇḍi and so forth who were known to him as early protagonists of Sanskrit poetics.² Though Daṇḍi in this list is identified as the author of the Kāvyaḍarsa, nevertheless the author of the Siyabaslakara did not refer to Daṇḍi's work by name. This makes us feel that he really wished to pretend his work was an original treatise. In most cases, his simple couplets follow the verses of the Kāvyaḍarsa line by line, if not word by word. Above all, the Siyabaslakara is totally designed within the basis of the Kāvyaḍarsa. But one thing must be stressed, that this work is not a perfect copy of the original. Instead of covering the entire subject matter the author preferred to select a considerable part of it which he considered as the most essential and appropriate to the Sinhalese poetic tradition. Thus, in practice, certain matters are left out which, according to the author, would be found difficult to apply properly to Sinhalese poetry.³

1. Siyabaslakara, ch.1, v.3.

2. Ibid., ch.1, v.2.

3. Ibid., ch.1, v.62. The work leaves out three prānas.

Sometimes new things were added so as to illustrate certain theoretical facts, especially where the author found that the original examples were not sufficient to convey what was really intended.¹ Sometimes certain names of the Alaṅkāras were replaced by new, probably popular native names.² Apart from these exceptions, the author of the Siyabaslakara gives the most faithful or literal translation of the Kāvyaḍarsa. To illustrate the nature of the translating process in the Siyabaslakara we may quote a few verses from both the original and the translation:

' vastu kiñcidabhipretya-tattulyasyānyavastunaḥ
 uktiḥ sankṣeparūpatvāt-sā samāsoktirucyate.
 piban madhu yathākāmaṁ-bhramaraḥ phullapañkaje
 apyasannaddhasaurabhyam-pāśya cumbati kuḍmalaṁ.
 iti praudhāṅganābaddha-ratīlīlasya rāginah
 kasyāñcidapi bālāyām-icchāvṛttir vibhāvyaṭe.'³

1. Siyabaslakara, ch. 2, v. 263, 322.

2. Ibid., ch. 2, vv. 75, 232.

3. Kāvyaḍarsa, ch. 2, vv. 205-207. Having a certain object in mind when an assertion is made about another object analogous to it, that, as being a shortened mode (of expression), is called inclusive assertion. In the full-blown lotus, while sipping honey according to his desire, the bee, mark you, is now kissing a bud in which the fragrance is not yet developed. Here can be made out in the case of a certain passionate man having amorous dalliance with a grown-up matron, the tendency of his desire for a certain young girl. (Translation of Verses No. 205-207) See Kāvyaḍarsa, ed. S.K. Belvalkar. (Poona, 1924).

' vatak yam kiyati va-eme vat vāni an vatak
 pavasat sakev rūnen-samāsaya yet he mese.
 bomin mī risi sē-bamara supul piyumihi
 piya gaṇḍa no pat kalhi du-bala elāmbē nava muhulu.
 valaṇḍa mana ātiyā-sara tara kumariya kerē
 hāṅge baṇḍa adahas nugi-min puvalaṅgana aturē.' 1

Here the first three verses cited from the Kāvyaḍarsa contain respectively the theory, illustration and the explanation of an alaṅkāra called samāsokti. The second three verses quoted from the Siyabaslakara reclothe the essential meaning of the original tongue. In this respect the translator appears to have followed so closely the original verses that his version makes no difference at all in respect of the original.

The Sinhalese version gives the exact meaning of the original verses following them word by word. Thus, in fact, it represents an identical entity with the original. During the operation of turning the Sanskrit verses into Sinhalese, the translator was able to retain not only the identical meaning but also a metrical form. In this case he seems not to have wished to make any kind of reduction or addition. The only alteration committed

1. Siyabaslakara, ch. 2, vv. 218-220.

Alavisi Sabihela gives different order which is more natural. See Siyabaslakara, ed. Alavisi Sabihela (Colombo, 1963) p.316.

at his discretion is to change the word order of the last two lines and to add two or three new words so as to accord with the metrical requirements. But even though he followed this type of literal translation in most cases, he was unable to retain it throughout the work. Since he asserted his preference to select certain essential portions from the original and to be in harmony with Sinhalese linguistic and poetic tradition,¹ he made certain alterations by reducing some features and adding certain others. Thus his version cannot be called an absolute literal translation of the Kāvya-darśa.

Thus we see that two types of translating process, viz., literal and free, were practised among the Ceylonese translators. The first category includes all sorts of word for word translations which asserted the identity of the subject matter in the original language. The other category consists of all the other sorts of interpretative and descriptive or decorative translations which involved any type of alteration, such as addition, reduction, abridgement or substitution. While the first kind placed stress on faithfulness to the original, the latter kind involved a sort of reproduction or re-creation. The second type of translation laid stress on the essence

1. Siyabaslakara, ch. 1, v. 32.

or particular features of the subject matter in the original text instead of on the absolute identity of meaning involved in the former type. Accordingly, it can hardly be expected from the second category that it will reclothe entirely the essential meaning of the original tongue, for such an ideal sort of transparent translation is difficult to reach even in the first category. The distinction between these two types of translation can well be illustrated by the following pair of alternatives formulated by a modern theorist of the art of translation:

- 1) 'A translation must give the words of the original, and
- 2) A translation must give the ideas of the original'.¹

Of these two kinds of translating process, for most scholars, the latter had perhaps more attraction than the former, not necessarily because of their inefficiency in linguistic affairs but because of the applicability of that method in practice. Viewed in comparative terms, the practitioner of the second method is more privileged than the one who practised the first. He is not bound to strive for a perfect faithfulness to the original since his duty is, to speak in somewhat vivid modern

1. Theodore Savory, The Art of Translation (London, 1968), p. 50.

terms, to show where the treasure lies or to make a new production.¹ Of course, not even the second type is allowed to be positively unfaithful to the original. The latitude that the translator of this second category has is not intended to encroach on the original entity. In fact, it is suggested by a modern critic of translation, that independence is to be pursued for the sake of the original.² To judge by the Siyabaslakara, there may have been a theory that the translation of verse should be in verse among our ancient translators. We have no evidence to determine how far such a theory was effective on them or by which group of translators, either the first or the second, or both, it was followed. However, the principle behind such a theory might be the faithfulness, in other words, to preserve not only the meaning of the original but also the metrical form. In the case of the Dāthāvamsa we find that unlike the other two Pali works of the same category this work was composed in verse. Since the original Sinhalese Daladāvamsaya is lost for ever, it is not possible to feel sure that the reason for writing the

-
1. John Hollander, 'Versions, Interpretations, Performances' On Translation, ed. R.A. Brower (Harvard, 1959), p. 213.
 2. Anton Popovic 'The Concept "Shift of Expression" in Translation Analysis', The Nature of Translation (Prague, 1963), p. 80.

work in verse was the influence of that theory. However, it must be noted that the author of the Dāthāvamsa refers in his introduction to an original work written by a Sinhalese poet.¹ The term used by him for 'poet' is 'kavi' of which the familiar meaning is the composer of a verse poem, though it is a common word for writers of both prose and verse. If we suppose that the original work in Sinhalese was a verse poem by taking into account the familiar meaning of the term, then it would not be unreasonable to conclude that one of the reasons for composing the present version of the Dāthāvamsa in verse might be the influence of such an accepted theory of translating poetry.

Similar problems would arise in the case of the present version of the Pali Mahāvamsa wherein an original work called Sīhalatthākathā-Mahāvamsa is said to be embodied. Mahānāma, the author of the Pali Mahāvamsa, refers at the outset of the work to an original work in Sinhalese.² As he does not speak much of this early work it is difficult to determine whether it was written in verse or prose. Regarding his new performance, the author says: 'Since the original work in Sinhalese is

1. Dāthāvamsa, v. 10.

2. Mahāvamsa, ch. 1, v. 2.

uneven in character, being sometimes too diffused, sometimes too short, and full of repetition, I shall proceed to compose this in Pali, avoiding the said deficiencies'. The Vamsatthappakāsinī, the commentary to the Mahāvamsa which is ascribed to the tenth century, says that the author of the Mahāvamsa just set aside the original tongue and turned the contents of the Sīhalatthakathā-Mahāvamsa into Pali verses with a view to facilitate the learning of them by heart.¹ This and the second name of the Mahāvamsa, Pajjapadoruvamsa which means versified Mahāvamsa, compels us to think that the Sinhalese work was not originally written in verse. It is believed that the original work was mainly written in prose intermingled with a considerable number of stanzas in Pali.² If the Sīhalatthakathā-Mahāvamsa was written in Sinhalese prose intermixed with Pali verses, then the rendering of Mahānāma makes no contribution in support of a theory that verse should be translated into verse. On the contrary it may support an alteration of the above-mentioned theory which might read as: the translation of prose should not necessarily be in prose, it may be turned into verse also.

-
1. Mahāvamsa Tīkā (Vamsatthappakāsinī), ed. B. Devarakkhita and H. Sumangala (Colombo, 1895), p. 25.
 2. Dīpavamsa, ed. H. Oldenberg (London, 1879), Introduction, p. 4; W. Geiger, Dīpavamsa and Mahāvamsa (Colombo, 1908), pp. 63, 69.

However, we find some evidence from our sources showing a certain trend to preserve the metrical form of the original verses, which were left unchanged and not translated. This mode of treating verses in the original tongue can be seen not only in the early prose works like the Amāvatura and the Butsarana but also in many Sinhalese prose works of later periods. The authors of these works seem to have preferred to quote verses in the original language with or without a summary of their meaning. To quote verses of various metres became very popular in Sinhalese prose, especially in the later works, and this seems to have been regarded as an important feature of the Sinhalese prose style. As such a mode of writing, prose intermingled with verse, is a commonplace feature of many Pali and Sanskrit works,¹ one might think that there is nothing much to say about the adoption of original stanzas in Sinhalese works. It is plausible to regard this as a separate fact from the problem we are dealing with. As a matter of fact, many Sinhalese writers of later times tended to use verses in the original language as an effective means of pleasing the ears of listeners. This fact which is

1. According to Sanskrit poetics, kāvya is divided into three categories, namely, prose, verse and mixed. The last of these contains verse as well as prose in appropriate places. Kāvya-darśa, ch. 1, v. 11.

related to the melodious stylistic pattern has no connexion with the translating process of poetry. It is a normal characteristic of a Pali and Sanskrit prose work to quote or compose verses so as to emphasize the more important points of the narration and to raise them above the level of the rest, or for some such other purpose. Motives or reasons for such a normative mode are easily conceivable. But to adopt or quote verse of an original tongue in a Sinhalese translation such as Amāvatura which is not intended for public reading without making any change or turning them into Sinhalese verses appears less natural.

It is quite natural and reasonable to raise a number of queries such as: Why did the translators not try their hand at turning the verses into Sinhalese verse? Why were they not satisfied with at least prose translations of the selected verses? Was there any deep-rooted tradition which compelled them to leave them unchanged? And above all, were they without the requisite linguistic and artistic ability? It is quite obvious that the early writers like Gurulugomi and Vidyācakravarti were well off in linguistic as well as artistic abilities. On the other hand, it is likely that such a tradition might affect them. In translating verses into Sinhalese

and in adopting verses of the original tongues in their works, our translators are not of the same opinion. While Gurulugomi adopted a considerable number of verses preceded or followed by their summarized meaning or, perhaps by a perfect literal translation, Vidyācakravarti simply quoted just a few untranslated verses.¹ The latter, unlike the former, does not bother about giving their meaning or translating them directly into Sinhalese. Sometimes he adds some annotations on account of the theme or main idea of the verse that he quotes. Gurulugomi, on the other hand, does not always quote all the verses which he is rendering; sometimes he translates a whole series of verses into Sinhalese prose after merely quoting the first verse of the series.² In the light of this short discussion, we may now be able to reach a conclusion regarding the verse translating process. As is apparent from our early sources, especially from the Amāvatura, there was a certain trend to preserve the metrical form of the original tongue, whether with or without a rendering into Sinhalese prose. Whether the idea of adopting verses without any change received

1. In the Amāvatura Gurulugomi quotes altogether about 33 verses whereas Vidyācakravarti quotes only 9 verses in the Butsarana.

2. Amāvatura, ed. Sorata, pp. 197-198.

traditional backing or not, it appears to be an important feature of the translating process in Sinhalese, of which a more primitive stage can be seen in the verbal paraphrase where the verses were translated word by word. As far as we know, neither Gurulugomi nor other prose writers tried their hand in translating verses into Sinhalese verse. What they have done in the case of verse translation was to turn the verses of the original tongue into Sinhalese prose and to insert this within the prose narration together with those original verses, which in most cases follow the translation. However, this practice seems not to have acquired the status of an accepted theory of the verse translating process and, at any rate, it did not affect the liberty of translators. They retained the liberty to translate verse of another tongue either into verse or into prose.

(b) Some distinctive features inherent in the renderings of Gurulugomi and Vidyācakravartī

We have seen in our previous discussion that there were among our early translators two types of translating processes, viz., literal or faithful translation and idiomatic or free translation, and for many of them the second type had a greater attraction than the first. In fact, if we take the most precise meaning of the term of the first category into account we ought to exclude all translations other than verbal paraphrases from it. However, it is desirable to include in it all translations which asserted the identity of the subject matter with the original or committed their energy to retain what is contained in the original with fidelity. Before we put the Amāvatura into either of these categories, we may need to consult some views of a traditional scholar. Pandit K. Nānāloka, in the introduction to his edition of the Amāvatura says: "Scholars other than Gurulugomi who tried their hand at the translating process elaborate the selected passages either from the Pali canon or Pali commentaries by adding their own similes and annotations. They tend to widen the subject matter of the source language, like an outspread peacock's tail, in order to

display their sagacity and scholarship. In rendering the selected parts for the Amāvatura, Gurulugomi departs from that path. He turns the original version into Sinhalese by adding nothing and omitting nothing; he adds neither a simile nor any annotation of his own." ¹ Whatever may be the plausibility of this view in its exaggerated account of the literality of Gurulugomi's translation, it firmly asserts the distinctiveness of the Amāvatura in contrast to other works of translation.

As an interpretative artist who tried his best to be faithful to the original, Gurulugomi excels many others in the field of literary translation in Sinhalese. In most cases his rendering reaches the most acceptable approximation to the meaning, if not the precise equivalent of the original; sometimes his translation agrees with the original word for word and phrase for phrase, sometimes it elucidates by adding something of its own. In some cases he leaves out certain words and phrases which, according to him, are not so important or do not comply with the conventions, thoughts and cultural conceptions of his time. On such occasions he appears to have preferred to furnish the essence or summary of the meaning. Gurulugomi generally did not seek to add

1. Amāvatura, ed. Kodagoda Nānāloka (Colombo, 1959), Introduction, p.XII.

materials of his own by way of embellishing the subject matter of the original tongue, but rather engaged himself in reducing or omitting certain things for the sake of brevity. To illustrate some characteristics of Gurulu-gomi's translating process here we may quote a passage from the Amāvatura with its original from the Jātakatthakathā :

' mahabōsatānō pāviji vā anupiya aṃba vanayāta vāda
 pāviji suven upan somnasin satiyak ehi davas galavā
 peravaru payin tisyo janak tān gos rajagahānuvara vāda,
 gepilivelin ahara siṅgat. ekalhi mulu nuvara mahasat'-
 hugē rūdasnen nālāgirihi van rajagahānuvara seyin
 asuran van devnuvara seyin ulela vī. nuvaravāsiyo gos
 "maharaja mesē vū satvayek nuvara vāda ahara siṅgayi.
 ohu deviyakubava no da danmaha. baṃbaku gurulaku mini-
 saku bava no da danmaha " yi sāla koḷō.
 raja sihimadurehi siṭa balanuyē mahapurisā dāka vismita
 vā " mama da mohu deviyaku bava no da danmi. baṃbaku,
 nayaku, gurulaku, yakaku, minisaku bava no da danmi.
 topaṭa upāyak kiyami. mohu pasupas yava. idin deviyek
 vī nam baṃbek vī nam nuvarin nikma devlō baṃbalō balā
 yeyi. nayek vī nam poḷō kimida yeyi. gurulek vī nam
 ahasa piyā paharā yeyi. yakek vī nam no penī yeyi.
 minisek vī nam lad ahara āra ektānek'hi hiṇḍa valaṇḍa
 kerē." 1

1. Amāvatura, ed. Sorata, p. 14.

' The Bodhisatva having become a monk went to a mango park called Anupiya, and stayed there for seven days enjoying the ecstasy engendered by the feeling inherent in himself as an ascetic. And then, he went in the morning on foot thirty yojanas to the city of Rajagaha and began his alms round from house to house. At that time the whole city was confused by the sight of the Bodhisatva, as when that same city was confused by the approach of the elephant Nālāgiri or when the city of gods was confused by the aggression of the Asuras. Citizens rushed to the palace gate and cried to the king: "Oh, king, there is a personage begging for alms in the street; we do not know whether he is a deva, brahma, garuda or a human being." The king looked at him from the balcony of the palace and was surprised by the sight of the Great Being, and said to them: "Fellow citizens, I do not know who he is, whether a deva, brahma, nāga, garuda, yakkha or a human being. But I suggest a device by which you would be able to find out. Follow him; if he is a deva or a brahma he will go towards the heaven or the world of brahma as soon as he leaves the city; if he is a nāga he will go through the earth; if a garuda he will fly through the sky; if a yakkha he will disappear; if he is a human being he will take his meal sitting in a (suitable) place." '

The following passage must be the source of that translation:

' Bodhisatto'pi pabbajitvā tasmiñ yeva padese Anupiyam nāma ambavanam atthi, tattha sattāham pabbajjasukhena vītināmetvā ekadivaseneva tiṅsayo janamaggam padasā gantvā Rājagaham pāvīsi. pāvisitvā sapadānam pindāya cari. sakalanagaram Bodhisattassa rūpadassanena Dhanapālakena-pavitṭha-Rājagaham viya asurindena-pavitṭha-Devanagaram viya ca samkhobham agamāsi. Rājapurisā gantvā "deva, evarūpo nāma satto nagare pindāya carati. devo vā manusso vā nāgo vā supanno vā ko nāma eso'tti najānāmā'tti ārocesum. Rājā pāsādatale thatvā Mahāpurisam disvā acchariyabbhuto jāto purise ānāpesi: "gacchatha bhane vīmamsatha, sace amanusso bhavissati nagarā nikkhamitvā antaradhāyissati, sace devatā bhavissati ākāsenā gacchissati, sace nāgo bhavissati pathaviyam nimujjitvā gamissati, sace manusso bhavissati yathāladham bhikkham paribhunjissati'ti'.¹

By comparing the first passage with the latter, one could distinguish some characteristics of Gurulugomi's translating process. Indeed, in this case Gurulugomi's attempt to bring home to his own tongue what was contained in the original language resulted in the intended fidelity in relation to the source, yet he made a little change by omitting and adding a few words and clauses during his

1. Jātaka (PTS), ed. V. Fausboll (London, 1962), Vol. I, p. 66.

operation. The words put into the mouth of the king in Gurulugomi's version display a sort of addition and transposition. In the above Pali passage the king mentions nothing regarding his inability to recognize the person whom they are talking about but is merely said to be surprised by the sight of the personage, and orders his service men to keep watch on the stranger. In the same way Gurulugomi transposes certain words and changes the syntactic order of some phrases. In the Pali passage the king refers first to the amanussa (non-human beings) whereas this is placed in the Sinhalese version between the 'garuda' and the 'manussa', and translated by the word 'yak'. The original version does not speak of brahma, but the Sinhalese version includes this together with deva. In the Pali version of the two sentences which were put into the mouths of the service men the second sentence reads 'devo vā manusso vā nāgo vā supanno vā' etc., whereas in the Sinhalese translation the order of the words is 'deviyaku, bambaku, gurulaku, minisaku etc.'. Here the translation omits the meaning of the word 'nāga'. This shows Gurulugomi's willingness to make certain changes

during the operation of his translating process where it calls for such changes. It seems that such changes were very often intended either to elucidate or to put stress on certain materials of the original. It is one of the most obvious characteristics of his translating process to add some annotations so as to elucidate a certain word or a phrase. In order to translate the word 'pabbajjasukhena' he employs four words which certainly perform the function of an interpretative translation. Sometimes Gurulugomi appears to pay attention more to the specific meaning than the literal meaning. Probably that was the reason for translating 'ekadivasena' as 'peravaru' which means the first half of the day. A similar reason might cause him to translate 'ākāsena gacchissati' to read as: 'devlō bāmbalō balā yeyi.' However, it is hard to understand the reason why he translates the word 'rājapurisā' as 'nuvaravāssō' which does not give the equivalent meaning of the original word. It seems that the Pali word is more appropriate than its Sinhalese translation to the context of the sentence. Whether this was caused by any social or psychological reason we do not know. However, it is likely that when Gurulugomi transposed a phrase as we have shown in this discussion he was influenced by

either conventional or psychological causes. The phrase referring to the 'amanussa' which is first in order in the Pali version is transposed in Gurulugomi's version. He puts another phrase in its place which speaks of 'devas and brahmas' perhaps because the amanussas are inferior to the other category according to conventional thought or his own personal views.

In spite of these variations in relation to the original, Gurulugomi's translation is very faithful to it. Some critics of Gurulugomi's translation who tend to elevate the quality of literalness contained in his rendering of Amāvatura appear to conclude that Gurulugomi's translating process is just a further development of the earlier verbal paraphrases, sanna, gātapada and the like.¹ According to these critics Gurulugomi retains not only the meaning of the original but also its structural or stylistic substance.² As is apparent from the Amāvatura, it is true to say that our translator, while he wrote in conformity with the grammatical order of the Sinhalese, made an attempt to retain some grammatical and stylistic peculiarities of the original language.

1. A.V. Suravira, Sinhala-sāhitya-sampradāya, p. 93.

2. Amāvatura, ed. K.Nanaloka (Colombo, 1959) Introduction, pp.xvi ff.
Ibid., ed. W.Sorata (Colombo, 1960), Introduction, p.VII.
Sinhala-sāhitya-sampradāya, pp.93,96,98,99,100.

As this fact has been discussed by many in detail, we need not enlarge on it. But it is necessary to remark on the author's success in many cases in retaining the puns of the original, which is generally considered difficult to achieve.¹ For instance, the following phrase of the Pali Jātakatthakathā is rendered into Sinhalese with all the meanings the original contains. Gurulugomi's slight change does no harm. On the contrary, it furthers that meaning. The phrase reads: 'tāta, Kantaka; tvaṃ ajja ekarattim maṃ tāraya; ahaṃ tam, nissāya Buddho hutvā sadevakam lokam tāressāmi'. 'me rā mā taravā; mam mulu lō taravami'. 'You carry me across tonight, I will carry the whole world across'. Here the words tāraya and tāressāmi carry a pun; they are charged with meaning; their most vivid meaning is to carry and the other meaning is to redeem. Both meanings are retained in Gurulugomi's rendering as in the original tongue.² In this case the translator's economy in the use of words also adds some weight to his rendering.

-
1. Leonard Forster, Translation: An Introduction, Aspects of Translation, (Studies in Communication, 2.) Secker and Warburg (London, 1958), p.4.
It is also held that words charged with meaning cannot be replaced. See Hendry Gilford, Comparative Literature (London, 1969), p.44.
 2. Amāvatura furnishes quite a number of such examples. See op.cit., ed. Sorata, pp.50, 59, 120.
Where he seems to prefer to use the words derived from the same verbal root 'tara'.

Gurulugomi's desire for economizing might be one of the main reasons which prevent him from resorting to a descriptive sort of translating process. Though his translation acquires sometimes certain features of the interpretative sort of translation, it does not cross the border of the descriptive method. Its brevity and faithfulness in relation to the original can be distinguished by comparing it with a passage rendered by Vidyācakravartī. We may quote two passages from the narration of the subjection of Ālavaka occurring in both the Amāvatura¹ and the Butsarana.² Since the source of both narrations is one and the same, the story of Ālavakayakḥa found in the Suttanipāṭatthakathā,³ the difference between the two types of translating processes can be illustrated easily. Gurulugomi, in this rendering too, following the same line as we have seen earlier, translates into Sinhalese by giving the most obvious meaning of the Pali version. But Vidyācakravartī, following an entirely different path from that of Gurulugomi, expands and embellishes the original subject matter by adding various things from his own world. Thus, while the first represents the identical entity of the original, the latter

1. Amāvatura, pp. 166-176.

2. Butsarana, pp. 129-154.

3. Suttanipāṭatthakathā (SHB), ed. S. Sumangala, Vol. VII (Colombo, 1934), pp. 161-177.

produces a new entity partly related to the original version. Nevertheless, both deal with the same subject matter. In some cases both narrations go side by side, but in many cases they differ from each other. At the outset of the story Gurulugomi, following the commentator, outlines some reasons which led the king of the Ālavaka country to the jungle, whereas Vidyācakravartī completely omits this. He merely mentions the king's going out hunting with his army. The two translators meet each other when they handle the conversation of the Buddha with Gadrabha, the care-taker of the mansion of Ālavakayakkha. The first part of this conversation is rendered by Gurulugomi in these words:

' " gadrabhaya, kaḷamaṇā deyakata āmha.idin taṭa nobara vi nam ek rāyak ālavakayāge bhavanayehi vasamha"yi vadāḷaha. vahanse,maṭa nobara.anekek matna.eyak kakūḷa;parusa;navpiyanudu pavā.no vaṇḍi.vahanse mehi vasanu no rissi" yi kīya.'¹

' " Gadrabha, I came here for a certain purpose. If thou dost not mind I shall stay tonight in the mansion of Ālavaka," said the Buddha. "Lord, I do not mind, but there is a fact to be considered. He is a cruel and malevolent yakkha, and does not even worship his parents. I do not like thy staying here," said Gadrabha.'

1. Amāvatura, ed. Sorata, p.168.

Vidyācakravartī expands this conversation by adding further details of Ālavaka's cruelty. His version reads:

' "gadrabhaya, esēya; no vēlehi tāgē yakṣa vimānayaṭa
 āmha. idin taṭa no bāri vī nam ada ek rā me
 vimānayehi dāvas gaḷavamha. tō eyaṭa anudāna"yi
 vadāḷasēka. ē asā gadrabha nam yakṣa "svamīni,
 māsatu teneka nuṃbavahansē vasat hot e mata
 bāri no veyi. itā dāḍi vū ālavaka yakṣayāgē
 vimānaya ya. svamīni, ē ālavaka yakṣayā itā
 krūrāya; nuṃbavahansē vāniyangē bas no asayi.
 mavun piyan noda vāṇḍi virīya. mā dannā tāna siṭa
 me vimānaya ēkāntayen pinakaṭa sārāhuvā nuduṭu
 virīni. me vimānayehi āsanna bima ū kolīn vāgira
 giya lē vatura gena piyā tibena niyāva balā vadāḷa
 mānava. e yakṣayā kā minī balat hot siyalu maha
 raṭak il koṭa liya hāki minissu ya. itā caṇḍa ya.
 nuṃbavahansē vāniyangē guṇa dannā ekek no veyi.
 e dān temē bāhāra ya. ohuge āmbuvo gehi ya.
 nuṃbavahansē brahma-cārībava no dāni. itā ma
 caṇḍa ya. mē vimānayehi vāsanabava no kāṃāttēmi
 svamīni"yi kiya.¹

' "Yes, Gadrabha, I have arrived at thy yakṣa mansion at a wrong time. If thou dost not mind I shall stay tonight in this mansion. Couldst thou give thy permission please", said the Buddha. Gadrabha the yakṣa having heard these words said: "Lord, I do not mind thy stay in this mansion if it is

1. Butsarana, p. 132.

' in my possession. But this is certainly not mine. This is the mansion of Ālavaka, the violent one. Lord, that yakṣa Ālavaka is very cruel. He does not listen to personages like thyself. He hath not worshipped his parents. As far as I know this mansion was never decorated for any sort of meritorious deed. Pray look at the ground near the house covered with blood spilled from both sides of his cheek. The number of human beings that have been eaten by him is enormous and would occupy a vast country. He is malevolent and is not aware of thy virtues. Now he is out. His wives are in. He does not know of thy celibacy, and is extremely violent. I do not like thy stay in this house."

The original version of these two renderings would be:

' āma gadrabha, āgato'mhi. sace te agaru vihareyyamekarattim, Ālavakassa bhavane'ti. 'na me bhante, garu. api ca so yakkho kakkhalo; pharuso; mātāpitunnampi abhivādanādīni na karoti. mā rucci bhagavato idha vāso'ti.'¹

A comparison of this with the other two passages would clearly show the distinction between the translating processes of our translators. It shows, on the one hand, Gurulugomi's intent to retain in his own language the identical meaning of the original without adding anything of his own, and on the other, Vidyācakravartī's enthusiasm

1. Suttanipāṭatthakathā, p. 164.

to redecorate or to recreate what he has gained from the original. Though Vidyācakravartī's version is entirely based on the subject matter of the original it stands as a new production, neither identical with it nor with Amāvatura, its counter-part in Sinhalese. Here Gurulugomi seems to have tried to retain not only the identical meaning but also the tone and the rhythm of the original. In Vidyācakravartī's case, he did not pay much attention to that. Instead, he invented his own tone and rhythm for his reproduction. He included them into the passage together with his new material. With the assistance of these, Vidyācakravartī was able to give a new look to his version. As is apparent from the collective meaning of his passage he appears to have intended to endow the main character with a self-confidence double or treble that which is given by the other two versions. This type of translating process which enjoyed much freedom can be seen practised by Vidyācakravartī in almost all his renderings. Sometimes he seems to indulge in this latitude beyond its normal frontiers. As we have mentioned elsewhere, a translator's independence is to be practised for the sake of the original.¹

1. The Nature of Translation, p.80.

It is formulated that the latitude may be sufficient to make of the translation an example of the translator's language correct in idiom, expression and structure, but it should not be more than that.
See The Art of Translation, p.54.

It is clear that during Vidyācakravartī's time writers were vested with such privilege as to handle any subject matter borrowed from an early work by taking as much liberty as they wished. They might have been encouraged by contemporary readers as well as critics who appreciated their works, which enjoyed such freedom. Though direct evidence is hardly found from our sources in support of such a hypothesis, certain evidence is available from Sanskrit poetics. Ānandavardhana, the author of the Dhvanyāloka, speaking of the coincidence of poetic themes formulates:

samvādo'hyanyasādrī'syam - tat punaḥ pratibimbavat
 ālekhyākāravat tulya-dehivacca 'sarīrīṇām,
 tatra pūrvamananyātma-tuochātmā tadanantaram
 trtīyaṃ tu prasiddhātma-nānyasāmyaṃ tyajet kavīh.¹

'Coincidence means correspondence with another. It may be like that of a reflected image, or like that of a painted picture or like that of two living persons resembling each other. Of these, the first has no separate existence at all of its own; the existence of the second is no more than a nonentity; while the third has a definite existence of its own. A poet need not reject such similarity in themes.'

Putting stress on the third category he further states:

'So long as there is separate life of its own even a poetic theme bearing close correspondence to an earlier one will acquire exceeding beauty, just as the

1. Dhvanyāloka, ch.4, vv.12-13.

delightful face of a woman will appear exceedingly charming in spite of its strong resemblance to the moon.¹

In this case, Ānandavardhana was not speaking of any translating process. He was dealing with the problem of borrowing poetic themes or subject matter from earlier works of art. But properly speaking, translation is also a sort of borrowing or imitating.² The main difference between them lies in the fact that the translating process always deals with two language groups, namely, the language of the original and the language of the receptor while the other process becomes effective within the framework either of different languages or a single language. According to Ānandavardhana such literary sorts of borrowing may be of three kinds:

- (1) Identical image of the source in soul as well as body;
- (2) Identical image of the source in soul only; and
- (3) Two different images bearing close resemblance of features.³

The first two of these were deprecated and the third was acknowledged and recommended for practice by poets. It

-
1. Dhvanyāloka, translation, K.Krishnamoorti (Poona, 1955), pp.151-152.
 2. It is pointed out that something of imitation, a controlled surrender to another poet's mode, is required from the translator. See Comparative Literature (Hendry Gifford), p.54.
 3. Dhvanyāloka, ch.4, pp.595-596.

is likely that Vidyācakravartī was influenced by such poetical conceptions as formulated in Ānandavardhana when he handled the task of rendering these Pali stories into Sinhalese. If so, the question is why they did not affect Gurulugomi. No doubt Gurulugomi was aware of these formulations laid down by Ānandavardhana. It is also likely that they might have affected him when he composed such artistic writings as Sulukaliṅgudā in the Dharmapradīpikāva where he recreates a new product based on subject matter borrowed from the Jātakatthakathā. But in the case of rendering the stories of the Amāvatura he seems to have chosen to practise the entirely different translating process, as opposed to the process followed in the rendering of Sulukaliṅgudā, so as to retain the identical entity of the original without giving it a separate life.

Before winding up this discussion it seems necessary to make a further enquiry into Gurulugomi's attitude towards the verse translating process. As we have mentioned earlier his verse translation received special care. He nearly always quoted verses with their translations except in a few cases where verses contain nothing more than mere proper names or something like

that.¹ To illustrate this translating process we may quote a few passages from Amāvatura. Just before the close of the story of Nālāgiri, he cites a Sanskrit stanza preceded by its translation:

' mesē kopola't't'hi pāhāra mada dāli musuva bamana maṭ-
bamara-mañḍulu ma bera āti kō-ginin diliyena yugat-
ginikaṇḍa men yana Dhanapaluvā viṣin ovun akusu-siyo
maṅgul-lakuṇu pirivarana ladu sak-lakuṇen visituru
depatlehi bāsa heva vaṇḍana lada.eyin kiha pādapaṅka-
jastavayehi :

gaṇḍasthalīluṭhitadānamasīniṣeka
bhrāntōnamadbhramaramaṇḍaladiṇḍimena
krodhoṣmanābhīdavatā dhanapālakena
pādadvaye pranatamārya drtāṅkuṣe te.²

' Thus, at his feet which bear the marks of the mahout's hook, worshipped the infuriated Dhanapāla, that elephant over whom a swarm of bees continued whirling and humming sonorous as the beating of drums, and who with his head smeared with rut trickling down his temples like soot ran amok infatuated by the fire of anger. Accordingly, it is said in the Pādapaṅkajastava:

gaṇḍasthalī.....etc.

This verse is cited to verify or confirm the main theme of the story. It certainly furnishes an appropriate background to terminate the narration. Here, the translation of verse is merged into the normal flow of the

1. Amāvatura, ed. Sorata, pp.108, 179.

2. Ibid., p. 165.

narration though its tone and rhythm sound slightly different from the normal flow. It compels us to think that Gurulugomi is attempting to retain not only the meaning of the stanza but also something of its underlying spirit or vitality connected especially with the form. In fact, he was so attentive as to retain at least something of the sound effect inherent in the verse which abounds in sonorous compounds, in addition to the entire literal meaning.

It is wrong to think that Gurulugomi always followed this type of verse translating process. Another aspect of his verse translation can be found in his rendering of the famous love song of Pañcasikha, the divine musician:

' sobana aṅgapasaṅga 'attiya, mata somnas denuviya,
 pādāntayehi patan gena ke'sāntaya dakvā lahirurāska-
 labak seyin nāgena 'sarīra rasīn suriyavaccasā nam
 lad soṅdura, tī piyā timbaru nam gandevedvrajahu
 vaṅdini. sosuluvanata sulaṅga seyin, pavas ātnata pān
 seyin, rātnata daham seyin, āturayanata behet seyin,
 sā ātiyanata bat seyin, diliyena gini nivannata diya
 seyin, tī visin upan māgē kāmārāgaparidāha nivā. yam
 sē miriṅgu-avaḷa-aṅganeka pul piyum-vilakata bata
 ātek pān bī aksoṅda matu pānena sē diyehi gālī suva
 viṅdī da, eseyin ma tī tanabadaturata mam kavara-dava-
 seka vāda suva viṅdimi ho ? yam sē madamat ātek tōtra-
 tōmāra-aṅkuṣāyen vidunāladde avas vana bāvin kisi
 kāranayak no dannī da eseyin ma mam umatu vana bāvin

virāgayata nisi kisi karanayak no danmi. tī kerē
 baṅdasita, bili gilū masak'hu seyin, galavannata no
 nissemi. yam se rātnata mada deyakudu duna no ek phala
 vē da, eseyin ma agbaṅburu kehe āttiya, maṅda bālum
 āttiya, maṅta palamu upan eka sita dān noyek sit vī ya.
 rātan kerehi mākala yam pinkamek ādda, he maṅta tī hā
 samaga phala devayi. polōtelehi satnata mā dun yam
 danek ādda, hē maṅta tī hā samaga phala devayi. yam sē
 sāhā mahanaraja palamu nivan soyā āvidī da eseyin ma
 mam tī soyā āvidimi. yam se buduraja maha bōpalag'hi
 vāda hiṅda savne dāna somnasvī da, eseyin ma mam tī
 lada dasvas somnas vemi. sakdevraja maṅta vara demin
 dedev lova rajaya ganhi da sūriyavaccasāva ganhi dā
 yi kī nam dedev lova rājaya piyā tī ma ganmi. tī
 piyāge nuvara-dora aluta pipi salrukek āti. he itā
 manohara ya. e salruka seyin siribāri vū tī piyā
 gaṅdevdev-rajahu vānda namaskāra keremi. 1

'Thou that art of lovely limbs and body, thou who givest
 me joy, through the lustre of thy body that issues
 forth from the tips of thy feet to the crest of thy
 hair like the morning sun, thou art called Suriya-
 vaccasā (sun lustre). Darling, I worship thy father
 Timbaru, king of the celestial gandharvas. Like wind
 to them that sweat, like water to them that thirst,
 like the Dhamma to the rahats, like medicine to them
 that are sick, like rice to them that hunger, like
 water to quench the blazing fire, so do thou quench
 the burning passion within myself that has arisen
 because of thee. Even as an elephant enters a lake

1. Amāvatura, ed. Sorata, pp.197-198.

of flowering lotuses lying in an open ground that is thick with mirages and drinks thereof, and sinks into the water so that only the tip of his trunk is seen, and hath comfort therein, even so when should I enjoy the comfort of thy bosom. Even as an elephant that is maddened with rut, when he is pierced by lance and spear and hooks knows nought, for that he may not be controlled, even so I being infatuated know nought of dispassion; with heart fixed upon thee I hear not what any man saith unto me. My heart that is entangled in thee, like a fish that has swallowed its bait is unable to free itself. Just as even a little gift offered to rahats yields much fruit, even so thou who hast curly locks, thou of tender looks, a single thought that first arose in me has now become many. If there is some act of merit that I have done to the rahats may it bear fruits for me with thee. If there is some gift that I have offered beings of the earth, may it bear fruit for me with thee. Even as the king of the Sakyan recluses first wandered in search of Nirvāna, so do I wander in search of thee. Even as the Buddha, sitting cross-legged beneath the Great Bo tree, gained enlightenment and attained joy, so shall I become happy the day I win thee. Were Sak, king of gods, to offer me the choice of kingship of the two worlds or Suriyavaccasā, the kingdom of the two worlds would I reject and choose thee. At the entrance to the city of thy father there stands a sal tree newly burst into bloom; it is exceedingly

lovely. Thy father, the king of celestial
gandharvas, is handsome even as that sal tree.
 I worship him.' ¹

In this case Gurulugomi quotes only one verse in the original, the first of a series which contains fourteen verses of Anustubh metre, but turns them all into Sinhalese prose. During the operation of the translating process only two and a half lines were left untranslated. The lines omitted in the translation are:

vāmūru saja mam bhadde, - saja mam mandalocane
 palissaja mam kalyāni - etam me abhipatthitam. ²

Within thine arm embrace me, lady, me
 with thy soft languid eyes embrace and hold,
 O nobly fair, 'This I entreat of thee. ³

The motives that prevented him from rendering these lines are not clear. Perhaps he might have thought them inappropriate due to the over-amorous trend inherent in them. However, he selected one epithet from them, that is, 'mandalocane' which is added to the translation of the next verse. As in most other cases, here too he has

-
1. See also Sinhalese Literature, pp.60-61, and An Anthology of Sinhalese Literature, pp.83-84. of. Translation of Pali verses corresponding to this Sinhalese version. Dialogues of the Buddha, ed. T. W. & C.A.F. Rhys Davids (London, 1910) Vol.III, pp.301-304.
 2. Dīghanikāya (PTS), ed. Rhys Davids (London, 1947), II, pp.265-267.
 3. Dialogues of the Buddha, III, p. 303.

attempted to add certain annotations which were intended to give more details to some original words. In the rendering of the first verse such an annotation is added to the word 'suriyavaccasā'. It is apparent from the translation of the last verse that the commentarial additions were sometimes made before the translation of the verse. In the verse there is no mention of a sal tree at the entrance of the city of Tinbaru; it just compares him to a full-blown sal tree. The commentary, however, refers to such a sal tree.¹ Despite a few such changes Gurulugomi tried to retain the identical meaning of the original. Here, nothing extraneous to the meaning has been added by the translator.

In contrast to Gurulugomi's verse-translating process, Vidyācakravartī's rendering of verse shows an entirely different process. By no means did his verse translations receive more attention than his prose translations. As we have mentioned earlier, he quoted just a few verses within the prose without giving even a summary of their meaning. He just quotes them as if he were thinking that they were well known and familiar to the reader. In the case of his narration of Vessantarajātaka he did translate quite a number of verses where he had no

1. Dīghanikāyatthakathā (PTS), ed. W. Stede (London, 1932), p. 703.

choice other than those verses to receive necessary information for the story. Here he seems to follow very much the same translating process as practised in the prose translations occurring in the early parts of the Butsarana. Unlike Gurulugomi, he generally makes no attempt to render verses into Sinhalese word by word or line by line. What he has really done is to grasp the most important meaning or the core of the original verse and to reproduce it in his own tongue. Sometimes his production represents an entirely fresh and new creation in relation to the original. Sometimes he gives just the summary of the meaning of a number of verses, casting off repetitions and details of the original. For instance, the following passage which delineates the physical character of Jūjaka is the summarized meaning of four Pali verses of Jātakatthakathā:

'me avalakṣaṇa bamunāta apa no dī anikak'hata denne.
 ū hisa kē taṃbavana.ās piṅga.vamarāsi ya.bun nāsā ya.
 kan rombu ya. piṭin vaka baḍin usa.bada mahata.pā bakala
 ya.niya piriti ya.mesē avalakṣana vū yakuta apa no denne.¹

'Do not give us to this ugly Brahmin, but rather to some-
 one else; for his hair is red, his eyes are bloodshot,
 he squints, he has a crooked nose, his ears are hairy,
 he is long in the tooth, he is hunchbacked, he is all

1. Butsarana, p.323.

belly, his belly is huge, his legs are deformed, and his nails are dirty. Do not give us to such an ugly devil.¹

In this rendering certain words and clauses of the original are omitted. Vidyācakravartī's intention to select the most important words for his translation is clear from the last sentence of the foregoing paragraph, whereas he has left untranslated everything other than a single word (yakkho) in the original verse. Yet, on the whole, it affords the core of the original.² However, the remarkable feature of this rendering rests on its appearance of originality. By virtue of the sum of all its parts, it flourishes as an original production rather than as a real translation. In this connexion he appears to treat his original script as a servant rather than as a master, whereas Gurulugomī, in many of his verse translations, regards the original as a master. Many of Vidyācakravartī's verse translations in this part of his work appear to have

1. An Anthology of Sinhalese Literature, p.156.

2. balaṅkapādo addhanakho - atho ovaddhapiṇḍiko
dīghuttaroṭṭho capalo - kalāro bhaggaṅāsiko.
kumbhūdarō bhaggaṅpittḥi - atho visamacakkhulo
lohamassuharitakeso - valīnaṃ tilakāhato.

piṅgalo ca vinato ca - vikaṭo ca brahākarō
ajināni ca sannaddho - amanusso bhayaṅako.
manusso udāhu yakkho - mansalohitabhōjano
gāma araṅṅaṃ āgamma - dhanam tam tāta yācati
niyamāne piṅcēna - kinnu tāta udikkhasi.

Jātakatthakathā, ed. W.Piyatissa (Colombo, 1939), VII,
p.484. cf. Jataka, Translation, E.B.Cowell (Cambridge,
1907), VI, pp.283-284.

resulted from this sort of decorative translating process. His intention to summarize the original during the translating process can be seen in the description of the Himālaya attributed to the queen Madri, which is intended to encourage Vessantara in his journey to the forest. The whole description consists of approximately one hundred and forty words while the source contains twenty-four verses in the Anustubh metre.¹ In the light of this discussion now we may be able to reach a conclusion that Gurulugomi and Vidyācakravartī tried their hand in translating verse and prose by practising two different types of translating processes; while the first type seeks the most acceptable literal meaning of the original,² the other category claims fidelity to the original in terms of basic facts and relies upon re-creation.

1. Butsarana, p. 302.

2. A. Kulasuriya distinguishes three kinds of translating processes exerted in the Amāvatura.
See Simhala-Sāhityaya, I, pp. 164-165.

Conclusion

The foregoing study has attempted to approach the selected literary period by first outlining the national literature of the period as a whole, which includes the works of various categories written in Sinhalese, Pali and Sanskrit, and then treating the selected works in Sinhalese individually. Special attention is paid to the intellectual bodies which organized the religious and literary activities on the one hand, and to the inspirations, trends and motives of contemporary minds which resulted in or demanded such literature on the other.

The discussion of authors and their works shows collectively the nature of the national literature of the period and also includes a description of authors who contributed to that literature. In the course of this discussion we have made a careful observation on an unpublished palm-leaf manuscript of the Nimijātakaya of Atthadassi, a Sinhalese narrative, which is different from the present version of the Nimijātakaya occurring in the Sinhala-Jātaka-Pota, and we give an added perspective on the problem of the purpose of writing as

exercised by our authors. Here we have seen that in general they composed their literary works with both religious and literary purposes in their minds except in the Sulukaliṅgudā of Dharmapradīpikāva where the literary purpose predominates over the other.

Since the concept of bhakti or love of god which has been subjected to a general consideration by some Sinhalese literary historians appears to have affected the Ceylonese during this period it is given some detailed discussion. Comparing the bhakti in Bhāgavata religion with bhatti, an equivalent of saddhā in Buddhism, we have maintained that there was no similarity between them in attitude or evaluation. In the same way by treating briefly some significant devotional works of Indian and Ceylonese writers we were also able to show how this concept of bhakti was transferred to the Buddha by Buddhist devotee writers.

We have then approached the selected literary works in Sinhalese, paying individual attention to each work. Referring to the genetic inspiration of the prose genre to which such Sinhalese narratives as the Amāvatura and the Butsarana belong we have tried to show its closer relation to a national literary tradition than to the

so called literary genres koṣa, kathā and ākhyāyikā in Sanskrit poetics. The inspiration that the Sinhalese narratives received from such Buddhist literary works as Avadānas is also detailed. In the discussion of the Sulukaliṅgudā of the Dharmapradīpikāva we have seen that the author had gained much inspiration from Sanskrit poetics as well as such an influential Sanskrit prose work as the Kādambarī of Bāṇabhaṭṭa. Focussing on the characteristics of Vidyācakravartī's narrative art in contrast to Guruluḡomi's we have also seen that his narrative art combined three main stands, namely current literary tendencies, tradition of Pali commentators and the motifs of folk lore.

The study of the Sasadāvata and the Muvadevdāvata begins with an observation on the concept of poetry, which leads to the discussion of the Siyabaslakara. In the light of this discussion we have seen the distinguished role played by the Siyabaslakara in disciplining Sinhalese poetry. Focussing on the genetic inspiration of the Sasadāvata and the Muvadevdāvata with special reference to the early Buddhist literary tradition we were able to maintain that these Sinhalese poems received a substantial inspiration, material as well as psychological, from the

Buddhist literary tradition in addition to the potent influence of Sanskrit poetics. We have also exercised an attempt to evaluate these two poems following the principle of rasa as expounded in Ānandavardhana and Viśvanātha.

The final discussion of this study deals with the problem of literary translation. Its first part examines the translating processes put into practice by Ceylonese writers from early times. After treating various types of translating processes we maintained that two types of translating processes, viz., literal and free, were practised among the Ceylonese translators. The first category includes all sorts of word for word translations which asserted the identity of the subject matter in the original language. The other category consists of all the other sorts of interpretative and descriptive or decorative translations which involved any type of alteration, such as addition, reduction, abridgement or substitution. Referring to the verse translating process we have also seen that there was no accepted theory of verse translation and our translators had retained the liberty to translate verse either into verse or into prose. The second part of this discussion is designed to illustrate

the distinctive features of translating processes put into practice by Gurulugomi and Vidyācakravarti. In the light of that discussion we were able to maintain that not only in the translation of prose but also of verse they had exerted the two different types of translating processes.

Bibliography

Ancient works

Sinhalese

- M.
- Atadā-sannaya, edited by Vimalakitti and N. Sombanda
(Colombo, 1934).
- Abhidharmārhāsaṅgraha-sannaya, edited by T. Pannamoli-tissa
(Ambalangoda, 1926).
- Amāvatura, edited by K. Nanaloka (Colombo, 1959).
- Amāvatura, edited by W. Sorata (Colombo, 1960).
- Elusāṅdaslakuna, edited by K. Pannananda (Colombo, 1938).
- Katikāvāt-saṅgarā, edited by D. B. Jayatilaka (Kālanīya, 1935).
- Kavsilumina (Kalpalatāvyaḅhyā), edited by W. Sorata
(Colombo, 1945).
- Kavsilumina (Pelagāsama), edited by M. Kumaranatunga
(Colombo, 1945).
- Kāvyaśekhara, edited by Ratmalane Dharmarama
(Colombo, Kālanīya, 1915, 1935).
- Jātaka-atuvā-gāṭapadaya, edited by D. B. Jayatilaka
(Colombo, 1943), I.
- Jātaka-atuvā-gāṭapadaya, edited by D. E. Hettiaratchi and
M. Sri Rammandala (Colombo, 1960) II.
- Jātaka-Pota (Pansiya-panas), edited by G. F. Munasinha Appuhami
and D. W. Siriwardhana Appuhami
(Colombo, 1955).
- Dahamsarana, edited by K. Dhammananda (Colombo, 1929).
- Daladā-Pūjāvaliya, edited by T. Sugatapala (Colombo, 1929).

Dhampiyā-atuvā-gātapadaya, edited by Jayatilaka
(Colombo, 1932).

Dhampiyā-atuavā-gātapadaya, edited by M. Vimalakitti and
N. Sominda (Colombo, 1960).

Dharmapradīpikāva, edited by Ratmalane Dharmarama
(Colombo, 1951).

Nimijātakaya, a palm-leaf manuscript in the possession of
the British Museum.

Nikāyasāngrahaya, Government edition (Colombo, 1907).

Pañcikaṅṅradīpaya, edited by Ratmalane Dharmarama
(Colombo, 1896).

Pūjāvaliya, edited by B. Saddhatissa (Colombo, 1930).

Pūjāvaliya, edited by M. Medhankara (Colombo, 1932) Ch. XXIV.

Butsarana, edited by W. Sorata (Colombo, 1959).

Mayūrasandesaya, edited by W. Dipankara (Colombo, 1910).

Mahābodhivaṃsa-granthipadaya, edited by G. Dhammapala,
Unpublished M.A. Dissertation, Vidyaodaya
University of Ceylon, 1967.

Mahābodhivaṃsa-granthipada-vivaranaya, edited by Ratmalane
Dharmarama
(Colombo, 1910).

Muvadevdā-vivaranaya, edited by M. Kumaranatunga
(Colombo, 1921).

Vesetaurudā-sanne, edited by D. E. Hettiaratchi (Colombo, 1950).

Sasadāvata with purāna-sanne, edited by A. Dhammapala
(Vālitara, 1934).

Sasadā-vivaraṇaya, edited by M.Kumaranatunga (Colombo, 1939).

Sidatsaṅgarā, edited by James D' Alwais (Colombo, 1852).

Sidatsaṅgarāva, edited by Ratmalane Dharmarama
(Pāliyaḡoda, 1931).

Sidatsaṅgarāva, edited by R.Tennakon (Colombo, 1959).

Siyabaslakara, edited by Alav-isi Sabihela (Colombo, 1963).

Siyabaslakara, edited by H.Nanatilaka and H.Nanasiha
(Colombo, 1933).

Pali

Anguttaranikāya (PTS), edited by E. Hardy

(London, 1896, 1899), II, III, & IV.

Abhidhammattha-vibhāvinī, edited by D. Pannasara and

P. Vimaladhamma (Colombo, 1933).

Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha with sanne, edited by T. Pannamoli-tissa

(Ambalangoda, 1926).

Abidhānappadīpikā, edited by Waskaduve Subhuti

(Colombo, 1921).

Upāsaka janālaṅkāra (PTS), edited by H. Saddhatissa

(London, 1965).

Gandhavamsa (JPTS), edited by J. Minayeff (London, 1886).

Cūlavamsa (PTS), edited by Wilhelm Geiger

(London, 1925, 1927), I, & II.

Cūlavamsa (PTS), Translated by Wilhelm Geiger

(London, 1928).

Jātaka (PTS), edited by V. Fausbøll

(London, 1962, 1963) Vols. I, & IV.

Jātaka, (Stories of the Buddha's Former Births),

Translated by E. B. Cowell

(Cambridge, 1895, 1907), III, & VI.

- Jātakatṭhakathā (SHB), edited by W.Piyatissa
(Colombo, 1926, 1931, 1939), I, III, VII.
- Jātaka-Pāli, (Catukka-nipāta), edited by Narada (Colombo, 1944).
- Jinālaṅkāra, edited by James Gray (London, 1894).
- Jinālaṅkāra, edited by R.Palita (Matara, 1955).
- Thūpavaṃsa, edited by D.Vacissara (Colombo, 1941).
- Dāthāvamsa with sanne, edited by H.Silalankara
(Alutgama, 1914).
- Dīghanikāya (PTS), edited by Rhys Davids (London, 1947), II.
- Dīghanikāya, Sacred Books of the Buddhists, edited by Max Müller
(London, 1899), II.
(Dialogues of the Buddha), translated by
T.W. & C.A.F. Rhys Davids (London, 1910), III.
- Dīghanikāyaṭṭhakathā (PTS), edited by W.Stede (London, 1932).
- Dīpavaṃsa, edited by H.Oldernberg (London, 1879).
- Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā (SHB), edited by K.Ratanasara
(Colombo, 1919, 1922).
- Nāmarūpa-pariccheda, edited by P.Buddhadatta (Colombo, 1954).
- Pajjamadhu, edited by H.Devamitta (Colombo, 1887).
- Padasādhana with sanne, edited by Ratmalane Dharmananda
(Colombo, 1932).
- Papañcasūdanī (PTS), edited by I.B.Horner (London, 1933), III.
- Paramatthajotikā (PTS), edited by Helmer Smith (London, 1917),
II, 2.
- Paramatthadīpanī (SHB), R.Ariyanana (Colombo, 1936).
- Paramatthavinicchaya, edited by Devananda (Colombo, 1926).

- Puggalapaññatti-atthakathā (JPTS), edited by G. Landsberg and C.A.F. Rhys Davids (London, 1913-1914).
- Bhesajjamañjusā with sanne, edited by Kulatilaka (Nugegoda, 1962).
- Majjhimanikāya (PTS), edited by Robert Chalmers (London, 1935, 1951), I, III.
- Madhuratthavilāsinī (SHB) (Buddhavamsatthakathā), edited by Y. Pannananda (Colombo, 1922).
- Manorathapūrani (PTS), edited by Max Walleiser and Herman Kopp (London, 1930), II.
- Mahābodhivamsa, edited by P. Sobhita (Colombo, 1890).
- Mahābodhivamsa (PTS), edited by S.A. Strong (London, 1891).
- Mahāvamsa (PTS), edited by Wilhelm Geiger (London, 1908).
- Mahāvamsatikā, edited by B. Devarakkhita and H. Sumangala (Colombo, 1895).
- Mahāvamsa, edited by H. Sumangala and D.A. De. Silva Batuvantudave (Colombo, 1908).
- Mānavulusandesa with sanne, ed. M. Nanananda (Colombo, 1925).
- Moggallāna, edited by H. Devamitta (Colombo, 1891).
- Mohavicchedanī (PTS), edited by A.P. Buddhadatta and A.K. Warder (London, 1961).
- Rasavāhini, edited by V. Devananda and B. Sarantissa (Colombo, 1913, 1928).
- Rūpasiddhi, edited by K. Pannasekhara (Colombo, 1964).
- Vimativinodanī, edited by B. Dhammadhara-tissa (Colombo, 1935).
- Visuddhimagga, edited by P. Buddhadatta (Alutgama, 1914).

- Vuttodaya with sanne, edited by W. Dipankara (Alutgama, 1925).
- Vuttodaya, edited by B. Jinananda (Patna, 1960).
- Saddhammopāyana (JPTS), edited by Richard Morris (London, 1886).
- Saddhammopāyana with sanne, edited by K. Ratanasara
(Colombo, 1911).
- Samantakūṭa-vannanā (PTS), edited by C. E. Godakumbura
(London, 1958).
- Samantapāsādikā (SHB), edited by B. Piyaratana, and W. Sorata
(Colombo, 1929).
- Samyuttanikāya (PTS), edited by M. Leon Feer (London, 1890), III.
- Sāratthadīpanī, edited by B. Devarakkhita (Colombo, 1914), I.
- Saratthadīpanī, edited by M. Medhankara (Kandy, 1933), II.
- Sārasaṅgaha, a palm-leaf manuscript in the possession of
Dr. Saddhatissa, London Buddhist Vihāra.
- Sāsanavamsadīpa, edited by Acariya Wimalasara (Colombo, 1881).
- Sikkhāpadavalāṅjana, edited by W. Pannananda (Colombo, 1907).
- Suttanipāṭattakathā (SHB), edited by S. Sumangala
(Colombo, 1934).
- Subodhālaṅkāra with sanne, edited by D. Dharmasena
(Vālitara, 1910).

Sanskrit

Anuruddhasataka with sanne, edited by D.A.DE.S.Batuvantudave, (Colombo,1879).

Avadāna-kalpalatā, edited by P.L.Vaidya (Darbhanga,1959).

Avadāna-sataka, edited by P.L.Vaidya (Darbhanga,1958).

Avadāna-sataka, edited by J.S.Speyer (St.Petersbourgh,1906),
I, II.

Aucitya-vicāra-carcā, edited by Sri Bhajmohan Jha
(Varanasi,1964).

Kādambari, translated by C. Riding (London,1896).

Kāvya-prakāśa, edited by R.D.Karmakar (Poona,1965).

Kāvya-mīmāṃsā, edited by Ganga Sagara Rai (Varanasi,1964).

Kāvya-darśa, edited by Jivananda Vidya Sagara (Calcutta,1925).

Kāvya-darśa (with the commentary of Premacandra), edited by
Kumud Ranjan Ray (Calcutta,1956).

Kāvya-darśa (with translation), edited by S.K.Belvalkar
(Poona,1924).

Kāvya-darśa (with original commentary), edited by Vidyabhushana Pandit Rangacarya Riddhi Sastri (Poona,1938).

Kāvya-anuśāsana, edited by R.C.Pariksh and V.M.Kulkarni
(Bombay,1964).

Kāvya-lāṅkāra, edited by P.V.Naganatha Sastri (Delhi,1970).

Kāvya-lāṅkāra-sūtra-vṛtti, edited by Narayana Nathaji
Kulkarni (Poona,1927).

Gitagovinda, edited by V.M.Kulkarni (Ahamadabad,1965).

Candīśataka, edited by G.P.Quackenbos (New York,1917).

Candrāloka, edited by Pandit Anantarama Sastri (Benares, 1933).

Jātakamālā, edited by F. Max Müller, translated by J. S. Speyer
(London, 1895).

Jātakamālā (A Selection), edited by R. C. Dwivedi and M. R. Bhat
(Delhi, 1966).

Nāṭyasāstra, edited by M. Ramakrishna Kavi (Baroda, 1926).

Nārada-Bhakti-Sūtra, (The Bhakti Sūtras of Nārada), trans-
lated by Nandalal Sinha (Allahabad, 1911).

Divyāvadāna, edited by E. B. Cowell and A. Neil (Amsterdam, 1970).

Dhvanyāloka (with Locana), edited by Jagannatha Pathak
(Varanasi, 1965).

Dhvanyāloka, translated by K. Krishnamoorti (Poona, 1955).

Buddhacarita, edited by G. K. Nandargikar (Poona, 1911).

Bhagavadgītā, edited by the Pandits of Adyar Library
(Adyar, 1941).

Bhaṭṭikāvya (with the commentary Jayamangala), edited by
V. N. Sastri and W. L. S. Panikkar (Bombay, 1920).

Mahābhārata, edited by V. S. Suktankar (Poona, 1942), II.

Raghuvamśa, edited by M. R. Kale (Bombay, 1922).

Raghuvamśa, edited by S. K. Adhikari (Katmandu, 1958).

Rāmāyana, edited by G. C. Jhala (Baroda, 1966), V.

Sāhityadarpana, edited by P. V. Kane (Bombay, 1923).

Sāhityadarpana (The Mirror of Composition), translated by
Pramada Dasa Mitra (Baranasi, 1956).

Saundarananda, edited by E. H. Johnston (London, 1928).

Svetāśvatara Upaniṣad (with translation), edited by Siddhes-
vara Varma Sastri (Allahabad, 1916).

Sāṅdilya Bhakti Sūtra (The One Hundred Aphorisms of Sāṅdilya
with the Commentary of Svapnesvara),
translated by Manmath Paul
(Allahabad, 1911).

Vakrokti-jīvita, edited by S. K. De (Calcutta, 1961).

Vyaktiviveka, edited by Madhusudhana Misra (Bénâres, 1936).

Modern Works

- Adikaram, E.W. Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon (Colombo, 1953).
- Ariyapala, M.B. Society in Mediaeval Ceylon (Colombo, 1956).
- Bhandarkar, R.G. Vaisnavism, Saivism and Minor Religious Systems (Bombay, 1913).
- Block, Haskell M. The Concept of Influence in Comparative literature, The Year Book of Comparative and General Literature, University of Indiana, 1958, VII.
- Bode, M.H. The Pali Literature of Burma (PTS), (London, 1909).
- Buddhadatta, A.P. Teravādi-bauddhācāryayō (Ambalangoda, 1960).
Pāli-sāhityaya (Colombo, 1966).
- Das Gupta, M. Śraddha and Bhakti in Vedic Literature, Indian Historical Quarterly, 1930, Vol. VI.
- Das Gupta, S.N. (with S.K.De) History of Sanskrit Literature (Calcutta, 1962), I.
- De, S.K. Aspects of Sanskrit Literature (Calcutta, 1959);
Early History of Vaisnava Faith and Movements in Bengal (Calcutta, 1942);
History of Sanskrit Poetics (Calcutta, 1960), I, II;
History of Sanskrit Literature (with Dasgupta);
Some Problems of Sanskrit Poetics (Calcutta, 1959).
- Dhammavisuddhi, Y. Buddhist Saṅgha in Ceylon, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, 1970.
- Dhavamony Marisuai, Love of God (According to Saiva Siddhānta) (Oxford, 1971).
- Dutt, N. Place of Faith in Buddhism, Indian Historical Quarterly, 1940, Vol. XVI.

- Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, edited by J. Hastings.
- Bhakti Mārga, written by George A. Grierson (Edinburgh, 1909), II.
- Epigraphia Zeylanica (London, 1912, 1928, 1943) Vols. I, II, III.
- Foster Leonard, Translation: An Introduction, Aspects of Translations (Studies in Communication, 2.), University College, London (London, 1958).
- Frenz Horst, The Art of Translation, Comparative Literature (Method and Perspective), edited by Newton P. Stalknetcht and Horst Frenz (Carbondale and Edwardsville, 1971).
- Geiger Wilhelm, Dīpavamsa and Mahāvamsa (Colombo, 1908).
- Gifford Hendry, Comparative Literature (London, 1969).
- Godakumbura, C. E. The Cūlavamsa (its authorship and date), Journal of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1949, Vol. XXXVIII, Part 3, No. 107;
- Reference to Buddhist Sanskrit Writers in Sinhalese Literature, University of Ceylon Review, 1943, Vol. I, No. I; Sinhalese Literature (Colombo, 1955).
- Guillen Claudio, Literature as System (Princeton, New Jersey, 1971).
- Gunawardhana, R. A. L. H. The History of the Buddhist Sangha in Ceylon, Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis, University of London, 1965.
- Guruge Ananda, Simhalaya hā Samskritaya, (Colombo, 1954).
- Heimann Betty, Indian and Western Philosophy (London, 1937).
- Hollander John, Versions, Interpretations, Performances, On Translation, edited by R. A. Brower (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1959).
- Keith, A. B. A History of Sanskrit Literature (London, 1941).

- Krishnamacariar, M. History of Classical Sanskrit Literature (Delhi, 1970).
- Kulasuriya, A. Simhala-sāhityaya (Maharagama, 1961-1963), I, II;
Siyabaslakara Hā Simhala Kavisamaya,
University of Ceylon Review, 1956, Vol. XIV.
- Kynsey, W. R. Report on the Parangi Disease, Ceylon Sessional Papers (Colombo, 1881), Vol. VIII.
- Law, B. C. A History of Pali Literature (London, 1933), I, II.
List of Pali, Sinhalese, Sanskrit and other Manuscripts
formerly in the possession of Hugh Nevill, the British
Museum, Vol. I.
- Ludowyk, Edith Gyomroi. Note on the Interpretation of
Pasidati, University of Ceylon Review, 1943, No. I, Vol. I;
The Valuation of Saddhā in the Early Buddhist Texts,
University of Ceylon Review, 1947, Vol. V, No. I.
- Malalasekara, G. P. The Pali Literature of Ceylon (London, 1928).
- Nariman, G. K. Literary History of Sanskrit Buddhism
(Bombay, 1920).
- Nicholas, C. W. (with S. Paranavitana) A Concise History of
Ceylon (Colombo, 1961).
- Pandita Vincent, Buddhism During the Polonnaruva Period,
Ceylon Historical Journal (Polonnaruva Period), 1954-1955,
Vol. IV.
- Pannasara, D. Sanskrit Literature Extant Among Sinhalese
and the influence of Sanskrit on Sinhalese (Colombo, 1958).
- Parananitana, S. Art and Architecture of Ceylon (Colombo, 1954);
The Art and Architecture of the Polonnaruva Period, Ceylon

- Historical Journal, 1954-1955, Vol. IV;
 Ceylon and Malaysia in Mediaeval Times, Journal of the
 Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society (New Series),
 1960, Vol. VII, Part I;
 Mahāyanism in Ceylon, Ceylon Journal of Science, Section G.
 1933, Vol. II;
Sigiri Graffiti (London, 1956) 2 Vols.;
 (with Nicolas) Concise History of Ceylon.
 Poggioli Renato, The Added Artificer, On Translation, edited
 by R.A. Brower, 1959.
 Popovic Anton, The Concept "Shift of expression" in Trans-
 lation Analysis, The Nature of Translation, edited by
 James S. Holms (Mouton, Hague, Paris, 1970).
 Rammandala M. Sri, A Critical Study of Dharmapradīpikāva,
 Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, 1954.
 Raghavan, V. Some Concept of Alankāra Śāstra (Adyar, 1942).
 Rahula Walpola, What the Buddha Taught (Gordon Fraser, 1959).
 Rajendralal Mitra, Sanskrit Buddhist Literature of Nepal
 (Calcutta, 1881).
 Reynolds, C.H.B. An Anthology of Sinhalese Literature
 (London, 1970).
 Rhys Davids, T.W. and Stede W. Pali English Dictionary (PTS)
 (London, 1925).
 Sannasgala, P.B. Simhala-sāhitya-vamsaya (Colombo, 1961).
 Sastri, K.A.N. A History of South India (London, 1958).
 Savory Theodore, The Art of Translation (London, 1958).
 Sharma Neeta, Bānabhatta, A Literary Study (Delhi, 1968).

- Shaw, J.T. Literary Indebtedness and Comparative Literary Studies, Comparative Literature (Method and Perspective), edited by Newton P. Stalknetch and Horst Frenz (Carbondale and Edwardsville, 1971).
- Sorata Walivitiye, Sri Sumaṅgala Sabdakosaya (Colombo, 1956), II.
- Suravira, A.V. Siṃhala-sāhitya-sampradāya (Nugegoda, 1966).
- Sūryakanta, Kṣemendra Studies (Poona, 1954).
- University of Ceylon, History of Ceylon (Colombo, 1959, 1960) Vol. I, Part I, II.
- Tamil Lexicon (Madras, 1934), VI.
- Vimalakitti, M. Sāsanavamsapradīpaya (Colombo, 1954).
- Vitarana Vini, Muvadevdāve Kartutvaya, Vidyādaya, 1968, Vol. I, No. I.
- Purāna Mayūra Sandesaya, Sāhityaya, 1962, Vol. VI Part, I.
- Wickramasinha Martin, Siṃhala-sāhityayē Nāgima (Colombo, 1945).
- Wickremasinghe, D.M.De.Z. Catalogue of the Sinhalese Manuscripts in the British Museum (London, 1900).
- Wickremasingha Sirima, The Age of Parākramabāhu I, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, 1958.
- Wijayawardhana, G. Kāvya-vicāra-gaveśana (Colombo, 1968).
- Siyabaslakara and Theory of Suggestion, University of Ceylon Review 1964-1965, Vol. XXIII.
- Wijesekara, O.H.De.A. Pali and Sanskrit in the Polonnaruva Period, Ceylon Historical Journal, 1954-55, Vol. IV.
- Wijetunga, W.M.K. The Rise and Decline of Cōla Power in Ceylon, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, 1962.

Williams Monier, Sanskrit English Dictionary (Oxford, 1899).

Winternitz, M. History of Indian Literature (Calcutta, 1933, Delhi, 1963, 1967), Vols. II, III, Part I, II.

Zoiza, John Siriman De, Asakdākava, Sāhityaya, 1958, IV.