

IN CEYLON
A HISTORY OF THE TOOTH RELIC[^] WITH
SPECIAL REFERENCE TO ITS POLITICAL
SIGNIFICANCE (c. A.D. 300 - 1500)

by

Herath Mudiyanseledara Dharmaratna
Banda Herath



Thesis presented for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
University of London
1974



ProQuest Number: 10731256

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 10731256

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

ABSTRACT

The history of the Tooth Relic during the first eleven centuries since its arrival in Ceylon forms the subject of this monograph. Chapter One begins with an introduction which surveys previous studies on the subject, aims and limitations of the present study, and then proceeds to examine the relevant sources from the point of view of their historical value. Chapter Two examines the historicity of the tradition recorded in the Daṭṭhāvamsa and explains the manner in which this text took its present form. The theme of Chapter Three is the history of the Tooth Relic until the end of the Anurādhapura period. The location of the Meghagiri-vihāra and the place where the Relic was first displayed are discussed here in detail. Subsequently an attempt is made to evaluate the Relic's position in the religious life of the Island. The history of the Relic during the next five centuries is examined in Chapter Four. The reasons why the characters of Mānābharana, Sugala and Vira Alakēśvara were distorted in our sources, the interpretation of the term rājyāntara and the reasons which determined the Relic's importance are examined here in detail. The political significance of the Relic is dealt with in Chapter Five. The major part of this chapter is concerned with the

discussion of the Tooth Relic as a decisive factor of kingship from c.A.D.1000 onwards. In Chapter Six the income and resources of the Tooth Relic as well as their administration are examined. A discussion of the ritual of the Relic as recorded in the texts, partly in comparison with that of the present Tooth Relic temple at Kandy, is the theme of Chapter Seven. This is followed by the conclusion which brings out the principal results of this study.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This monograph presents the results of my research work undertaken at the School of Oriental and African Studies, under the supervision of Dr. J.G. de Casparis, Reader in the History of South and South-east Asia in the University of London. It is hardly possible to express my gratitude adequately to Dr. de Casparis whose comments and criticisms contributed immensely to the improvement in the quality of this study. For all his help, I remain deeply beholden to him.

Dr. Hema Ellawala, Professor in History, Vidyodaya Campus, University of Sri Lanka, took a keen interest in arranging this course of study for me. My most sincere thanks go to him.

In the course of the preparation of this work, I had several useful discussions with Ven. Dr. H. Saddhatissa of the London Buddhist Vihara, Dr. Ananda Kulasuriya, Senior Lecturer in Sinhalese, Peradeniya Campus, University of Sri Lanka, and especially with Dr. P.G.Robb, Lecturer in History, University of London, who read the entire manuscript and made valuable suggestions. I thank them most sincerely.

A word of thanks to Mr. H.B.Uduravana, the Diyavaḍana Nilamē of the Tooth Relic temple in Kandy who provided me with

useful information concerning the present ritual of the Tooth Relic.

My thanks are also due to Mr. Gordon Harris for his help; to the staff of the Library, School of Oriental and African Studies for their courteous service; and to the Vidyodaya Campus, University of Sri Lanka for granting me study leave and finance, thus enabling me to follow this course of study.

Last, but not least, my gratitude goes to Sisi Kumari, my wife, who constantly helped and encouraged me.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Abstract	2
Acknowledgements	4
Abbreviations	7
Chapter I Introduction and Sources	11
Chapter II The <u>Dāṭhāvamsa</u> Tradition: Its Historicity	80
Chapter III The History of the Tooth Relic from <u>c.</u> A.D. 300 to 1000	114
Chapter IV The History of the Tooth Relic from <u>c.</u> A.D. 1000 to 1500	161
Chapter V The Political Significance of the Tooth Relic <u>c.</u> A.D. 300-1500	254
Chapter VI The Property and Resources of the Tooth Relic	315
Chapter VII The Ritual of the Tooth Relic	372
Conclusion	443
Appendix I Administration of Temple Affairs	448
Appendix II The Guardians of the Temple; Their Official Dress	452
Bibliography	456
Index	480
Map: Ancient Kāliṅga	513

ABBREVIATIONS

Alak.Yuddh.	<u>Alakēśvara Yuddhaya.</u>
ARASC.	<u>Annual Report, Archaeological Survey of Ceylon</u>
BEFEO.	<u>Bulletin de l'Ecole Francaise d'Extreme-Orient, Hanoi</u>
Br.Mus.Ms.	<u>British Museum Manuscript</u>
CALR.	<u>Ceylon Antiquary and Literary Register, Colombo</u>
CHJ.	<u>Ceylon Historical Journal, Colombo</u>
CJHSS.	<u>Ceylon Journal of Historical and Social Studies, Colombo.</u>
CJS(G).	<u>Ceylon Journal of Science Section G - Archaeology, Ethnology etc., Colombo</u>
Cult.Ceyl.Med.Times	<u>Culture of Ceylon in Mediaeval Times</u>
Cv.	<u>Cūlavamsa (PTS)</u>
Cv.Transl.	<u>Cūlavamsa Translation (PTS)</u>
DAG.	<u>Dampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya</u>
Dal.Pjv.	<u>Daladā Pūjāvaliya</u>
Dal.S.	<u>Daladā Sirita, ed. V.Sorata Thera</u>
Dav.	<u>Dāṭhāvamsa, ed. Asabhatissa Thera</u>
Dmb.A.	<u>Dāmbadeṇi Asna</u>

Elu.Av.	<u>Elu Attanagalu Vamsaya</u>
Elu.Av.(Vidāgama)	<u>Elu Attanagalu Vamsaya, Vidāgama</u> version
Ep.Ind.	<u>Epigraphia Indica, Delhi</u>
Ep.Zeyl.	<u>Epigraphia Zeylanica, Colombo</u>
Gir.Sand.	<u>Girā Sandēsaya</u>
Han.Sand.	<u>Haṅsa Sandēsaya</u>
Hvv.	<u>Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa (PTS)</u>
IHQ	<u>Indian Historical Quarterly, Calcutta</u>
Ind.Ant.	<u>Indian Antiquary, Bombay</u>
J.A.	<u>Journal Asiatique, Paris</u>
JAG	<u>Jātaka Aṭuvā Gātapadaya</u>
JAHR.	<u>Journal of Andhra Historical Research</u> <u>Society, Rajahmundry</u>
JAS.	<u>Journal of Asian Studies, Michigan</u>
Jātaka.	<u>Jātaka together with Its Commentary</u>
JBORS.	<u>Journal of Bihar and Orissa Research</u> <u>Society, Patna</u>
Jkm.	<u>Jinakālamāli (PTS)</u>
JRAS.	<u>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society,</u> London
JRAS(Ben.Br.)	<u>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society,</u> <u>Bengal Branch, Calcutta</u>

JRAS (Bom.Br.)	<u>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society,</u> <u>Bombay Branch, Bombay</u>
JRAS(CB).	<u>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society,</u> <u>Ceylon Branch, Colombo</u>
JSEAH.	<u>Journal of South East Asian History,</u> Singapore
Kōk.San.	<u>Kōkila Sandēśaya</u>
Ktk.Sṅg.	<u>Katikāvat Saṅgarā</u>
MASC.	<u>Memoir of the Archaeological Survey</u> <u>of Ceylon, Colombo</u>
May.Sand.	<u>Mayūra Sandēśaya</u>
Mbv.	<u>Mahābodhivaṃsa</u>
Mv.	<u>Mahāvāṃsa (PTS)</u>
Mv.Transl.	<u>Mahāvāṃsa Translation (PTS)</u>
Nks.	<u>Nikāya Saṅgrahaya</u>
Ns.	New Series
OHRJ.	<u>Orissa Historical Research Journal,</u> Bhubanesvar
Pali Lit.Ceyl.	<u>The Pali Literature of Ceylon</u>
Par.Sand.	<u>Parevi Sandēśaya</u>
Pjv.	<u>Pūjāvaliya, 34th Chapter, ed.</u> M.Medhankara
Pmvv.	<u>Pāli Muttakavinayaviniccaya</u>
PTS.	Pali Text Society, London

Rjv.	<u>Rājāvaliya</u>
Rjv.V.	<u>Rājāvaliya</u> , ed. Vatuvatte Pemananda
RKD.	<u>The Report on the Kāgalla District</u>
Rrk.	<u>Rājaratnākaraya</u>
Sāl.Sand.	<u>Sālalihini Sandēsaya</u>
SBE.	Sacred Books of the East
SBV.	<u>Sinhala Bōdhi Vaṃsaya</u>
SHB.	Simon Hevavitarāna Bequest
Siñ.Dal.V.	<u>Sinhala Daḷadā Vaṃsaya</u>
S.Ind.Ins.	<u>South Indian Inscriptions</u>
Siñ.Sā.Lipi.	<u>Sinhala Sāhitya Lipi</u>
Skt.	Sanskrit
Smp.	<u>Samantapāsādikā</u>
Srk.	<u>Saddharmaratnākaraya</u>
Tv.	<u>Thūpavaṃsa</u>
UHC.	<u>University of Ceylon History of Ceylon</u>
UCR.	<u>University of Ceylon Review</u>

Chapter I

Introduction and Sources

In this study an attempt is made to reconstruct the history of a relic of the Lord Buddha and to examine the interaction of religion and politics in ancient Ceylon. Two aspects which deserve clarification at the outset are the definition of the term 'Tooth Relic' and the scope of the study. The term 'Tooth Relic' denotes in this survey the left canine tooth of the Buddha which was transferred to Ceylon in about A.D.310 and is at present enshrined in the Daḷadā Māligāva at Kandy. The period dealt with in this study comprises eleven centuries after the arrival of the Relic in Ceylon. The year 1500 has been selected for the end of the study for two reasons. Firstly, a complete history of the Tooth Relic up to the present time is too vast a field for a study of this nature as it would not permit a detailed discussion of the problems connected with the Relic. Secondly, at the beginning of the sixteenth century there begins a new phase of the history of Ceylon. This century witnessed the appearance in the political scene of the Portuguese, who were followed by two other western powers, namely the Dutch and the British. Almost every aspect of the traditional Sinhalese society underwent great change as

a result of the relations with as well as the policies of these foreign powers. Although the importance of the Tooth Relic was not, on the whole, affected its fortunes were in some respects related to the complex problems of the history of these five centuries. Hence the period examined in the present study is well defined.

It is hardly necessary to stress the need for a study of this nature. Viewed with the pre-eminent position of the Relic in both political and religious respects, it is surprising that no comprehensive study of its history has so far been attempted. On the other hand, casual discussions, especially those devoted to the understanding of some problems of the Dāṭhāvamsa tradition date back to as early as the first half of the nineteenth century. In 1837, George Turnour examined the Dāṭhāvamsa and made an attempt to identify one of the rulers mentioned in the text.¹ A similar attempt was made by Ferguson in 1868.² A few years later, another scholar traced some phases of the history of the Tooth Relic and concluded that its worship was a 'mistaken devotion'.³ Several attempts to identify Dantapura of the Dāṭhāvamsa were also made from the

-
1. JRAS(Ben.Br)., VI, pt.II, pp.858-68.
 2. JRAS., NS., VI, 1868, p.150.
 3. JRAS(Bom.Br)., XI, 1875, pp.115-46.

latter half of the nineteenth century.¹

In his Annals of the Tooth Relic, published in 1928, Andreas Nell brought together the relevant material found in the Dāṭhāvamsa, the Cūlavamsa and such other works as the Pūjāvaliya and the Rājaratnākara, and described the history of the Tooth Relic up to 1853.² Three years later Hocart brought out a Memoir of the Archaeological Survey of Ceylon on the Temple of the Tooth Relic.³ This work places much emphasis on the structure, ritual and officials of the present Tooth Relic temple at Kandy, but also provides a brief outline of the history of the Tooth Relic as well as a translation of the temple regulations found in the Daḷadā Sirita.⁴ These regulations, together with a brief discussion of the arrival of the Relic and of Fa-Hsien's account of the Tooth Relic festival, have been dealt with, in the same year, by Paranavitana.⁵ Malalasekara's Dictionary of Pali Proper Names, which appeared in two volumes in 1937/38, also provides numerous references to places and persons connected with the history of the Tooth

1. See below, p.103 ff.

2. Andreas Nell, The Annals of the Tooth Relic, Kandy, 1928.

3. MASC., IV, London, 1931.

4. Ibid., pp.1-5, 34-37.

5. Buddhistic Studies, ed. B.C.Law, Calcutta, 1931, pp.529-46.

Relic.¹ It still remains a valuable reference work for studies of this nature.

The next scholar to take up the subject was Rahula, who, in his History of Buddhism in Ceylon, gave numerous references to the Tooth Relic. For the first time he drew attention to the fact that the importance of the Tooth Relic might have been determined by sectarianism in the Order.² A few years later Paranavitana briefly discussed the Tooth Relic festival and the importance of the Relic, in sections devoted to civilization, in the History of Ceylon sponsored by the University of Ceylon.³ Numerous other references to the Relic are also found in the same work. The Culture of Ceylon in Mediaeval Times, a posthumous publication of a study by Geiger, brought out by Heinz Bechert in 1960, also brings together references to the Tooth Relic found in the chronicle.⁴ A more elaborate discussion of a rather limited period is found in the Study by Liyanagamage on the Decline of Polonnaruwa and the Rise of Dambadeniya. This scholar drew attention to the chronicles of the Tooth Relic and homage paid to the Relic by the rulers of Dambadeniya as well as to its political significance.⁵

-
1. G.P.Malalasekara, Dictionary of Pali Proper Names, 2 Vols. London, 1937/38.
 2. Walpola Rahula, The History of Buddhism in Ceylon, Colombo, 1956, pp.128, 280-82.
 3. UCHC., I, pt.I, pp.278-79; pt.II, pp.571-74, 758-62.
 4. Culture of Ceylon in Mediaeval Times, ed. Heinz Bechert, Wiesbaden, 1960, pp.213-15.
 5. A.Liyanagamage, The Decline of Polonnaruwa and the Rise of Dambadeniya, Colombo, 1968, pp.22-27, 90-93, 105, 121, 129, 137, 151, 165.

In addition to the works mentioned above, there are some unpublished monographs in which some attention has been given to the Tooth Relic. The first of these is the doctoral thesis of Sirima Wickramasinghe.¹ In this valuable work Wickramasinghe examined the reliability of some statements of the chronicle which have a direct bearing on the Tooth Relic and drew attention to the fact that the Rohaṇa campaign of Parākramabāhu may not have been motivated by his territorial ambitions alone.² The next scholar to pay attention to the subject was Gunawardhana, who, in his valuable study on the History of the Buddhist Saṅgha in Ceylon from the Reign of Sena I to the Invasion of Māgha,³ provided a useful discussion of the origin and history of the Uttaramūla-parivēṇa and its association with the Tooth Relic.⁴ He also referred to the relevant accounts of the Cūlavamsa, Fa-Hsien and the Daḷadā Sirita.⁵ A more elaborate discussion of the subject is found in the doctoral thesis of Dhammavisuddhi.⁶ This scholar drew attention to the

-
1. S.Wickramasinghe, The Age of Parākramabāhu I, Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, 1958.
 2. Ibid., pp.168, 174, 177-78, 315, 436-37.
 3. Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, 1965.
 4. Ibid., pp.416-26.
 5. Ibid., pp.327-29.
 6. Y.Dhammavisuddhi, The Buddhist Saṅgha in Ceylon (circa. A.D. 1200-1400), Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, 1970.

political significance of the Relic, its use in rain magic, and the regulations of the Daladā Sirita; the last aspect is dealt with in considerable detail.¹ The latest contribution is from Ilangasinha who pays special attention to the homage paid to the Relic by Parākramabāhu VI.²

The present study seeks to examine further the complicated problems of the history of the Tooth Relic. The method that has so far been followed by scholars was to concentrate either on the history of kingship or on that of the Buddhist Order and to analyse the interdependence of the two institutions. This study differs from that method in that it concentrates on a single object and its relation with politics. The advantages of this method are twofold. In the first place it provides a closer insight into some aspects of kingship and the extent to which kingship depended on the presence of the Tooth Relic. In the second place, it may lead to a better understanding of religious influence in politics and to a clearer view of the significance of the Tooth Relic in the Buddhist Order as a whole.

Our special attention has been focused in this study on the Dāṭhāvamsa tradition, the political significance of the Tooth

1. Ibid., pp.316-50.

2. H.B.M.Ilangasinha, A Study of Buddhism in Ceylon in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries (circa. A.D.1400-1600), Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, 1972, pp.304-68.

Relic, its property and resources and those aspects of the ritual which have hitherto not been examined in detail. The ritual of the Relic is especially compared with that of the present Relic temple with a view to showing that there was no drastic change in this respect throughout the history of the Relic in Ceylon. The structure, ornamentation and symbolism of the Tooth Relic Temples are not dealt with, for the available material would require a separate study. It is hoped that this study may provide a proper background for such a study and also for further research into the more complex problems of the later history of the Relic.

The sources utilized in this study can broadly be divided into three categories. They are, I. Ceylonese literary works written in Pali and Sinhalese, II. Foreign literary works and notices and III. Epigraphs both native and foreign as well as Archaeological remains. It is useful to note that many of the principal sources which are relevant to this study have been extensively used by the students of various aspects of the history of medieval Ceylon. Hence, our discussion on sources is confined to drawing attention to particularly noteworthy features which are of direct importance to us.

Pali and Sinhalese Sources

The so-called Cūlavamsa, which is another name for the continuation of the Mahāvamsa, is by far the most important source of information for this study. It is worthy of note that 55 chapters¹ of the Cūlavamsa, which cover twelve centuries, come within the scope of our survey. The authorship, sources, contents and authenticity as well as the value of the Cūlavamsa for the understanding of the history of Ceylon have been discussed by various scholars.² Hence our attention is focused on the use and limitations of this work for the present study.

In his valuable discussions of the trustworthiness, date and authorship of the Cūlavamsa Geiger recognized three different

-
1. Chapters 37-92.
 2. Geiger, 'The Trustworthiness of the Mahāvamsa', IHQ., VI, no.2, 1930, pp.205-228; CHJ., IV, 1954-55, pp.153-68; Cv., Transl., pt.I, Introduction, p.IV ff; Pali.Lit.Ceyl., p.215; JRAS(CB)., XXXVIII, pp.123-26; L.S.Perera, 'The Pali Chronicle in Ceylon', Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon, ed. C.H.Philips, London, 1961, pp.29-43; UCHC., I, pt.I, pp.51-53; S.Wickramasinghe, op.cit., pp.8-33; W.M.K.Wijetunga, The Rise and Fall of the Cola Power in Ceylon, Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, 1962, pp.18-26; A.Liyanagamage, op.cit., pp.5-10; G.S.Ranawella, A Political History of Rohana from c.991-1255 A.D., Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, 1966, pp.13-29; G.P.V.Somarathna, A Political History of the Kingdom of Kōṭṭē (c.A.D.1400-1521), Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, 1969, pp.9-11; H.B.M.Ilangasinha, op.cit., pp.6-15.

parts of the text. According to him, the first part, i.e. chapters 37 to 79 which covers a period of about eight centuries from the reign of Siri Meghavanna to the end of Parākramabāhu I, was written by a thera named Dhammakitti.¹ The author of the second part, i.e. chapters 80 to verse 102 or 104 of chapter 90, is not known. The third part, i.e. chapters 90-100, was written by a thera known as Tibboṭuvāvē Buddharakkhita, during the reign of Kitti Siri Rājasinha (A.D.1747-82).² That the latter two parts are the works of two different authors is a fact established beyond doubt but, as Wickramasinghe quite convincingly pointed out, there is strong reason to believe that the so-called first part (chapter 37-79) was also written by two different authors in two sections; one from the reign of Siri Meghavanna to the Coḷa conquest (37.51 to 56.17) and the other from the rise of Vijayabāhu I to the end of the reign of Parākramabāhu I.³ Both Liyanagamage and Ranawella agree with this division.⁴ The latter especially furnishes further information to support it.⁵ There is also reason to justify

1. Cv., Transl., pt.I, Introduction, p.IV.

2. IHQ., VI, no.2, 1930, pp.207-08.

3. S.Wickramasinghe, op.cit., p.12 ff.

4. Liyanagamage, op.cit., p.5 ff; Ranawella, op.cit., p.14.

5. Ibid., p.14 ff.

it for the present study.¹ An attempt will be made in the following pages to examine the use and limitations of the four parts of the Cūlavamsa.

Part I

The construction of the history of the Tooth Relic during the Anurādhapura period depends largely on the first part of the Cūlavamsa. The author of this part has been praised by scholars for the exactitude of the contents and his unbiased attitude towards nikāyas and vihāras, as well as towards other religions.² It is true that the author of this part did not adopt a strong line against views with which he disagreed, in contrast to the author of the Mahāvamsa. Nevertheless, there are indications that he may have had a prejudice against the Tooth Relic.

In one aspect this is particularly noticeable. In the light of later developments, the bringing of the Tooth Relic would have been the most important event in the reign of Siri Meghavanna. But this event is given an insignificant place in the chronicle - the arrival is briefly described and it is stated the Meghavanna welcomed the Relic in the manner set forth in the chronicle of the Tooth Relic.³ It is not impossible

1. See below, p. 21 ff.

2. Cv., Transl., pt. I, Introduction, p. IV; Wijetunga, op.cit., pp. 20-22.

3. Cv., 37.93.

that the chronicler expected people to know the contents of the chronicle of the Tooth Relic but such an attitude is surprising especially in comparison with the detailed description by the earlier author of the Mahāvamsa of the arrival of the Bō Tree¹ and the construction of the Mahāthūpa.² Like the Dāṭhāvamsa, the Pali chronicles of the Bō Tree and the Mahāthūpa were based on Sinhalese chronicles. Although one cannot be certain whether they were popular or not, it is beyond doubt that they did exist at the time when the Mahāvamsa was written. Therefore, if the author of the Mahāvamsa had wished to avoid a detailed description of the Bō Tree and the Mahāthūpa, he could well have done so by referring to their chronicles. But he included these detailed descriptions, which clearly suggest that he considered the Bō Tree and the Mahāthūpa to be very important perhaps because the former was one of the initial steps taken after the introduction of Buddhism while the latter was the greatest monument of his hero, Duṭṭhagāmaṇī, and were of supreme significance to the Buddhist community. Thus the question may be raised as to why the author of the Cūlavamsa did not pay equal attention to the arrival of the Tooth Relic, which later became the palladium of the Sinhalese kings. As will be discussed in

1. Mv., 18.1-68; 19.1-85.

2. Ibid., chapters 28-31.

the following pages, this seems to have been due to sectarian considerations on the part of the chronicler.

A clear example of this bias is the omission from the Cūlavamsa of the Meghagiri-vihāra, which according to the Dāṭhāvamsa and the Daḷadā Sirita, was the original place of deposit of the Tooth Relic. As we shall see later, the Relic was brought to Ceylon under the aegis of the non-Theravāda Hīnayāna Sects¹ and was entrusted to the Abhayagiri to which Meghagiri was affiliated. Therefore the omission of this particular detail from the chronicle may suggest that the chronicler was attached to the Mahāvihāra, the doctrinal rival of the Abhayagiri. There are some indications that this is indeed the case.

The occasion on which the Cūlavamsa describes the arrival of the Tooth Relic may be significant. In addition to the fact that only six verses are devoted to this important event, the place in the chronicle also deserves our attention. The chronicler has paid much attention to the restoration works done by Meghavanna at the Mahāvihāra, Lohapāsāda, and also to his celebration of a festival in honour of Mahinda.² Only at this stage is the arrival of the Tooth Relic mentioned.³ It might be

-
1. See below, pp. 123-24.
 2. Cv., 37.53-91.
 3. Ibid., 37.92.

suggested that the chronicler had followed a chronological order and therefore could not give prominence to an event which took place in Meghavanna's ninth regnal year. But to accept this suggestion, one would have to assume that all the meritorious deeds described in thirty-eight verses¹ were accomplished within the first nine years, while nineteen years were spent to carry out the tasks described in two verses.² This is very unlikely. What is more, the insignificant place accorded to the Tooth Relic remains unchanged throughout the Anurādhapura period except on two occasions. In the reign of Dhātusena the chronicler describes his reorganization of the administrative system, the erection of the vihāras, the irrigations works, the renovations done at the Lōhapāsāda and the Abhayagiri, the Bō Tree festival, the Mahinda festival, the offerings to the Thūpārāma, and the festivals celebrated at some insignificant places;³ and only then does he mention the king's benefactions towards the Tooth Relic.⁴ There is similar treatment of the Relic even in the reigns of Aggabodhi I,⁵ and Mahinda IV.⁶ The two occasions on which

1. Ibid., 37.53-91.

2. Ibid., 37.98-99.

3. Ibid., 38.35-70.

4. Ibid., 38.71-72.

5. Ibid., 42.14-32 other meritorious deeds, 42.33 Tooth Relic.

6. Ibid., 54.17-44 other meritorious deeds, 54.45 Tooth Relic.

priority is given to the Tooth Relic were during the reigns of Sena II¹ and Sena IV.² But even here greater importance is attached during the reign of the former to the Bō Tree, the Lohapāsāda and even to some insignificant places of worship;³ in the case of the latter, his benefaction towards the Tooth Relic is his only noteworthy religious deed. These two references in no way prove that the chronicler was not consistent in his attitude towards the Tooth Relic. Such conduct, especially when compared with that of his successors (the authors of the second and third parts of the chronicle)⁴ leads one to the suggestion that he was a monk who belonged to the Mahāvihāra and therefore paid less attention to a relic guarded by their rivals in the Abhayagiri.

Another deficiency of this part of the chronicle is that sometimes it makes no mention of the Tooth Relic for one or two centuries. For instance, it remains silent about the Tooth Relic for nearly a century after the reign of Siri Meghavanna, a period for which information is available from other sources.⁵ It remains silent also for about two centuries after the reign of Dāṭhopatissa.⁶

1. Ibid., 51.22.

2. Ibid., 54.5.

3. Ibid., 51.53 ff., 69, 74 ff.

4. See below, pp. 25-30.

5. See below, pp. 134-35.

6. See below, pp. 142-44.

However, while it is true that these limitations hinder the chronicle's usefulness to some extent, the information it provides is still of considerable value for the present study. It refers to the Dhammacakkageha where the Relic was kept when it was delivered to Ceylon,¹ a detail not found elsewhere. On many occasions we largely depend on its account to reconstruct the Relic's history, though at other times some of its details are corroborated by other sources. Hence this part of the Cūlavamsa may be regarded as a valuable source of information for our study.

Part II

The second part of the Cūlavamsa deals with the period starting from the rise of Vijayabāhu I to the end of the reign of Parākramabāhu I, and is traditionally believed to have been written by a thera named Dhammakitti during the reign of Parākramabāhu II.² The chronicler of this section lays much emphasis, unlike his predecessor, on the happiness and heavenly bliss gained through meritorious deeds, rather than on the impermanence of worldly things. This part was written at a time when antagonism between sects was less strongly pronounced, especially after the unification of the Saṅgha by Parākramabāhu I.

-
1. Cv., 37.95; see below, pp. 116-17, 256-57.
 2. Cv., Transl., Introduction, p.IV; IHQ., VI, no.2, 1930, pp.206-07; Historians of India Pakistan and Ceylon, pp.31-32.

Hence, as far as the religion is concerned, one gets a well-balanced picture of the rulers' benefactions towards various institutions. The events connected with the Tooth Relic especially are described with great care, sometimes even to the extent that important political events are pushed into the background.¹ This may have been the result of the growing importance of the Tooth Relic in the political field. Various statements concerning the Tooth Relic find confirmation in other sources, both literary and epigraphical. The Uttaramūla-pariveṇa is mentioned here for the first time as the place where the Tooth Relic was kept.²

This part of the chronicle has, however, its own weaknesses. The chronicler was writing a eulogy of his hero, Parākramabāhu I, to whom he devoted eighteen chapters of his work.³ Parākramabāhu's achievements are therefore often exaggerated while his failures, such as losses in wars, are glossed over.⁴ The opponents of Parākramabāhu, especially Mānābharāṇa, Sugalā and the people of Rohaṇa, who bravely resisted a conquest are depicted as villains. This treatment is specially noteworthy in the case of

-
1. Cv., 74.22-180, 181 ff. The narrative of the Rohaṇa campaign was brought to an abrupt end so as to describe the festival of the Tooth Relic.
 2. Ibid., 57.20-22.
 3. Ibid., chapters 62-79.
 4. S.Wickramasinghe, op.cit., p.25 ff.

Mānābharāṇa. On one occasion the chronicle describes him as a person who was distinguished by many virtues and who had won the hearts of the people.¹ But when he was engaged in a contest against Parākramabāhu I for the throne of Rājaraṭṭha, the chronicler, in direct contrast to his previous statement, refers to Mānābharāṇa as evil.² Moreover, both Mānābharāṇa and his mother Sugalā are accused of the seizure and destruction of the rich treasures belonging to the Tooth Relic.³ These accusations are evidently attempts by the author to justify the activities of his hero by villifying the character of his opponents; for as we shall see later in this survey, there is no reason to believe that Mānābharāṇa had abused the riches of the Tooth Relic.⁴ The uprising of Rohaṇa is also described to the advantage of Parākramabāhu. These details therefore need to be utilized with utmost care.

Further, the chronicler has failed to record some important events. No reference is made to the entrustment of the Tooth Relic to the Vēlaikkāra mercenaries, nor is it mentioned in what shrine in Rohaṇa the Relic was kept since it was delivered to that province during the rule of Vikramabāhu.

1. Cv., 63.17.

2. Ibid., 72.304-05.

3. Ibid., 72.304-05; 74.36-38; S.Wickramasinghe, op.cit., p.168.

4. See below, pp.179-82.

Also the date of its return to Polonnaruva is nowhere given. However, these shortcomings do not prevent this part of the chronicle from being very valuable for the reasons mentioned above.

Part III

The continuation of the chronicle from the reign of Vijayabāhu II to the end of that of Parākramabāhu IV (chapters 80-90, 102 or 104) was taken up by another author whose identity is not yet known. Considering the keen interest taken in the literary activities during the reign of Parākramabāhu IV, Liyanagamage suggests that this part of the Cūlavamsa may either have been written some time towards the end of or not long after this ruler's reign.¹ The advantages and limitations of this part for a student of political history also have been discussed by this scholar.²

For the present study this part of the chronicle may be called a mine of information. It provides information on the homage accorded to the Tooth Relic by many rulers of the period, such as Nissāṅkamalla, Vijayabāhu III, Parākramabāhu II, Bhuvanekabāhu I and Parākramabāhu IV.³ One observes that much attention has been paid to the worship accorded to the

1. Liyanagamage, op.cit., p.6 ff.

2. Ibid., p.5 ff.

3. Cv., 80.19; 81.17-39; 82.5-53; 85.2-58, 90-93; 89.13-46; 90.66-79.

Relic by Parākramabāhu II,¹ the hero of this part of the chronicle, and by Parākramabāhu IV,² who may have been the patron of the author. The delivery of the Tooth Relic to Kotmalē during the rule of Māgha,³ Candrabhānu's demand for the surrender of the Relic⁴ and its capture by Arya Cakravarti,⁵ the recovery of the Relic by Parākramabāhu III⁶ and the composition of the Daladā Sirita⁷ are some of the other events recorded in the chronicle. There is hardly any doubt regarding the authenticity of these details for they are corroborated by many other literary works dealing with the period. Further some details, such as Nissaṅkamalla's donations to the Relic, are quite in agreement with epigraphical sources while the delivery of the Relic to Kotmalē and its capture by Arya Cakravarti, are confirmed by popular traditions and foreign notices respectively.⁸

There are some limitations too. The writing of the Dāthāvamsa during the reign of Līlāvati would have been an important event of the day, especially in the light of the

-
1. Ibid., 82.5-53; 85.2-58, 90-93; 89.13-46.
 2. Ibid., 90.66-79.
 3. Ibid., 81.17-19.
 4. Ibid., 88.65-66.
 5. Ibid., 90.43-47.
 6. Ibid., 90.48-57.
 7. Ibid., 90.77-79.
 8. See below, pp. 185-86, 190, 200, 303-07.

significant position this relic held in the religious as well as the political sphere. But the Cūlavamsa makes no mention of it. Similarly, though mentioning that a thēra named Vācissara took the Tooth Relic to Kotmalē during the dissasterous reign of Māgha,¹ the chronicle does not state who he was and to what pariveṇa he belonged. The description of the miracle of the Tooth Relic during the reign of Parākramabāhu II, as pointed out by Geiger,² is an imitation of a similar passage in the Mahāvamsa concerning the enshrinement of relics in the Mahāthūpa.³ However, as is discussed below in the relevant chapter,⁴ the author seems to have exaggerated a historical event, to serve the purpose of eulogizing the career of his hero, Parākramabāhu II. These limitations, however, should not prompt one to undervalue the importance of the third part of the Cūlavamsa which is by far the most useful source of information for the present study.

Part IV

This part of the chronicle consists of 10 chapters (90-100) and was written by a thēra named Tibboṭuvāvē Buddharakkhita during the reign of Kitti Siri Rājasinha (A.D.1747-82), at the

-
1. Cv., 81.17-19.
 2. IHQ., VI, no.2, 1930, p.225.
 3. Mv., 31.96 ff.
 4. See below, pp.290 ff.

latter's invitation.¹ The intention of the author was to eulogize the religious activities of his patron Kitti Siri Rājasinha. Much of the work has been devoted to this end. The author ignores even important contemporary political events as well as those of the preceding period.² Much emphasis has been put on the history of the Kandyan kingdom, especially on the religious works and benefactions of its rulers. A careful examination of the work reveals that it is heavily dependent on the Rājaratnākaraya for the reconstruction of the history prior to the reign of Vimaladhammasūriya.³ The use and limitations of the work for studies of the political and religious history of the period have been discussed by previous writers.⁴

In this part only 44 verses in three chapters⁵ are relevant to our study. These 44 verses cover a period of nearly two centuries. For about half a century after the death of Parākramabāhu IV until the accession of Bhuvanekabāhu V, i.e. A.D.1326-72, The Cūlavamsa makes no mention of the Tooth Relic.

-
1. IHQ., VI, no.2, 1930, pp.207-08; Cv., Transl., II, fn. to 99.77; Sangharāja Sādhucariyāva, ed., Henpitagedara Piyananda, Colombo, 1954, p.20.
 2. Somaratna, op.cit., p.10; Ilangasinha, op.cit., pp.7-9.
 3. Somaratna, op.cit., p.11.
 4. Ibid., pp.9-11; Ilangasinha, op.cit., pp.6-15.
 5. Cv., 90.105-09; 91.1-36; 92.1-3.

Therefore, one is deprived of any knowledge of homage paid to it by the rulers of this period especially Vikramabāhu III and Parākramabāhu V of Gampola. The chronicler pays no attention to the rivalries of the members of the Alakēśvara family, and present an incorrect picture when he states that Vīrahāhu (one of the three Alakēśvara brothers) attained royal dignity after Bhuvanekabāhu V.¹ Vīra Alakēśvara's encounter with the Chinese envoy, Cheng-Ho, which is an important political event of the early 15th century and of direct relevance to this study is not mentioned. Similarly, no benefactions made by the successors of Parākramabāhu VI to the Tooth Relic are recorded in the chronicle.

Although the fourth part of the Cūlavamsa suffers from serious defects, it does contain two valuable references, useful for this study. It records the benefactions made by Bhuvanekabāhu V² and gives an elaborate account of the homage paid to the Tooth Relic by Parākramabāhu VI.³ The latter description finds confirmation in contemporary literature.⁴

Apart from the Cūlavamsa a number of other works which deal particularly with the Tooth Relic have been utilized. Foremost

-
1. Cv., 91.13.
 2. Ibid., 91.12.
 3. Ibid., 91.17-21.
 4. See below, pp. 61-64, 231-33.

among them is the Pāli Dāṭhāvamsa, 'chronicle of the Tooth Relic', written by Dhammakitti thera¹ at the request of Parakkama of the Kālanāgara clan,² the prime minister of Līlāvati, who had raised this queen to the throne for the third time.³ This work was, according to the author, based on an earlier chronicle of the Tooth Relic written 'in the language of the land' during the reign of Siri Meghavanna.⁴ This latter work which is no longer extant, is said to have consisted of the history of the Tooth Relic from the parinibbāna of the Buddha to the Relic's arrival in Ceylon.⁵ The Dāṭhāvamsa has, however, a wider scope than the earlier work. It starts with the Buddha's previous existence as Sumedha and briefly narrates the life of the Buddha.⁶ The material for this section seems to have been borrowed from the first chapter of the Mahāvamsa. Similarly its account of the parinibbāna of the Buddha, his cremation and the distribution of the relics, closely follow the narrative of the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta.⁷ At this point the author introduces his own chronicle by adding that a thera named Khema took the left canine Tooth from the

1. Dav., v.414.

2. Ibid., v.4.

3. Ibid., vv.5-6; Cv., 80.49-50; UCHC., I, pt.II, pp.520-21; Liyanagamage, op.cit., p.22.

4. Dav., v.10; JRAS(CB), XXXVIII, no.107, Nov.1949, pp.123-26. It was probably this chronicle that is referred to in the first part of the Cūlavamsa.

5. Dav., the passage opposite p.1.

6. Ibid., vv.11-92.

7. Dav., vv.94-111, 115-118; see below, p.86.

funeral pyre and handed it over to king Brahmadata of Kalinga.¹ The Dāṭhāvamsa then relates the history of the Tooth Relic until its arrival in Ceylon in the ninth regnal year of Siri Meghavanna.² This king is said to have welcomed the Relic, paid homage to it and decreed the manner in which relic festivals should be celebrated by future rulers.³

The value of the Dāṭhāvamsa for a study of the political history of Ceylon, especially with regard to the reign of Līlāvati has been discussed by previous writers.⁴ It contains some useful information which is directly relevant to this study, and was the source of many Sinhalese chronicles of the Tooth Relic written in later times.⁵ Hence the information found in it is of considerable importance for comparisons of details in later works. The Dāṭhāvamsa's reference to the Meghagiri-vihāra enables one to gain an idea of the location of this vihāra.⁶ Further the description of the manner in which Siri Meghavanna celebrated the Tooth Relic festival⁷ gives a useful insight into the extent of homage paid by rulers of this period to the Tooth Relic.

-
1. Ibid., vv.114, 119.
 2. Ibid., vv.119-340.
 3. Ibid., v.352 ff.
 4. Liyanagamage, op.cit., pp.22-25.
 5. See below, pp.43 ff.
 6. See below, pp.118-19.
 7. Day., vv.386-406.

However, in considering the historical value of the Dāthāvamsa, one has to take a few weak points into consideration. The taking of the Relic from the funeral pyre by a Khema is a detail found neither in the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta nor in any other work which followed its tradition.¹ The rulers of Kāliṅga mentioned in this work, appears to be fictitious figures.² Miracles often play an important role in the narrative³ and make it less credible, while some descriptions are embellished with poetical and other obvious exaggerations.⁴ The obstructions made by the Nāgas at sea to those who brought the Tooth Relic⁵ reminds one of a similar event found in the Mahāvamsa and the Mahābodhivamsa,⁶ with regard to the bringing of the Bō-Tree to Ceylon. Above all, since the Dāthāvamsa ends with the reign of Siri Meghavanna, it is of little value for a study of the later history of the Tooth Relic in Ceylon. Owing to these limitations great care has been taken in this study in utilising the material of the Dāthāvamsa especially that concerning the early history of the Tooth Relic.

Another work which deals with the history of the Tooth Relic is the Daladā Sirita, written in the Śaka year 1247 i.e.

-
1. See below, pp. 86-87.
 2. See below, p. 87 ff.
 3. Dav., vv. 185, 199-200, 203, 240-41, 245, 247-48, 251, 363 ff.
 4. Ibid., vv. 172-74.
 5. Ibid., v. 331 ff.
 6. Mv., 19.19-23; Mbv., ed., Pedinnoruve Sobhita, Colombo, 1890, pp. 98-99.

A.D.1325.¹ It consists of seven chapters written in Elu, and mixed Sinhalese including many Sanskrit and sometimes Tamil words. The contents of the first five chapters are similar to those found in the corresponding chapters of the Dāṭhāvamsa and are presented in the same order, but more elaborately.² The sixth chapter gives a list of kings from Siri Meghavanna to Bhuvanekabāhu II, which, for the most part, seems to have been based on the Pūjāvaliya,³ while the seventh is devoted to contemporary events such as the benefactions of Parākramabāhu IV to the Buddhist Order in general and the Tooth Relic in particular, as well as the regulations for the conduct of the ritual of the Tooth Relic.⁴ The main purpose of the Daladā Sirita was to record the ritual found in this seventh chapter from which the text seems to derive its title. The first six chapters therefore were meant as an historical introduction by reason of which the text became also a history of the Tooth Relic.⁵

The author of the Daladā Sirita, as mentioned at the end of the work, was Devrada Dampasaṅginā who claims to have been associated, perhaps as a pupil, with the Great Elder at Pārakumbā-

1. Dal.S., p.54.

2. Ibid., pp.1-41.

3. Ibid., pp.41-46; Pjv., p.3 ff.

4. Dal.S., pp.46-54.

5. C.E.Godakumbura, Sinhalese Literature, Colombo, 1955, p.112.

pāriveṇa, a monastery built by Parākramabāhu IV.¹ Sorata convincingly points out that Devrada was the personal name of the author and that he was the minister in charge of ecclesiastic affairs of the state.² The author states that he compiled the Daladā Sirita at the request of the king. It is evident that the material for the history of the Tooth Relic was drawn from such earlier works as the Dāṭhāvaṃsa, but the regulations embodied in the last chapter are not found elsewhere. Hence one gets the impression that these regulations were formulated only in the reign of Parākramabāhu IV. Nevertheless, there are indications of the prevalence of at least some of them in the earlier period.

Siri Meghavanna, after having exhibited the Tooth Relic at the Uturu-vehera, is said to have decreed that it should be taken annually to this particular vihāra and that the worship he accorded to it should be continued in an annual festival.³ Both the Dāṭhāvaṃsa and the Daladā Sirita refer, in this context, to the writing of cāritta and sirit respectively⁴ which imply the recording of the manner in which the celebrations were held. From the Dāṭhāvaṃsa we learn that the king placed the Tooth Relic

-
1. Dal.S., p.54; Godakumbura, op.cit., p.112.
 2. Dal.S., Introduction, p.XXXII ff.
 3. Dav., v.406; Dal.S., p.41.
 4. Dav., v.406; Dal.S., p.41.

on the royal chariot and that, while making offerings, he took it in procession to the Abhayagiri-vihāra.¹ The Daladā Sirita gives a more elaborate account of the celebrations² but, as we shall see later, this description and that of the Dāṭhāvansa are similar in many respects to the description in the Daladā Sirita of festivals prevalent in the fourteenth century.³ Thus even if we leave aside the daily ritual, the writing of cāritta and sirita in the above contexts may well be taken as pointing to the recording of the manner in which annual celebrations were to be held.

Another reference to the recording of the ritual is found in the same work. Vijayabāhu III is said to have compiled regulations which were necessary for the performance of the ritual connected with the Tooth Relic and the Bowl Relic.⁴ It is not known what particular regulations were compiled during his reign, but he probably recorded the worship accorded to the Relic in his time or perhaps utilized regulations connected with the ritual which were in force before his time, making the necessary amendments and additions to them. The regulations embodied in the Daladā Sirita may therefore be regarded as indicating a similar attempt made by Parākramabāhu IV to organize the ritual and ceremonies more elaborately.

-
1. Dav., v.392 ff.
 2. Dal.S., pp.39-40.
 3. See below, p.402 ff.
 4. Dal.S., p.44.

However, apart from a few instances, the date of the compilation of most of the regulations cannot be determined with any degree of precision. The use of the term isā,¹ which is widely used in ninth and tenth-century inscriptions,² seems to indicate antiquity, but the date cannot be determined on this basis alone for the term was used also in some regulations which we know to have been added at a later date.³ Moreover, there are some regulations (16,23,34) which cannot be dated earlier than the latter half of the seventh century. These regulations make mention of the chief incumbent of the Uttaramūla-pariveṇa (Uturulumuḷu ayatān siṭitān).⁴ Tradition ascribes the origin of the Uttaramūla-pariveṇa to the reign of Mānavamma in the latter half of the seventh century⁵ while according to a Sīgiri graffito it was already known in the eighth century.⁶ A detailed discussion of the beginnings of the Uttaramūla need not concern us here, for the problems connected with it have been adequately discussed by Gunavardhana.⁷ But, whatever the exact date may have been, it is probable that the Uttaramūla-pariveṇa as such, did not exist before the latter half of the seventh century. On

1. Dal.S., p.49 ff.

2. Ep.Zeyl., I, pp.38,47-49, 91-97, 168-69, etc.

3. Dal.S., pp.51, 53, regulations 12, 13, 31; see below, p.40.

4. Ibid., pp.51-53.

5. Cv., 57.4 ff.

6. Sīgiri Graffiti, II, ed. S.Paranavitana, London, 1956, p.285, v.463.

7. Gunavardhana, op.cit., p.416 ff.

this basis, it is quite certain that the earliest date that can be ascribed to these three regulations is the end of the seventh century.

Similarly of later origin are the three regulations (12,13, 31) dealing with the worship to be accorded to the relic of Mahā Kassapa (mahasup sāmīn).¹ This relic is mentioned for the first time in the reign of Parākrāmabāhu II, who is said to have known about it. The relic was preserved in the vihāra at Bhīmatittha (Bentoṭṭa) in the province of Pancayōjana.² The Cūlavamsa, in its reference to the relic, states that the king went there with his four-fold army and for three days celebrated a great festival of offerings.³ Whether or not the king brought this relic to Daṁbadeṇiya and kept it in the Tooth Relic temple is nowhere mentioned, but the regulations concerning it suggest that the relic found its way to the Tooth Relic Temple some time before A.D.1325, i.e. the time when the Daladā Sirita was written. One cannot be certain as to who was responsible for bringing the relic to the Temple, but since the earliest reference is found in the reign of Parākrāmabāhu II, the regulations concerning its worship at the temple cannot be dated earlier than the thirteenth century. It is extremely difficult to be certain when the rest of the regulations took their present form, but some of

1. Dal.S., pp.51, 53.

2. Cv., 85.78-84; Pjv., p.36.

3. Cv., 85.82-84; Pjv., p.36.

them, as suggested earlier, may have originated at the time of the arrival of the Relic in Ceylon. In the course of time they would have been elaborated and amended, and others would have been added afterwards, as the evidence referred to above would have us believe. Devrada Dampasaṅginā would undoubtedly have utilized such regulations made by previous rulers and observed in the ritual in the Tooth Relic temple, as well as those that were added to the ritual during his time.

Various aspects of this work, such as the significance of the title, author, language and the light it sheds for the study of political and social history of mediaeval Ceylon, have been discussed by Sorata, Godakumbura, Wickramasinghe and Liyanagamage.¹ In so far as this study is concerned, the Daladā Sirita is of considerable value. Although the Dāthāvamsa mentions that Hēmamālā and Dantakumāra landed in Lankāpaṭṭana, the Daladā Sirita states that they came to Māvatu (Mahātitttha).² Many of its details concerning the Tooth Relic, especially those after the reign of Parākramabāhu I, are in agreement with the works dealing with the period. For instance it confirms the epigraphical evidence concerning Nissankamalla's benefactions towards the Relic,³ while other literary sources confirm its tradition of the removal of the Relic to Kotmalē during the

1. Sorata, Dal.S., Introduction, p.XXXI ff; Godakumbura, op.cit., pp.112-14; S.Wickramasinghe, op.cit., pp.43-45; Liyanagamage, op.cit., pp.25-26.

2. Dal.S., p.34; see below, p.115.

3. See below, pp.185-86.

oppressive rule of Māgha, the patronage of Vijayabāhu III and that of his sons, Parākramabāhu II and Bhuvanekabāhu I, the capture of the Relic by Ārya Cakravarti and its recovery by Parākramabāhu III.¹ The Daḷadā Sirita also provides fresh details. Bhuvanekabāhu II is mentioned as a benefactor of the Tooth Relic,² a detail not found in the Cūlavamsa, and above all, the narrative of the reign of Parākramabāhu IV, especially the regulations provided in the concluding portion of the work,³ is of great importance for our study of the daily and annual celebrations of the Tooth Relic.

The Daḷadā Sirita is not devoid of weaknesses. The first five chapters follow closely the corresponding chapters of the Dāḷhāvamsa and therefore add nothing new to our knowledge. Some details such as the reference to the Meghagiri-vihāra are misleading,⁴ Although one would naturally expect a detailed account of the fortunes and misfortunes of the Tooth Relic from the chronicle one is somewhat disappointed with its contents. In the sixth chapter the author follows the Pūjāvaliya and provides a mere list of kings from Siri Meghavanna until the reign of Parākramabāhu I.⁵ He seems to have lost the significance of the

-
1. Dal.S., pp.43-45; see below, pp.188 ff.
 2. Dal.S., pp.45-46.
 3. Ibid., p.46 ff.
 4. Ibid., p.36; see below, p.119 ff.
 5. Dal.S., pp.41-43.

contributions made to the Tooth Relic by such rulers as Dhātusena, Sena II, Mahinda IV, and Vijayabāhu I. Similarly Māgha's persecution of Buddhism is mentioned in general terms¹ but with no particular reference to the Tooth Relic. There is no mention of either the miracle of the Tooth Relic during the reign of Parākramabāhu II or Candrabhānu's demand for the surrender of the relics. These limitations however, do not reduce the importance of the Daladā Sirita for this study for the other reasons stated above.

The Daladā Pūjāvaliya is another work which covers the same period as the Daladā Sirita i.e., up to the reign of Parākramabāhu IV. The author, for reasons best known to him, preferred anonymity but it has been suggested that he was a monk and that he belonged to the lineage of Dharmakīrti in pupillary succession.² There is no agreement among scholars with regard to the exact date of the compilation of the work but it is generally accepted that it belongs to a period between the reigns of Parākramabāhu IV and Bhuvanekabāhu V (A.D.1326-72).³

The pattern and the sequence of events narrated in the Daladā Pūjāvaliya are similar to those of the Dāṭhāvamsa as far as they concern the period before the arrival of the Relic in

1. Ibid., p.43.

2. Dal.Pjv., ed., T.Sugatapala, Colombo, 1929, Introduction, p.V.

3. Godakumbura, op.cit., pp.114-15; S.Wickramasinghe, op.cit., pp.45-46; Liyanagamage, op.cit., pp.26-27.

Ceylon. But the author freely quotes Pali verses from the Dāṭhavaṃsa, the Mahāvaṃsa, the Dīpavaṃsa, the Jinālaṅkāra and the Jinacarita, especially in those parts dealing with the life of the Buddha.¹ The last chapter, like the corresponding one of the Daḷadā Sirita, is devoted to the patronage of the Tooth Relic by certain kings; but here a remarkable difference can be seen between the two sources. The details of the Daḷadā Pūjāvaliya are brief and incomplete, compared with those of the Daḷadā Sirita. The narrative of the former is wound up with a decree that future kings and their ministers should maintain the homage due to the Relic.² The value and defects of this work as a historical source have been discussed by previous scholars.³

Although not as important as the Daḷadā Sirita, the Daḷadā Pūjāvaliya provides some valuable information for the present study. It reveals the place where the Tooth Relic was preserved in Rohaṇa⁴ after being carried to that region during the insecure conditions that prevailed in Polonnaruva in the reign of Vikramabāhu II. It also gives the date of its recovery by Parākramabāhu I.⁵ Similarly it states that Parākramabāhu IV assigned to the Tooth Relic the duty of a quarter per cent twice

1. Godakumbura, op.cit., pp.114-15.

2. Dal.Pjv., p.51.

3. S.Wickramasinghe, op.cit., pp.45-50; Liyanagamage, op.cit., pp.26-27.

4. Dal.Pjv., p.48; see below, pp.176-79.

5. Dal.Pjv., p.48.

a year i.e. on the new year and the kārttika,¹ and that he made a casket worth 7000 silver coins for the Relic.² The reference to the recovery of the Relic is a clear indication that the author drew material from sources other than those used by the authors of the Daladā Sirita and the Cūlavamsa. Some records preserved in Rohana would perhaps, have provided this information. Moreover, the assignment of a levy deserves credit for the author was reporting a more or less contemporary event. Hence this information furnished by the Daladā Pūjāvaliya is of considerable value for the clarification of some doubtful points arising in this study.

The narrative of the Daladā Pūjāvaliya, however, suffers from serious defects. One is that it includes statements that are not factual and certain later traditions which find no corroboration from contemporary sources. For example, it records a tradition that in the latter part of the reigns of the rulers who belonged to the lesser dynasty (suluvasa), the Colas, invaded Ceylon, ruled there for a time, and carried away the Tooth Relic together with a jewelled drum (minibera).³ A king named Pāsula Sirisaṅgabō is said to have assembled his forces at Māvātutoṭa, - invaded the Coḷa country, and recovered the

1. Ibid., p.51.

2. Ibid., p.51.

3. Ibid., p.46.

Tooth Relic and the drum.¹ Although this tradition is recorded in later works such as the Sinhala Daladā Vaṃsaya which borrowed material from the Daladā Pūjāvaliya, it finds no corroboration in any other work - not even the Cūlavamsa which contains detailed descriptions of the Coḷa invasions. Further it is impossible to identify Pāsulu Sirisaṅgabō who is credited with the recovery of the Relic. In these circumstances the tradition can hardly be considered authentic. Another doubtful story which immediately follows this account is that a ruler named Gajabāhu II (Devana Gajabā), invaded the Coḷa country and recovered the Tooth and Bowl Relics captured by the Coḷas on a previous occasion.² Gajabāhu II, as we know, ruled in Polonnaruwa (A.D.1132-53).³ None of our sources make any mention of a Coḷa invasion which resulted in the capture of the Relics nor is Gajabāhu II credited with a counter-invasion for the recovery of the relics. In fact, the two relics were at Rohaṅga during his time, as even the Daladā Pūjāvaliya admits.⁴ On the other hand a tradition recorded in some later Sinhalese works credit Gajabāhu I who reigned many centuries before Gajabāhu II, with an invasion of the Coḷa country to release 12000 Sinhalese taken prisoner by a Coḷa king.⁵ The account in

1. Ibid., p.46.

2. Ibid., pp.46-47.

3. Cv., 63.19 ff; UCHC., I, pt.II, p.846.

4. Cv., 61.58-61; Dal.Pjv., p.48.

5. Rrk., p.20; Rjv., pp.33-34.

the Daladā Pūjāvaliya may perhaps have been the result of a confusion with this tradition, and if this was the case it is completely unhistorical as far as the Tooth Relic is concerned for Gajabāhu I reigned about two centuries before the Relic's arrival in Ceylon.¹ It would appear, therefore, that it is extremely difficult to rely on these confused traditions when they gain no support from other sources.

Moreover, there is evidence to show that the author of the Daladā Pūjāvaliya did not grasp the significance of many events connected with the Tooth Relic. The work states in general terms that the rulers of the Cūlavamsa, who were the successors of Siri Meghavanna, paid homage to the Tooth Relic in accordance with their faith (tamangē bhakti pramāṇayen).² The author has not specified who these rulers were and hence implies that all who reigned after Siri Meghavanna were patrons of the Relic. But, as we learn from other sources, this was not the case.³ Similarly, the Daladā Pūjāvaliya makes no mention of the fortunes and misfortunes of the Tooth Relic during the period between the reigns of Parākramabāhu I and Parākramabāhu II,⁴ nor does it take any notice of the invasions of Candrabhānu and Arya Cakravarti,

1. UCHC., I, pt.II, p.844.

2. Dal.Pjv., p.46.

3. See below, p.134 ff.

4. Dal.Pjv., pp.49-50.

the latter of which especially had far-reaching results. Owing to these limitations the Daḷadā Pūjāvaliya adds little new to our knowledge, although in the other ways mentioned, it can be of considerable use to this study.

Attempts have been made in later works to continue the history of the Tooth Relic from the point at which the Daḷadā Sirita and the Daḷadā Pūjāvaliya ended their narrative, i.e. the reign of Parākramabāhu IV. One such work which merits special attention is the Sinhala Daḷadā Vaṃsaya, written by an unknown author during the reign of Kitti Siri Rājasinha.¹ The intention of the author, as he himself states at the beginning of the work, was to relate the homage paid to the Tooth Relic during the period of 446 years from the reign of Parākramabāhu IV until the twenty-fourth regnal year of Kitti Siri Rājasinha.² As he has acknowledged, the material for his work was heavily drawn from the Daḥāvāṃsa and the Daḷadā Pūjāvaliya,³ up to the reign of Siri Meghavanna. The work is modelled on the Daḷadā Pūjāvaliya up to this time and even beyond. From Siri Meghavanna onwards, the narrative, though containing some fresh material, is heavily dependent on the Daḷadā Pūjāvaliya, Cūlavāṃsa, Daḷadā Sirita, Pūjāvaliya, Rājaratnākaraya and Saddharmaratnākaraya.

The Sinhala Daḷadā Vaṃsaya is of considerable use for our

1. Godakumbura, op.cit., pp.115-16.

2. Sin.Dal.V., ed., H.Sārananda, Alutgama, 1916, p.1.

3. Ibid., pp.1-2.

study. Its close association with the Daḷadā Pūjāvaliya resulted in the recording of some traditions found in the latter work such as the one concerning the place where the Tooth Relic was preserved in Rohaṇa.¹ Following a similar detail in the Daḷada Sirita and the Rājaratnākaraya, it records the homage paid by Bhuvanekabāhu II of Kurunāgala.² Further, it mentions the benefactions of Parākramabāhu V, Vikramabāhu III, Bhuvanakabāhu V, Jayabāhu, Bhuvanekabāhu VI and Paṇḍita Parākramabāhu VII.³ The other indigenous literary sources though referring to the homage paid to the Tooth Relic by Bhuvanekabāhu V,⁴ make no mention of the worship accorded to it by the other rulers mentioned in this text. Nevertheless the information seems reliable for it finds confirmation in epigraphical as well as foreign literary sources.⁵ The Sinhala Daḷadā Vaṃsaya also states that Vīrabāhu, one of the three Alakēśvara brothers, paid homage to the Tooth Relic;⁶ but, in the absence of any confirmation by other sources, the authenticity of this is more doubtful.

Because to some extent it follows the Daḷadā Pūjāvaliya

-
1. Ibid., pp.36-37.
 2. Ibid., p.44.
 3. Ibid., pp. 48, 52-53.
 4. Cv., 91.12.
 5. See below, p. 212 ff.
 6. Sin.Dal.V., p.51.

after the reign of Siri Meghavanna, the Sinhala Daladā Vamsaya shares the defects of the former work. The tradition concerning the capture of the Tooth Relic and the jewelled drum is preserved here except for the difference that the king Pāsula Sirisaṅgabō of the Daladā Pūjāvaliya is referred to as Siḷu Sirisaṅgabō.¹ The Gajabāhu story of the former work is also reproduced.² Vijayabāhu II, Āniyaṅgana (Anikaṅga), Dharmāsoka, Līlāvati, Kalyānavati, Lokēśvara and Māgha are referred to as patrons of the Tooth Relic.³ This may perhaps be true in the case of Līlāvati for we know that the Dāṭhāvamsa was written during her reign - an indication of the worship the Relic received - but in the absence of confirmation from other sources, the same cannot be said about the remainder of these rulers. Indeed, at least one of these rulers, namely Māgha, is well known to have done great harm to Buddhism. Further, the Sinhala Daladā Vamsaya does not mention the invasions of Candrabhānu and Ārya Cakravarti nor the encounter of Vīra Alakēśvara with the Chinese Admiral Cheng-Ho. Repeating an error of the Cūlavamsa, it records that Vīrabāhu became king after Bhuvanekabāhu V.⁴ Hence, although it provides some interesting details, the Sinhala Daladā Vamsaya has to be utilized with the utmost care.

1. Ibid., p.35.

2. Ibid., pp.35-36.

3. Ibid., p.38.

4. Ibid., p.50.

There are a few other works, some of them still unpublished, written in Sinhalese verse concerning the history of the Tooth Relic. Of these the Dāṭhāvamsaya kavi¹ relates in 431 verses the history of the Relic up to the British period. The author of this work is not known; but since John Doyly, the British agent at Kandy, is described therein in laudatory terms² it is possible that the author was either a minor government official or someone who received the agent's patronage. The same period is covered by the Dāṭhāvamsaya or Dāgoppadīpayakiyana kavipota³ printed under the title of Daḷadā Itihāsakāvyaya,⁴ and written by one who calls himself Vāligala Kiviyāra. The Daḷadāhaṭṭanē kavi,⁵ written in the month of Poson (June) of Śaka 1615⁶ (A.D.1693) covers the history of the Tooth Relic from the Buddha's parinibbāna to the reign of Vimaladhammasūriya I. The material for all these poems was drawn from previous works on the subject, and therefore they add nothing to our knowledge.

-
1. Br.Mus.Ms., Or.6606 (129), 60 leaves.
 2. Ibid., v.400 ff.
 3. Br.Mus.Ms., Or.6606 (27), 44 leaves.
 4. Ed., Ratnapura Dhammaratana, Maradana, 1947.
 5. Br.Mus.Ms., Or.6606 (34), 23 leaves.
 6. Sakavasīnekdaḥasa - Sasiyapasalosveni vasa Sapirunuposon masa - kalē mē elu pada basin rasa; also in Br.Mus.Ms., Or.6615 (10), folio 82.

There are some other works which shed light on the history of the Tooth Relic. Among these may be mentioned the Pūjāvāliya, written by Mayurapāda thera, the head of the Mayurapāda-parivēṇa at Vātagiri (Vākirigala). The intention of the author was to write a dharmavyākhyāna (a commentary on the dhamma) in order to justify the epithet arahaṃ (worthy one) applied to the Buddha.¹ The work was compiled in the 30th year of Parākramabāhu II, i.e. 1266 A.D.² at the invitation of Deva Patirāja,³ the prime minister of the king. It consists of 34 chapters, the last two of which are devoted to a historical outline from Vijaya to the reign of Parākramabāhu II.

Of the 34 chapters the most important for the present study is the last, which deals with the honours paid by the rulers of Ceylon to the Buddha. While doing so the author shows no sign of particular interest towards any particular religious object or place of worship, but occasionally he mentions homage paid by rulers to the Tooth Relic. There are brief accounts of the bringing of the Tooth Relic to Ceylon,⁴ the miraculous story of Mittasena,⁵ the relic festivals of Parākramabāhu I⁶ and the building by Nissankamalla of a Tooth Relic temple in sixty hours.⁷ Up to the reign of Parākramabāhu I, the author seems to depend

-
1. Godakumbura, op.cit., p.63.
 2. Pjv., p.50.
 3. Godakumbura, op.cit., pp.63-64.
 4. Pjv., p.16.
 5. Ibid., p.17.
 6. Ibid., p.24.
 7. Ibid., p.24.

mainly on the first two parts of the Cūlavamsa, but from Vijayabāhu II onwards he draws on a source known to the author of the Cūlavamsa as well as on contemporary sources such as the Hatthavanagallavīhāravamsa. A notable feature of his treatment in this section is that his accounts concerning the Tooth Relic are brief in comparison with those of the Cūlavamsa. The delivery of the Tooth Relic to Kotmalē during the rule of Māgha,¹ its recovery by Vijayabāhu III,² and the homage paid to it by him³ and his son Parākramabāhu II,⁴ are all mentioned. In dealing with the miracle of the Tooth Relic the narrative is interspersed with two Pali verses which occur in the Pali Hatthavanagallavīhāravamsa, a work slightly earlier than the Pūjāvaliya.⁵ This similarity may have been the result either of the borrowing of details from the Hatthavanagallavīhāravamsa or of the use of a source common to both works. The only additional detail found in this work is the establishment by Vijayabāhu III of a military guard at the Tooth Relic temple at Beligala just as at the royal palace.⁶ This may give an impression of the care taken by the rulers of the period for the protection of the Relic.

1. Ibid., p.26.

2. Ibid., p.26.

3. Ibid., pp.26-27.

4. Ibid., pp.28-31.

5. Ibid., p.31; Hvv., p.32; Liyanagamage, op.cit., pp.12, 17.

6. Pjv., p.27.

The shortcomings of the Pūjāvaliya are quite obvious. Since its narrative is brief and follows that of the Cūlavamsa for the most part, it adds very little to our knowledge. Besides, its narrative of the worship accorded to the Relic by the rulers is incomplete, for it fails to mention the homage of such rulers as Dhātusena, Sena II, Mahinda IV, and Vijayabāhu I, who are well known as patrons of the Relic. Similarly, although it states that the Saṅgha brought the Tooth Relic to safety during the rule of Māgha¹ it does not tell us who was in charge of the relics, nor does it mention the demand of Candrabhānu for their surrender. But in spite of these shortcomings the Pūjāvaliya is of considerable use to us for in addition to the supply of fresh information, it provides details to support the information furnished by the Cūlavamsa, especially with regard to the reigns of Vijayabāhu III and Parākramabāhu II.

Another work which contains information on the Tooth Relic during the reigns of these two rulers is the Pali Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa, written during the reign of Parākramabāhu II.² As the title itself suggests the work intends to provide a history of the Hatthavanagalla-vihāra which, according to tradition, was the site where Siri Saṅghabōdhi, a

1. Ibid., p.26.

2. Liyanagamage, op.cit., pp.16-17.

ruler of the third century, gave his head to a wayfarer.

The author, perhaps following the tradition of some writers of the past, preferred to be anonymous; but it is stated that the work was written at the request of Anomadassi, who is referred to as sabbayatirāja,¹ and thus it is possible that the author was either a pupil or an associate of his. The text consists of eleven chapters. Such aspects as the nature of the text, its contents, language and historical value, have been discussed sufficiently by previous writers.²

The last chapter of the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa, which deals with the reigns of Vijayabāhu III and Parākramabāhu II, is of particular importance. At the beginning of the chapter, the adversity of the reign of Māgha is described in a melancholy tone³ and this is followed by a reference to the delivery of the Tooth Relic to Kotmalē by the chief incumbent of Uttaramūla.⁴ The narrative continues by stating that Vijayabāhu III, after his accession to the throne at Daṃbadeṇiya, recovered the Relic and built a temple in which to enshrine it.⁵ His successor made three caskets of gold, jewels and silver and

-
1. Hvv., p.1.
 2. Liyanagamage, op.cit., pp.16 ff.
 3. Hvv., p.30.
 4. Ibid., p.30.
 5. Ibid., p.30.

celebrated a relic festival.¹ Particular attention is paid to the miracle of the Tooth Relic.²

It would seem that, apart from a few differences, the information found in the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa is basically similar to that of the Cūlavamsa. This may be either because the Cūlavamsa borrowed material from it or because both works drew on a common source. The noteworthy difference between the two is that the account of the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa is less elaborate than that of the Cūlavamsa. On the other hand, the fact that the Tooth Relic was delivered to Kotmalē by the chief incumbent of the Uttaramūla³ is a detail not stated so emphatically in either the Pūjāvaliya or the Cūlavamsa. It makes it quite clear that the thera Vācissara who is credited with the delivery of the Tooth Relic⁴ was the head of the Uttaramūla. Apart from this, the importance of the relevant part of the work lies in the fact that it is contemporaneous with the events which it narrates, i.e. those which took place between 1215 and 1266 A.D.⁵ Besides, the author seems to have had no intention to eulogize the career of either Vijayabāhu III or Parākramabāhu II. These two reasons make one believe that his

1. Ibid., p.31.

2. Ibid., pp.31-32.

3. Ibid., p.30.

4. Cv., 81.17.

5. From the invasion of Māgha to the composition of the book; Liyanagamage, op.cit., p.17.

account represents a reliable description of the events which took place between 1215 and 1266 A.D.

However, the author has omitted some details. He refers to the building of a Tooth Relic temple by Vijayabāhu III but does not state the site where it was built.¹ The context in which this reference is found implies that the temple was built at Daṁbadeṇiya, the royal residence. But the site of this temple, as we learn from other sources, was Beligala.² Similarly, he makes no mention of the demand made by Candrabhānu for the surrender of the Relics. However, these omissions do not seriously affect the importance of the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa for a study of the Tooth Relic during the reigns of Vijayabāhu III and Parākramabāhu II. The information furnished in the work is reproduced in its two Sinhalese versions, both termed Elu Attanagalu Vamsaya and written in the 14th and 15th centuries respectively.³

The Daṁbadeṇi Katikāvata, promulgated during the reign of Parākramabāhu II for the purification of the Buddhist Saṅgha, also provides some information on the homage paid to the Tooth Relic by Parākramabāhu and his father Vijayabāhu III. The text of this work, preserved in manuscript, has been published

1. Hvv., p.30.

2. Cv., 81.31; Pjv., p.27.

3. Elu.Av., ed., Makuluduve Piyaratāna, Colombo, 1954. pp.67 ff; Elu.Av., (Vidāgama), ed. Rā Tannakon, Colombo, 1954.

by D.B.Jayatilaka.¹ The document lays emphasis on the abuses that had crept into the Order and the rules enacted by the synod to eliminate those.² But in its introductory passages the text refers to some important political and religious events in the reigns of these two rulers.³ As to the homage paid by them to the Tooth Relic, the katikāvata records that Vijayabāhu III recovered the Tooth Relic, built a three-storeyed Relic temple and venerated the Relic constantly.⁴ Parākramabāhu II is said to have enshrined the Tooth Relic in silver and gold caskets and worshipped it with offerings of flowers, incense and the like.⁵ The account is less descriptive, and, apart from the fact that it narrates some contemporary events, does not provide any new information on the subject.

Another short account which furnishes some information is the Kāṇḍavuru Sirita, which deals with the daily routine of Parākramabāhu II. The author of this work is not known.⁶ The internal evidence of the text suggests that its author was influenced to a large extent by the Manusmṛti and the

-
1. Ktk.Sng., ed., D.B.Jayatilaka, Kālaṇiya, 1955.
 2. Ibid., p.9 ff.
 3. Ibid., pp.7-8.
 4. Ibid., pp.7-8.
 5. Ibid., p.8.
 6. Liyanagamage, op.cit., p.28.

the brahmanic way of life in general.¹ This list of dignitaries given in this work² is of great value for the study of the political conditions of Ceylon, but what is of direct relevance to us is the detail that Parākramabāhu II used to worship the Relic daily at dawn.³ As will be discussed in the relevant chapter,⁴ such details are of considerable importance for the understanding of some aspects of daily ritual at the Tooth Relic temple.

The Daṃbadeṇi Asna, which also contains a history of the reign of Parākramabāhu II, furnishes us with some details not found in the works so far mentioned. The author and date of this work are not known.⁵ Its narrative contains exaggerations and is somewhat confused, but it provides useful information on the political and social conditions of the country. Some details concerning the Tooth Relic, such as the building of a three-storeyed relic temple,⁶ are similar to those found in other works, but there are also some notable differences. It mentions that Parākramabāhu II instituted an offering of five lamps⁷ day and night for twelve years,⁸ a detail not found in

1. Godakumbura, op.cit., p.111.

2. Sin.Sa.Lipi., p.65.

3. Ibid., p.64.

4. See below. pp.385-86.

5. For details see Godakumbura, op.cit., pp.110-11; Liyanagamage, op.cit., pp.27-28.

6. Dmb.A., (Kuvēni Asna, Sihabā Asna, Daṃbadeṇi Asna, ed. K.Nanavimala, Colombo, 1960), p.31.

7. Ibid., p.36. The five kinds of fuel mentioned here are

(Contd. on next page.....)

any contemporary work. Siri vaḍḍhanapura, the site where a relic festival was celebrated by Parākramabāhu II, is referred to here by the name of Nāmbāmbara.¹ The miracle wrought by the Tooth Relic is mentioned, but the account concerning this event differs in some details from that of the Pūjāvaliya and the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa. For instance the Daṃbadeṇi Asna states that the miracle took place after the festival at Nāmbāmbara,² whereas the other works state that it took place at Daṃbadeṇiya soon after the accession of Parākramabāhu II.³ Further it is stated that Parākramabāhu II made an offering of 300,000 lamps of camphor, mustard oil, and musk rat fat (urulātel) before asking for a miracle, and declared that he would commit suicide unless the Tooth Relic perform a miracle,⁴ a detail not found in the contemporary works. But these details are quite obviously exaggerations, and hence much reliance cannot be given to them especially in preference to the accounts found in contemporary works.

(....contd. from previous page)

talatel (sesamum oil), elaṅgitel (ghee), urulātel (musk rat fat), kapurutel (camphor oil) and amu kapuru (camphor).

8. Ibid., p.36.

1. Ibid., p.37.

2. Ibid., p.38.

3. See below, pp.193, 290 ff.

4. Dmb.A., p.38.

Like the sources which deal with the reign of Parākramabāhu II, those which deal exclusively with the sixth ruler of that name provide some useful information for this study. Among these may be mentioned the Saddharmaratnākara, 'the Mine of Gems of the Good Law', written by Vimalakīrti, a thera of the Dharmakīrti school.¹ At the end of the first chapter the author states that his work was written in the seventh year of Parākramabāhu, (A.D.1417) who ascended the throne in B.E. 1953 (A.D.1410).² The work consists of thirty-six chapters, the material for which was drawn mainly from the Sārasaṅgaha, Jinacarita, Samantakūṭjavannanā, Jinabōdhāvalī, Saddharmālankāraya and the Nikāya Saṅgrahaya.³ Various aspects of this work, such as its contents, sources and its use as a historical source, have been discussed by previous writers.⁴

So far as we are concerned, the directly relevant part of the text is the end of the twelfth chapter which deals with the religious works of Parākramabāhu VI. The author credits the king with the building of a three-storeyed relic temple which was decorated with paintings and ornamented with a gold tiara⁵ and also with the making of four relic caskets of gold and jewels.⁶

1. Srk., ed., Kosgoda Nanavimala, Colombo, 1931, p.72.

2. Ibid., p.71.

3. Godakumbura, op.cit., p.94.

4. Ibid., p.94 ff; Somaratna, op.cit., p.62., Ilangasinha, op.cit., pp.24-28.

5. Srk., p.295.

6. Ibid., p.295.

Further it states that the king made offerings of vessels of solid gold and silver, gold betel trays, pitchers, lamps (siṭivāṭa), conches, horns and the like,¹ flowers, lamps and incense, betel and food.² These details are of considerable importance for our study, for the account concerns the homage paid by Parākramabāhu VI to the Tooth Relic during the first seven years of his reign. These find corroboration in other contemporary works and later chronicles.³ It is also noteworthy that the reference to the caskets for the Tooth Relic is more specific than that of the Cūlavamsa, in the sense that it mentions the amount of gold used to make one of the caskets.⁴ The reference to the offerings of gold and silver vessels is not found elsewhere.

One of the weak points which deserve particular attention is that no details are given concerning the history of the Relic nor the homage paid to it before the reign of Parākramabāhu VI. The reason for this omission appears to have been that the twelfth chapter of the Saddharmaratnākaraya was dependent on the Nikāya Saṅgrahaya which, because of its obvious sectarian bias, omits the Tooth Relic completely from its narrative.⁵

-
1. Ibid., p.295. 'ghanaran ridī tali ran ilattattu kendikā siṭivāṭa dhamana susirādivū pūjābhāṇḍayanudu...'
 2. Ibid., p.295.
 3. See below, pp.63 ff, 231-33.
 4. Srk., p.295. The king spent thousand gold (coins) to make a casket.
 5. Compare Srk., pp.285 ff. with Nks., pp.14 ff.

Similarly the Saddharmaratnākaraya does not refer to Vīra Alakēśvara's encounter with the Chinese envoy, an event of great political and religious importance, possibly because Vīra Alakēśvara was a rival of Parākramabāhu VI, the patron of the author. These short-comings however, do not lessen the importance of the work as a source of information for a study of the Tooth Relic during the reign of Parākramabāhu VI.

There are some poetic works too, which deal with this ruler's reign. Among such works as have a direct bearing on this study, the Sandēśa poems, the Sinhalese counterparts of Sanskrit dūtakāvyas, deserve particular attention. These poems provide valuable information on the political, social and religious life of the country during the period in which they were written. Of these, five sandēśas, namely the Parevi, Kōkila, Sālahini, Girā and Haṅsa are ascribed to the reign of Parākramabāhu VI.¹ They present a vivid picture of the Tooth Relic temple and the Relic during this period. The Relic temple according to these works was a splendid building² of three storeys.³ The rays emanating from the gold of the temple surpassed even those of the sun.⁴ There was a tiara on the

-
1. Godakumbura, op.cit.; p.189 ff., Somaratna, op.cit., pp.59-60; Ilangasinha, op.cit., pp.34-41.
 2. Par.Sand., v.42; Haṅ.Sand., v.47.
 3. Sāl.Sand., v.16.
 4. Kōk.Sand., v.135.

temple which also emitted forth rays and attracted the eyes of the people.¹ The constant playing of musical instruments in the temple equalled the sounds that were produced when Viṣṇu was churning the milk with the Mahāmēru.² The Tooth Relic 'that enjoyed the touch of the body of doctrine which originated in the Sage's mind'³ was placed in caskets of gold and jewels.⁴

It would appear that these descriptions are adorned with poetical exaggerations but this does not reduce the importance of the information they provide. For, on the one hand, the poets were not primarily concerned with describing the Tooth Relic and would therefore have had little reason to give a false picture of the Tooth Relic temple and the worship accorded to the Relic. On the other hand, their descriptions find confirmation in many other literary works of the period. Hence, although the information furnished by these poems is obscured by embellishments and metaphor, and limited to the reign of Parākramabāhu VI, the poems nevertheless are of considerable value for the understanding of the importance of the Tooth Relic and its temple during this period.

The Pāarakumbā Sirita, a eulogy of Parākramabāhu VI written by an unknown poet,⁵ also makes some reference to the Tooth Relic.

1. Gir.Sand., v.51.
2. Ibid., v.50. 'pera uviṅḍā gena giriṅḍā kiri sayura'.
3. Sal.Sand., v.16.
4. Par.Sand., vv.42-43.
5. Godakumbura, op.cit., p.224.

The Relic brought to Ceylon in the reign of Siri Meghavaṇṇa, according to this work, was the right canine tooth of the Buddha.¹ This detail is in direct contrast to that of the Dāṭhavaṃsa, which states that the Relic was the left canine tooth.²

Among the later Sinhalese chronicles, the Rājaratnākaraya, 'the Mine of the Gems of kings', is useful for this study. The author of this work was the Mahāthera of Valgampāya who was the head of the Abhayarāja-pirivena during the reign of Vīravikrama³ (Vikramabāhu) of Kandy. The author draws heavily on such earlier works as the Dāṭhavaṃsa, Mahābodhivaṃsa, Rasavāhinī Dharamapradīpikā, Nikāya Saṅgrahaya, Mahāvaṃsa, and the Pūjāvaliya.⁴ This work is believed to have been a source of the section IV of the Cūlavāṃsa.

Since the Rājaratnākaraya is dependent on the works referred to above we get hardly any fresh information from this work. The arrival of the Tooth Relic in Ceylon is mentioned in two verses quoted from the Dāṭhavaṃsa,⁵ and the story of

-
1. Pārakumbā Sirita, ed. Sri Charles de Silva, Colombo, 1954, v.19; this is repeated in the Rājāvaliya. Rjv., p.37.
 2. Dev., v.114.
 3. Godakumbura, op.cit., p.127.
 4. Ibid., p.127; Ilangasinha, op.cit., pp.15-16.
 5. Rrk., p.26.

Mittasena is borrowed from the Pūjāvaliya.¹ From Mittasena onwards the Rājaratnākaraya closely follows the Nikāya Saṅgrahaya and especially the Pūjāvaliya up to the reign of Parākramabāhu I, and therefore omits the homage paid by the rulers of the intermediate period.² Similarly, the worship accorded to the Relic by Parākramabāhu I, Nissāṅkamalla, Vijayabāhu III and Parākramabāhu II is described³ following the accounts of the Pūjāvaliya and the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa. There is evidence to show that even the Dambadeni Asna was consulted by the author.⁴ Following the Daḷadā Sirita, Bhuvanekabāhu II is credited with the worship accorded to the Tooth Relic, but he is said to have ruled in Subhagiri (Yāpahuva) instead of Kurunāgala.⁵ What is described here from Parākramabāhu IV until the end of the period under survey is similar to that found in the part IV of the Cūlavamsa. Since the latter work is believed to have drawn material from the Rājaratnākaraya the details found here are useful to determine its trustworthiness. However, since it depends largely on other sources, the Rājaratnākaraya is of very limited value for this study.

-
1. Rrk., pp.27-28; Pjv., p.17.
 2. Rrk., p.28 ff; Nks., p.14 ff; Pjv., p.18 ff.
 3. Rrk., pp.35-42; Pjv., p.24 ff; Hvv., p.30 ff.
 4. Rrk., p.41, refers to four kinds of lamps, a detail first found in the Dambadeni Asna, p.36.
 5. Rrk., p.44.

The Rājāvaliya, 'the Lineage of Kings', although not a work of primary importance deserves some attention as far as the understanding of the defects of later works are concerned. The nature of this text has been discussed in detail by Godakumbura and more recently by Somaratna and Ilangasinha in their doctoral theses.¹ The standard edition of the Rājāvaliya, edited by Gunasekara gives the history of the Island from the earliest times to the reign of Vimaladhammasūriya II. The portion relevant to our study, i.e. from Siri Meghavanna onwards begins with a description of the bringing of the Tooth Relic.² The author evidently drew material from earlier chronicles of the Tooth Relic, but narrates them quite independently. For instance he states that Guhasiva's kingdom was invaded by a ruler of Savātnuvara,³ that Danta and Ranmalī⁴ embarked from Tuttukūdiya, and that they were given the village of Kīravālla⁵ - all details not found in earlier works. These are no doubt later versions based on legends and for that reason it is not possible to rely on them. After Siri Meghavanna⁶ the

-
1. Godakumbura, op.cit., pp.127-29; Somaratna, op.cit., p.11 ff; Ilangasinha, op.cit., p.17 ff.
 2. Rjv., p.37.
 3. Ibid., p.37.
 4. Ibid., p.37. The Pūjāvaliya too refers to Hēmamālā by this name. Pjv., p.16.
 5. Rjv., p.37.
 6. Ibid., p.37 ff.

Rājāvaliya follows such works as the Pūjāvaliya, Cūlavamsa, and the Nikāya Saṅgrahaya. Therefore it does not contain any fresh material. In fact, it omits some details such as the homage paid by Parākramabāhu I to the Relic. Further there is a hiatus from the end of Parākramabāhu II to the rise of the Alakēśvaras as a result of which no information about the honours paid by the rulers of Yāpahuva, Kurunāgala and Gampola is found in this work. Similarly, it makes no mention of the worship accorded to the Relic by Parākramabāhu VI or by his successors until the end of the period under survey. In the circumstances the Rājāvaliya is not of primary importance to this study.

Foreign Literary Sources and Notices

In addition to the indigenous literary sources so far mentioned, we are fortunate in being able to utilize some foreign sources especially those written in Thailand, Burma and China. Among these may be mentioned the Jinakālamālī, a Pali chronicle written by Mahāthēra Ratanapaṇṇa of the Rattavanavihāra of Chiengmai in present Thailand.¹ The book was written in three stages and was completed in A.D.1528.² The intention of the author was to narrate the spread of Buddhism into Ceylon and thence to South East Asia.³ He

1. Jkm., pp.128-29; Introduction, p.VII.

2. N.A.Jayawickrama, The Sheaf of Garlands of the Epochs of the Conqueror, being a translation of Jinakālamālīpakaranam. PTS., London, 1968, Introduction, p.XXIX.

3. Ibid., p.XV.

utilizes many legends and stories relating to the history of Buddhism in order to achieve this end.

Among the various aspects of the history of Buddhism in Ceylon narrated in the Jinakālamālī, its account concerning the bringing of the Tooth Relic to Ceylon, in the ninth regnal year of Siri Meghavanna, is of particular importance to us.¹ This account is based on that of the Dāṭhāvamsa but there are some later additions and omissions which immediately catch the eye of the reader. For instance, the daughter of Guhasiva according to the Dāṭhāvamsa is Hēmamālā, but she is referred to in this work as Hēmajālā.² It states that the royal couple who brought the relic met the Brahmin chaplain of the king,³ presumably of Siri Meghavanna, another detail not found in the Dāṭhāvamsa. Above all this work records that the Tooth Relic was brought to Ceylon in the spring of the 840th year of the passing away of the Buddha,⁴ and that the Dantadhātuvamsa was written by the commentator Buddhadatta,⁵ two details which find no corroboration elsewhere. These are evidently later additions and hence we cannot place much reliance on them when they stand alone.

The only interesting detail found in this work is that the Thai

1. Jkm., pp.65-71.

2. Jkm., p.68; however, these two names are not different in meaning for both of them stand for 'golden-wreath'.

3. Ibid., p.70.

4. Ibid., pp.70-71; 854th year according to the Sinhala Daladā Vamsaya (Sin.Dal.V., p.1).

5. Jkm., p.71; Epochs of the Conqueror, Introduction, p.XVI.

monks who received higher ordination at Kālaṅgiya in A.D.1425 paid homage to the Tooth Relic.¹ The latter detail, in corroboration with the Ceylonese sources, establishes that the Tooth Relic was at Kōṭṭe during the reign of Parākramabāhu VI.

The Hmannan (Glass Palace Chronicle) of Burma, a nineteenth-century work, records a request for the Tooth Relic made by king Aniruddha of Pagan (A.D.1044-77) of the Ceylonese king. It is said that Aniruddha received only a replica of the Relic which was enshrined in the Shwezigon Pagoda.² This story, however interesting it may be, can hardly be considered authentic. According to this work, the Ceylonese contemporary of Aniruddha was Dhātusena whereas in fact it was Vijayabāhu. The confusion regarding the identity of the Ceylonese king suggests either that there was a mistake in recording the story or that the detail was not taken from a contemporary record but was a later addition. The latter is very likely to have been the case, for the Ceylonese chronicle, which lays much emphasis on Vijayabāhu's relations with Aniruddha³ makes no mention of the latter's request for the Relic nor do the early Burmese sources. Hence it is extremely difficult to rely on a detail found in a much later chronicle especially when it stands alone.

1. Jkm., p.93.

2. The Glass Palace Chronicle, English transl., Pe Maung Tin and G.H.Luce, London, 1923, pp.88-91.

3. Cv., 58.8-10; 60.4-8.

Occasional references to the Tooth Relic are found in Chinese literature, too. The Sung-Shu, (History of the Northern Sung Dynasty), records that a model of the temple of the Tooth Relic was sent to the Chinese emperor by a Ceylonese king in the fifth century. The latter is mentioned in this work as Cha-cha-mo-ha-nan¹ who is identified with Mahānāma (A.D.406-28).² The trustworthiness of this story remains somewhat doubtful, but since it is evident that there was religious intercourse between the two countries³ one cannot rule out the possibility that a model of the Tooth Relic temple was sent to China. This would point to the spread of knowledge of the Tooth Relic even in distant lands like China.

An interesting encounter between the Chinese and a Sinhalese ruler is recorded in the Ming Annals. The Pien-i-tien (A History of Foreign Nations) and the Ming-shih refer to a king named A-lie-kou-nai-enl or Ya-lieh-ku-nai-erh, who is identified with Vīra Alakēśvara, who came into conflict with the Chinese admiral Cheng-Ho.⁴ The reason for this encounter, according to the Chinese sources, was an attempt made by Cheng-ho

-
1. UCHC., I, pt.I, p.291 has the name as Tsa-li-Mohanana.
 2. History of the Northern Sung Dynasty, A.D.487, b XLVII, p.6, quoted in Tennent, Ceylon, I, London, 1859, fn.1 to p.615 and p.620.
 3. JRAS(CB)., XXIV, no.68, p.98 ff; UCHC., I, pt.I, pp.291-92.
 4. JRAS(CB)., XXIV, no.68, pp.98,119; Somaratna, op.cit., p.126.

to convert Vīra Alakēśvara who was a heretic and who did not venerate the teachings and the Tooth Relic of the Buddha, to Buddhism.¹ These details, however, find no corroboration in Ceylonese sources. The nature and the reliability of this evidence will be discussed in the relevant chapter² and need not therefore concern us here. Suffice it to state that the Chinese references to the Tooth Relic clearly indicate that it was at Kōṭṭe during the rule of Vīra Alakēśvara, a detail not found elsewhere.

Among the travellers who have kept records on Ceylon mention may be made of two Chinese pilgrims, Fa-Hsien and Hiuen-Tsiang, who provide some data relevant to this study. Of the two, Fa-Hsien, who visited Ceylon and stayed there some time, probably during the reign of Mahānāma (A.D.406-28)³ has left for us an excellent record of the annual celebrations of the Tooth Relic. In agreement with the CĪlavamsa and the chronicles of the Tooth Relic, he records that the Relic was exhibited annually at the Abhayagiri-vihāra.⁴ Further he mentions the month in which the celebration was held, the preliminary arrangements for the festival, the street decorations, the manner

-
1. Si-Yu-Ki (Buddhist Records of the Western World), English Transl., Vol.II, S.Beal, London, 1906, pp.249,82; Fei-Hsin and Ma-Huan furnish similar accounts on this encounter. Somaratna, op.cit., p.126.
 2. See below, pp.219-31.
 3. UHC., I, pt.I, p.291. He stayed in Ceylon for two years.
 4. Cv., 37.97; Day., v.406; Dal.S., p.41; The Travels of Fa-Hsien (399-414 A.D.), or Record of the Buddhistic Kingdoms, English Transl., H.A.Giles, Cambridge, 1923, pp.70-71.

in which the exhibition was held and its duration,¹ details not given so explicitly elsewhere. Fa-Hsien evidently was an eye-witness of what he relates. Therefore his description, as will be discussed in the relevant chapter,² is of great importance for this study.

In his account of Sang-kia-lo (Sinhala, Ceylon), Hiuen-Tsiang mentions the Tooth Relic and its temple. The latter, according to him, was situated by the side of the king's palace. It was high and well ornamented with precious stones and jewels. Further he refers to a daily ritual of the Tooth Relic performed by the king.³ Since he had not been to Ceylon,⁴ it is very likely that Hiuen-Tsiang records here some information gathered during his sojourn in India. Some of it, such as the reference to the location of the temple, agrees well with archaeological evidence but certain other details are perhaps exaggerated. In any case, since he was not an eye-witness of the details which he relates, great care has been taken in this study not to draw conclusions from his account alone.

1. Ibid., pp.70-71.

2. See below, pp. 405-09.

3. S.Beal, op.cit., p.248.

4. Ibid., fn. 1 to p.235; UHC., I, pt.I, p.64.

Archaeological sources

In addition to the literary sources so far considered, this work uses a considerable amount of archaeological material, especially inscriptions, and also monuments. Often the inscriptions relevant to this study were issued by ruling kings but there are some that were issued by state dignitaries.¹ Apart from the light they shed on political history, these inscriptions prove very useful as, on the one hand, they provide fresh material which would not otherwise have been known and on the other hand, being contemporary to the events they record, provide a sound basis to examine the validity of the evidence found in literary sources.

The epigraphical evidence concerning the homage paid to the Tooth Relic is first attested in the reign of Mahinda IV (A.D. 956-72), about six and a half centuries after the arrival of the Relic in Ceylon. There are two inscriptions of this ruler which contain references to the Tooth Relic. One of these records that Mahinda IV built a temple for the Relic and that he made a valuable casket for it.² The other inscription is in a bad state of preservation and cannot therefore be satisfactorily deciphered.

-
1. JRAS(CB)., XXII, no.65, 1912, pp.362-63; RKD., pp.78-79.
 2. Ep.Zeyl., I, p.222. II lines 30-31. The chronicle confirms the detail that Mahinda IV built a temple for the Tooth Relic. Cv., 54.45.

As it appears now, it may perhaps contain a reference to the allocation of a share of produce for the upkeep of the Tooth Relic temple.¹ But as the interpretation is so doubtful it is essential to exercise the utmost care in using this information.

Some very useful material on the Tooth Relic, during the period of political instability after the death of Vijayabāhu I, is furnished by the Vēlaikkāra Inscription of the eleventh century.² The epigraph refers to the building of a temple for the Relic by Vijayabāhu I,³ a detail confirmed by the chronicle.⁴ The record also provides some fresh information such as the name of the dignitary in charge of the construction of the temple, the custodians of the Relic during the period, measures taken by those custodians to safeguard the Relic temple, its riches and its servants, and the manner in which the newly

-
1. Ep.Zeyl., I, p.118. II lines 41-49.
 2. There is no unanimity as regards the date of the compilation of this inscription. Geiger believed that it must be dated immediately before A.D.1137 (Cult.Ceyl.Med.Times., p.153). Paranavitana believed that it was inscribed after the death of Vijayabāhu I (Ep.Ind., XVIII, 1925-26, pp.330-38). According to Krishna Sastri it was promulgated in the thirtieth regnal year of Vijayabāhu or shortly afterwards (Madras Report on Epigraphy, no.961, Aug. 1913, pp.101-02). Wickramasinghe placed it between A.D.1137 and 1153 (Ep.Zeyl., II, pp.248-50). Gunawardhana thinks that this record belongs to the period between the death of Vijayabāhu I and the accession of Vikramabāhu II (Gunawardhana, op.cit., pp.122-25). Dhammavisuddhi suggests that it was inscribed during the last regnal year of Vijayabāhu or immediately after his death before the accession of Jayabāhu I (Dhammavisuddhi, op.cit., pp.93-102).
 3. Ep.Zeyl., II, pp.254-55.
 4. Cv., 60.16.

appointed guardians were remunerated.¹ None of these details are confirmed by literary sources, but this does not necessarily lessen the importance of the inscription. It is contemporary with the events it records, and independent in character in the sense that it is not meant to extol the achievements of any ruler and is free from praise and exaggeration. In these circumstances, it is possible to place much reliance on its information and it helps to clarify some doubts that arise in this study.

The inscriptions of Nissankamalla throw valuable light on many aspects of his reign, and also are very useful for our study. Some of these inscriptions refer to the building by this king of a Tooth Relic temple,² a detail confirmed by the chronicle.³ They also provide such additional information as the dedication to the Tooth Relic of royal personages, temple servants, villages and lands,⁴ actions not elsewhere attributed to this king. As is well known to students of the history of Ceylon, Nissankamalla's inscriptions contain a certain amount of exaggeration, but, after making allowances, the details they provide remain very useful for understanding the wealth and resources of the Relic.

1. Ep.Zeyl., II, pp.254-55; see below, pp.316-19.

2. Ep.Zeyl., II, p.89 II lines 19-20, p.113 II B. line 24, C. line 1.

3. Cv., 80.19.

4. Ep.Zeyl., II, p.89 II lines 18-21; p.173, II line 23.

Similarly, two inscriptions issued in the reigns of Parākramabāhu V (A.D. 1344-1359) and Vikramabāhu III (A.D. 1357-74) respectively provide valuable information on the homage accorded to the Tooth Relic during their times. Of these the Hapugastāna Inscription issued in the fifteenth regnal year of Parākramabāhu V records a donation of a field made by a dignitary called Sivalkolu Lakdivu Adhikāra.¹ The donation of another tract of fields made by the same dignitary together with four other colleagues is recorded in the Vīgulavatta Inscription of the fourth regnal year of Vikramabāhu III.² These two epigraphs are invaluable for this study, for they shed some light on a period for which we have little information and that too in^a much later work, the Sinhala Daḷadā Vamsaya.

Finally, three inscriptions, one of which is foreign, contain information on the Tooth Relic in another less known period of this study, i.e. the latter half of the fifteenth century. The first of these, the Gaḍalādeniya Slab

-
1. JRAS(CB)., XXII, no.65, 1912, pp.362-63; N.Mudiyanse, Art and Architecture of the Gampola Period, Colombo, 1963, pp.168-69.
 2. RKD., pp.78-79; JRAS(CB)., XXII, no.65, 1912, p.363; N.Mudiyanse, op.cit., pp.186-87; Br.Mus.Ms., Or. 6606 (165), folio, ku.

Inscription, ascribed to the reign of Jayavīra Parākramabāhu VII,¹ provides important data which enable one to determine the position of the Tooth Relic during this reign in the religious as well as the political sphere.² Similar use can be made of the Dādigama Slab Inscription of Bhuvanekabāhu VI (A.D.1470-78).³ The Kalyāṇi Inscriptions of king Dhammaceti (A.D.1472-92) of Pegu also contain a reference to the worship accorded by him, through some Burmese monks, to the Tooth Relic.⁴ What is more, these two inscriptions establish that Bhuvanekabāhu VI was a patron of the Tooth Relic. This is confirmed by the later Sinhalese works such as the Rājaratnākaraya and the Sinhala Daḷadā Vamsaya.⁵ The epigraphs are thus not very numerous, but each makes an important contribution to this study.

-
1. Codrington believed that this inscription belongs paleographically to the latter half of the fifteenth century. He identified the king Parākramabāhu mentioned therein with Parākramabāhu IX (Ep.Zeyl., IV, pp.16-20). According to Paranavitana the inscription was issued by Parākramabāhu VI. He identified the person called Doḍamvela Parākramabāhu āpāna with Parākramabāhu āpāna, the grandson of Sēnā Laṅkādhikāra (UCHC., I, pt.II, p.670). After rejecting these views, Somaratna identifies the ruler of this epigraph with Jayavīra Parākramabāhu, the immediate successor of Parākramabāhu VI (Somaratna, op.cit., pp.257-62). It is this conclusion which I follow here.
 2. Ep.Zeyl., IV, pp.24-27.
 3. Ibid., III, pp.278-86; see below, p.313.
 4. Ind.Ant., XXII, 1893, pp.40-41; Kalyāṇi Prakaranaya, ed. Gintota Medhankara, Colombō, 1924, p.50 ff.; see below, pp. 235-36.
 5. See above, pp. 49, 66.

The other kind of archaeological material which is used consists of monuments, i.e. ruined temples of the Tooth Relic. During the period under survey, the capital of Ceylon was moved from Anurādhapura to Polonnaruva and subsequently to Daṁbadeṇiya, Yāpahuva, Kurunāgala, Gampola and Kōṭṭe. The chronicle mentions the Tooth Relic temples built at each of these cities with the exception of Gampola and Yāpahuva.¹ Some of these temples have not yet been identified;² and there is no unanimity among scholars with regard to the identification of some others, especially those at Anurādhapura, Polonnaruva and Yāpahuva.³ As stated earlier, the available materials are rich but it is necessary that a trained archaeologist should handle them in order to determine their identity and also satisfactorily to explain such details as the development of the structure of the temples, their decorations and the like. Leaving these problems for future researchers, we have utilized the archaeological material only as a means of confirming the evidence furnished by other sources.

-
1. Cv., 54.45; 6 .16; 74.198; 78.41; 80.19; 81.34-35; 82.91; 90.66-68.
 2. CJS(G)., I, pp.152-53.
 3. Anurādhapura: ARASC., 1895, p.3; 1933, pp.8-9; MASC., I, pp.49-50; III, pp.14-24; S.B.Bandaranayake, The Architecture of the Monasteries of Anurādhapura, D.Phil Thesis, University of Oxford, 1972, Appendix 2, pp.498-504. Polonnaruva: ARASC., 1903, pp.8-11; 1904, p.5 ff; CJS(G)., II, p.163; Gunawardhana, op.cit., pp.422-23; Yāpahuva: ARASC., 1910-11, pp.55-56.

Chapter II

The Dāṭhāvamsa Tradition: Its Historicity

The study of the early history of the Tooth Relic, i.e. from the parinibbāna of the Buddha to the arrival of the Relic in Ceylon, depends mainly on the tradition recorded in the Dāṭhāvamsa. As has been remarked earlier,¹ this work was written in the twelfth century. Hence it is far removed from the events which it narrates. The gap of time between the events and their recording naturally raises the question of the historicity of the data found in the source. This chapter therefore is devoted to an examination of the Dāṭhāvamsa tradition in order to determine the historicity of its material.

The Dāṭhāvamsa devotes four chapters² to the early history of the Tooth Relic. It starts with the Buddha's previous birth as Sumedha and then gives an outline of the life of the Master.³ This account is followed by the death of the Buddha, the cremation and the distribution of relics.⁴ A thera named Khema, it is said, took the left canine Tooth from the funeral pyre, brought it to Kāliṅga and handed it over to king

-
1. See above, p.33.
 2. Chapters 1-4, vv.11-339.
 3. Dav., vv.11-92.
 4. Ibid., vv.93-118.

Brahmadatta of Dantapura, who converted himself to Buddhism, built a relic temple and celebrated many festivals of offerings.¹ Brahmadatta was succeeded by his son Kāsīrāja² who in turn was succeeded by Sunanda³ - two rulers who venerated the Relic. Many other kings of Dantapura who ruled in succession are also said to have paid homage to it.⁴

The Dāthāvamsa pays special attention to the worship accorded to the Tooth Relic by Guhasiva of Dantapura. This ruler first adhered to non-Buddhist teachings but later converted himself to Buddhism after harkening to the advice of a minister. He then expelled all the niganthas from his kingdom.⁵ The niganthas took themselves to Pāṭaliputta and complained to king Paṇḍu, the overlord of Guhasiva, that while he (Paṇḍu) was an adherent of Śiva and Brahma his vassal Guhasiva worshipped a cavaṭṭhi (bone of the dead). This, they added, is a disgrace to the gods who receive high veneration from Paṇḍu.⁶ Stricken in anger on hearing this news, Paṇḍu ordered one of his vassals, Cittayāna to go in haste to Kāliṅga (Dantapura) and bring Guhasiva together with the cavaṭṭhi which received his worship.⁷ On his arrival in Kāliṅga Cittayāna was welcomed by Guhasiva who later exhibited the Tooth Relic to

1. Ibid., vv.114, 119-27.

2. Ibid., vv.128-30.

3. Ibid., vv.131-32.

4. Ibid., v.133.

5. Ibid., vv.134-51.

6. Ibid., vv.152-56.

7. Ibid., vv.157-58.

him. The Relic on this occasion performed miracles which resulted in the conversion of Cittayāna to Buddhism.¹ However, being unable to disregard the order of Paṇḍu, Cittayāna brought Guhasiva and the Tooth Relic to Pāṭaliputṭa.² Acting on the advice of the niganṭhas Paṇḍu used several methods to destroy the Relic but having seen the miracles wrought by it on all these occasions, he developed faith in it and became an adherent of Buddhism.³ Later he disappointed an invader named Khīradhāra, sent Guhasiva back to Dantapura with the Relic, and abdicated the throne in favour of his son.⁴

Then the Dāṭhāvamsa continues its narrative with the coming to Dantapura of Danta, a prince of Ujjain, and his marriage to Guhasiva's daughter, Hēmamālā. Danta was also entrusted with the protection of the Tooth Relic.⁵ During this time, it is said, three nephews of Khīradhāra, who had been slain in an earlier battle, collected a large force and invaded Dantapura in order to capture the Tooth Relic.⁶ Before going to the battlefield Guhasiva instructed his son-in-law, Danta-kumāra, to take the Tooth Relic to Ceylon and hand it over to Mahāsena, in case of his failure to defeat the enemy.⁷ Guhasiva was slain

-
1. Ibid., vv.159-86.
 2. Ibid., vv.187-94.
 3. Ibid., vv.195-283.
 4. Ibid., vv.284-87.
 5. Ibid., vv.290-94.
 6. Ibid., vv.295-96.
 7. Ibid., vv.297-302.

in battle but before the enemy entered Dantapura
 Dantakumāra, acting according to instructions given by his
 father-in-law, fled with the Relic to a spot south of the
 city where he crossed a river on the bank of which he
 deposited the Relic. He then returned to Dantapura, collected
 his wife, who was in the guise of a Brahmin woman, came back
 to the spot where he had concealed the Relic and lived for some
 time.¹ Afterwards they continued their journey and, having
 been miraculously delivered from dangers which threatened them
 arrived with the Relic at Tāmalitti.² From there they went
 aboard a ship to Ceylon and arrived in Laṅkāpaṭṭana in the ninth
 regnal year of Siri Meghavanna.³

A passage written in Sinhalese prose found at the beginning
 of the work indicates the basis on which the Dāṭhāvamsa was
 written. It runs thus:

'After the end of the Great Dynasty (mahavasa) when
 Dantakumāra brought the Tooth Relic from Kāliṅga in
 the ninth regnal year of Kitsirimē the first in the
 lower dynasty (suluvasaṭṭaādi), at the order of the
 king, the Sinhalese scholars of the day composed in
 Sinhalese verse the history of the Tooth Relic from
 the parinirvāna of the Buddha to its arrival in
 Ceylon. The author of the Cūlavamsa who had read
 this Sinhalese poem Daḷadāvamsaya, alluded in verse
 to the mere fact of the bringing of the Relic and
 added that one should refer to the Daḷadāvamsaya for

-
1. Ibid., vv. 303-306.
 2. Ibid., vv. 307-324.
 3. Ibid., vv. 325-40.

the rest of the story. I therefore, have taken this Sinhalese history of the Tooth Relic (eḷu Daḷadā vamsaya) as my authority. Further it appears from the Parinirvāna Sūtra that the Tooth Relic was taken to Kāliṅga. This history too states that at the death of the Buddha a thera named Khēma took the Relic to Kāliṅga. As these two statements agree with each other I have taken this history of the Tooth Relic as authoritative'.¹

It is evident from this passage that the author of the Daḥāvamsa based his work on an older tradition of the history of the Tooth Relic and that he considered the latter an authoritative work for two reasons. One is the reference of the Cūlavamsa to the work. The other is the affinity of the story with that of the Mahāparinibbānasutta. One cannot however, be certain whether it was the same Sinhalese work that was mentioned by both the Cūlavamsa and Dhammakitti. Nevertheless there is no valid reason to doubt that Dhammakitti based his work on an ancient tradition. From the Thūpavamsa and the Mahābōdhivamsa we learn that these works were based on Sinhalese chronicles.² The Mahāvamsa Tikā (Vamsatthappakāsinī) refers to two commentaries, Mahācetiya-vamsatthakathā³ and Mahābōdhivamsa-aṭṭhakathā⁴ which, too, were written in Sinhalese.⁵ Even the Mahāvamsa is believed to have been based on a Sinhalese work called the Sīhalaṭṭhakathā Mahāvamsa.⁶ Thus taken together

-
1. Ibid., the passage opposite p.1; Godakumbura's translation in JRAS(CB)., XXXVIII, no.107, pp.124-25 has been utilized here with slight variations.
 2. Pali Lit. Ceyl., p.133 ; Godakumbura, op.cit., p.106 ff.
 3. Vamsatthappakāsinī, (PTS)., II, p.509.
 4. Ibid., I, p.142.
 5. Godakumbura, op.cit., p.106.
 6. Mv., Transl., Introduction, p.X; Godakumbura, op.cit., p.106.

all this evidence point to a practice of recording in Sinhalese the events connected with the institutions and religious objects which received worship of the Buddhists in Ceylon. From this consideration it may be concluded that the history of the Tooth Relic, too, may originally have been written in Sinhalese as Dhammakitti states.

However, the acknowledgement of his indebtedness to this earlier work suggests that, Dhammakitti sought authority for his work by stating that it was written on the basis of an earlier work. Nevertheless, there is reason to believe that Dhammakitti himself added some details to this narrative. It would appear from the foregoing passage¹ that the Elu Daladā Vamsaya contained the history of the Tooth Relic from the parinibbāna of the Buddha to its arrival in Ceylon. But the Pali Dāṭhāvamsa as we have it today, starts with the Buddha's previous existence as Sumedha and narrates the life of the Buddha.² One would notice that particular attention has been given in this section to the Buddha's three visits to Ceylon.³ A closer examination of the narrative further reveals that it closely follows the first chapter of the Mahāvamsa. The resemblance of the two narratives indicates that Dhammakitti borrowed some material from the Mahāvamsa in order to present a

-
1. See above, pp.83-84.
 2. Dav., vv. 11-93.
 3. Ibid., vv. 63-90.

complete poem,¹ but apart from this detail his additions, if there were any, are not easily traceable. Hence one is beset with a difficulty in distinguishing the original work from later additions - a difficulty which cannot be remedied at this stage.

The tradition which is directly relevant to our study begins with the parinibbāna of the Buddha. Although not so elaborate as the one found in the Mahāparinibbānasutta, the account of the Dāṭhāvamsa concerning the Buddha's death, funeral arrangements, cremation and the distribution of relics, closely follows the sutta.² The bringing of the Collar-Bone Relic to Ceylon by thera Sarabhu, a detail found in this context, even indicates the author's consultation of the Mahāvamsa.³ As to the distribution of the Tooth Relics, the Dāṭhāvamsa follows the Mahāparinibbānasutta and states that one tooth Relic is honoured by Sakka, and one by the Gandhāras while yet another is worshipped by the Nāga kings.⁴ The detail of the Mahāparinibbānasutta that another Tooth Relic is honoured in Kāliṅga⁵ is elaborated here by stating that a thera named Khema took the left canine Tooth from the funeral pyre, took it

-
1. Dav., v.407 which refers to the homage paid by Buddhadāsa and other rulers also seems to be a later addition.
 2. Dav., vv.94-118; Sumāṅgalavilāsinī, (PTS)., II, p.594 ff; Dīgha Nikāya, (PTS), II, pp.156-68.
 3. Dav., v.113; Mv., I, 37-39.
 4. Dav., v.118; Dīgha Nikāya, (PTS)., II, p.168; see also Buddhāvamsa (PTS)., ch.XXVIII, p.68, v.6; Jkm., pp.37-38.
 5. Dīgha Nikāya, (PTS)., II, p.168.

to Kāliṅga and gave it to king Brahmadata in Dantapura.¹ The addition of the name Khema may perhaps appear as a sign of the authors' consultation of a tradition other than the one found in the Mahāparinibbānasutta but such a tradition is not found in any other canonical work. Hence the possibility cannot be ruled out that either the author of the Elu Daladā Vamsaya or Dhammakitti inserted a name in order to provide a more elaborate story of the manner in which the Tooth Relic was transferred to Kāliṅga.

In fact, there is more convincing evidence to suggest the creations of the author in this narrative. Khema who took the Relic from the funeral pyre is said to have delivered it to king Brahmadata.² Two other kings of his lineage, Kāsīrāja and Sunanda, who ruled in succession are then mentioned as patrons of the Relic.³ The Buddhist canonical works and the Jātakas refer to such names as Satthabhu,⁴ Karaṇḍu,⁵ Kāliṅga⁶ Nālikīra⁷ and Uggata⁸ borne by the rulers of Kāliṅga, but

1. Dav., vv.114, 119.

2. Ibid., v.119.

3. Ibid., vv.128-32. See above, p.81.

4. Dīgha Nikāya, (PTS)., II, p.235 ff.

5. The Jātaka together with Its Commentary, ed., V.Fausboll, III, London, 1883, p.376.

6. Ibid., IV, London, 1963, p.230.

7. Ibid., V, London, 1891, p.144.

8. Mahāvastu, ed., E.Senart, III, Paris, 1897, p.364.

Brahmadatta, Kāsīrāja and Sunanda never figure among them as rulers of that region. Nor do they occur in any known inscriptions, in Purānic literature or in later, admittedly more fantastic works like the annals of the temple of Jagannāth¹ which contain genealogical lists of the rulers of Kāliṅga. The absence of any corroborative evidence to these names therefore raises doubts as to their historicity.

A plausible explanation that can be offered to account for the occurrence of these names is that Dhammakitti borrowed some material from Buddhist literature. The name Brahmadatta especially reminds one of the opening sentence of many Jātaka stories which runs as: atīte bārānasiyaṃ brahmadaate rajjaṃ kārente² meaning 'once on a time when Brahmadatta was reigning in Benares'. On numerous other occasions Brahmadatta is described as the ruler of the same city.³ We further learn from the Jātakas⁴ as well as the Dīgha Nikāya⁵ that Bārānasī was the capital of Kāsī. Hence the passage implies that Brahmadatta was the king of that region. Similarly the name

-
1. For a list of these names, see A History of Orissa, Vol. II, ed., N.K.Sahu, Calcutta, 1956, pp.223 ff.
 2. Jātaka., III, pp.23, 25, 27, 30, 45, etc.
 3. D.Anderson, Index to the Jātaka and Its Commentary, London, 1897, pp.111-12.
 4. Jātaka., III, p.39.
 5. Dīgha Nikāya, (PTS), II, p.235; Sumaṅgalavilāsinī, (PTS)., II, p.662.

Kāsīrāja literally means the 'ruler of Kāsī'. In the Mūgapakkha Jātaka there is a reference to a Kāsīrāja who ruled justly in Benares¹ while the Khantivādi Jātaka refers to another Kāsīrāja named Kalābu who reigned from the same city.² The latter reference further illustrates that Kāsīrāja is not a personal name but a general term which denotes the rulers of Kāsī. This is very likely to be the case with the other occasions on which the term is used.³ Further, from the Mūgapakkha Jātaka we learn that the Kāsīrāja had a charioteer named Sunanda.⁴ A charioteer of the same name who was in the employ of king Sivi finds mention in the Ummadantī Jātaka too.⁵

There is reason to believe that Dhammakitti was well acquainted with these stories. In the colophon of the Dāṭhāvaṃsa, Dhammakitti describes himself as one who is well versed in logic, religion and the like (takkāgamādikusalena visāradena).⁶ His claim to the mastery of āgama (religion) is particularly noteworthy in this context for it suggests

-
1. Jātaka, VI, London, 1896, p.1.
 2. Ibid., III, p.39; V, p.135.
 3. D.Anderson, op.cit., p.32.
 4. Jātaka., VI, p.10.
 5. Ibid., V, p.213, The name appears in the Bhāgavata Purāna (ed., T.R.Krishnacharya, Kumbakonam, 1916, I.14.32; II.9.14; VII.8.39; VIII.20.32;22.15; X.39-53) and the Vāyu Purāna (ed., Anandāśrma, Poona, 1905, 22.16) as a chief attendant of Viṣṇu and a disciple of Brahma respectively.
 6. Dav., v.413.

that he was well versed in religious lore as well as Buddhist stories. As Dhammakitti was a Buddhist monk and was a rājaguru (royal preceptor),¹ there is nothing surprising in this claim. In fact it gains some strength from another consideration. At the time when the Tooth Relic sank into the anvil as a result of Paṇḍu's attempt to destroy it, Dhammakitti brings into the narrative a certain setṭhi Subaddha. The setṭhi on this occasion resorted to an act of faith in order to remove the relic from the anvil. One would notice that Subaddha described the Buddha's greatness by citing such Jātakas as the Caddanta, Sasa, Sivi, Khantivādī (Ksāntivādī), Vidhura, Vaṭṭakā, Macca, and Vessantara.² Although the words are attributed to Subaddha, the reference to these Jātakas is a clear indication of Dhammakitti's acquaintance of such stories. Such indications to his knowledge of the Jātakas together with the fact that Brahmadata Kāsirāja and Sunanda appear in the same source suggest that Dhammakitti borrowed these details from the Jātakas, although the possibility that he also consulted the Purānas for the name Sunanda³ cannot be completely ruled out. If this explanation is plausible it would follow that, with a view to

1. Ibid., v.414.

2. Ibid., vv.217-238.

3. See above, p.89 fn.

providing a complete story of the unknown past of the Tooth Relic, Dhammakitti borrowed some material from the Jātakas and utilized it in his work with no regard to their historical context. Whether or not the author of the Elū Dalādā Vamsaya too was responsible for such additions cannot be determined as this work is not available to us today.

Similarly the historicity of other personages who occur in the Dāṭhāvamsa narrative seems somewhat doubtful. It would appear in the foregoing account¹ that Paṇḍu, Guhasiva, Cittayāna, Khīradhāra and his three nephews and Dantakumāra were either contemporaries or near contemporaries of Mahāsena of Ceylon. Many suggestions have been made as regards the identification of Paṇḍu. Turnour expressed the view that the first five lines of the first edict of the Delhi Topra Pillar refer to this ruler who claimed to have obtained the Tooth Relic from Dantapura.² It has been found later that Turnour's reading was erroneous for the inscription belongs to Aśoka and has no connexion whatsoever with Paṇḍu, Dantapura or the Tooth Relic.³ In 1868, Ferguson identified the king with Gautamiputra Sātakarni⁴ while

1. See above, pp.81-82.

2. JRAS (Ben.Br.), VI, pt.II, pp.868, 1053, 1059.

3. Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, I, ed., E.Hultzsch, Oxford, 1925, pp.119-20.

4. JRAS., NS., VI, 1868, p.150; Dav., Transl., Muthucomaraswamy, London, 1874, Introduction, p.13.

more recently Sahu believed that he was a Murunda ruler.¹

None of these identifications is based on a valid foundation for the name Paṇḍu as such does not occur in any of the dynastic lists of the third and fourth centuries.

Similar uncertainty prevails concerning the identification of Guhasiva, Cittyāna and Khīradhāra. In reference to the dynasties of the early fourth century, the Vāyu and Brahmānda Purānas state that a ruler named Guha was protecting the territories of Kāliṅga, Mahiṣa and Mahendra mountains² at the time when the Guptas were enjoying the territory along the Ganges including Prayāga, Sāketa and Magadha.³ Although Guha has some affinity to the name Guhasiva in the sense that it constitutes the first half of the latter name, and although the period of Guha's reign roughly corresponds to that ascribed to Guhasiva in the Dāṭhāvamsa,⁴ it is hardly possible to identify the ruler on this basis alone, and there is no conclusive evidence which would substantiate this. Sahu on the other hand suggested that Guhasiva might have been a remote chief of the Bhaumakaras. These rulers who came into prominence in the eighth century named their capital Viraja (modern Jajapura)⁵

1. History of Orissa, II, p.335.

2. The Purāna Text of the Dynasties of the Kāli Age, F.E. Pargiter, Oxford, 1913, pp.53-54, Transl., pp.73-74.

3. Ibid., pp.53-54.

4. He is described as a contemporary of Mahāsena (A.D.274-301) the ruler of Ceylon. Dav., v.301.

5. N.K.Sahu, Buddhism in Orissa, Utkal University, 1958, p.85.

as Guheśvarapāṭaka (Guhadēvapāṭaka). The change of the name of the capital, according to Sahu, implies that it was the seat of authority of the kings representing the lineage of Guheśvara (Guhasiva).¹ It is particularly noteworthy, however, that, apart from the similarity of the names, there is no further evidence to suggest any link between Guhasiva and Bhaumakaras who were separated by about four centuries. Hence it seems rash to attach any significance to such identifications until more conclusive evidence in this connexion is brought to light.

The lack of corroborative evidence concerning the identity of the rulers mentioned in the Dāṭhāvamsa leaves one in doubt as to whether they were mere inventions of the author. There are indications which lend some support to such doubts. One is the similarity of the name Paṇḍu with that of the mythical founder of the Pāṇḍya dynasty. As is evident from the Paṇḍukābhaya legend of the Mahāvamsa² the Ceylonese writers often drew material from such works as the Mahābhārata in order to construct history of some periods far removed from and quite unknown to them. Dhammakitti does not claim directly that he was well versed in such works but the detail that he was a master of logic, religion and the like (takkāgamādi) leaves

1. History of Orissa, II, p.347.

2. Mv., chapters 8-10; UCHC., I, pt.I, p.105 ff.

little doubt that they were known to him. If such was the case it explains how the name Paṇḍu could have crept into the Dāṭhāvamsa.¹

There is yet another consideration which supports this explanation. The Dāṭhāvamsa, as we know, was written at a time when Līlāvati, a member of the Pāṇḍya family, was in power. In its introductory verses the Dāṭhāvamsa describes Līlāvati as a member of the Paṇḍu vaṃsa which is immaculate as the moon. (Sudhāmayakhāmalapaṇḍuvaṃsajaṃ).² Another member of the same vaṃsa named Madhurinda was given complimentary epithets in this work.³ The context in which these verses are found not only suggests that Dhammakitti might have been well aware of the history of the vaṃsa but also that he held the latter in high esteem. This is quite evident from the fact that Paṇḍu is described as a rājādhirāja⁴ (sovereign lord) who had many vassals. In the circumstances it is very likely that the name Paṇḍu was drawn from either the Mahābhārata or some records containing the genealogy of the Pāṇḍyas; and it is quite possible that he was brought into the narrative to glorify the royal family of

1. The Sinhala Daladā Vaṃsaya refers to this king as Paṇḍuvāsa. (Sin. Dal. V., p.14). This on the one hand reminds one of the Paṇḍukābhaya legend and the rulers of the Paṇḍuvāsa dynasty of the....6th century, on the other.

2. Dav., v.5.

3. Ibid., v.7.

4. Ibid., v.250; He is described in v.153 as:
'tattha rājā mahātejo jambudīpassa issaro
paṇḍunāmo tadā āsi anantabalavāhano'

Pāṇḍyas during whose rule the Dāṭhāvamsa was written.

It is not apparent, however, how the name Guhasiva came into the Dāṭhāvamsa narrative. Although the author claims that Guhasiva was a Buddhist, it is particularly noteworthy that the name sounds more Hindu than Buddhist.¹ This is not a conclusive argument against his being a Buddhist, but it does seem rather unusual especially when viewed in the light of the practice followed in Ceylon.² Further the name as such does not occur in any of the genealogical records. This consideration taken together with the oddity of the name raises a reasonable doubt concerning the historicity of Guhasiva.

-
1. The Bhāgavata Purāna makes mention of a Guha who fought with Tāraka in the Dēvāsura war and with Pradyumna at Somatapura, (Bhāgavata Purāna, ed., T.R.Krishnacharya, Kumbakonam, 1916, VIII.10.28; X. 63.7). The Matsya Purāna states that he had a peacock as riding animal and that as a baby of seven days he killed asura Tāraka (Matsya Purāna, ed., Ānandaśrama, Poona, 1907, 133.64; 140.40; 146.10-11; 266.42). See also Purāna Index, I, ed., V.R.Ramachandra Dikshitar, Madras, 1951, p.539. It would appear that this description fits in well with the legends concerning the heroism of god Skanda (God of Kataragama). JRAS(CB)., XXIX, no.77, p.238; P.E.Pieris, Sinhale and the Patriots, Colombo, 1950, p.695. If Guha stands in this context for Skanda and Siva for Śvara the name constitutes Skanda+Siva - or Śivaskanda which is a pure Hindu name. This even reminds one of a ruler of the same name (Sivaskandhavarman) of the Pallava dynasty.
 2. Pārinda, one of the Tamils who invaded Ceylon in the fifth century is referred to in an inscription as 'Budadasa la parideva'. This indicates that he used the epithet Buddhadāsa which is used by Buddhist rulers. See below, p.138.

Although it is impossible to draw conclusions on this point owing to inadequacy of our knowledge of the subject, we would like to draw attention to some considerations which may be helpful for understanding the manner in which the name came into the Dāṭhāvamsa.

A tentative explanation that can be offered is that Dhammakitti drew it from the Purāṇas. As has been remarked earlier the Purāṇas state that a ruler named Guha reigned in the early fourth century over the regions of Kāliṅga, Mahiṣa and Mahendra.¹ It is also evident from the Dāṭhāvamsa and the Cūlavamsa that the Tooth Relic was brought from Kāliṅga during the same period.² If by any chance, the detail of Guhasiva was not in the Sinhalese chronicle it is not unlikely that Dhammakitti referred to the genealogical lists of the Purāṇas where he found that the ruler of Kāliṅga during this period was Guha. In that case it is possible that Dhammakitti, for the reasons best known to him, added the latter half of the name, 'Siva', and inserted the name Guhasiva in his chronicle. Whether such an addition was made by Dhammakitti or the author of the Elu Daladā Vamsaya is again a matter of conjecture.

1. See above, p. 92.

2. Day., v. 340; Cv., 37.92; these works refer to the ninth year of Siri Meghavanna (A.D. 310) as the date of the arrival of the Relic in Ceylon.

This explanation brings us to the question of the historicity of the alleged friendly relations between Guhasiva and Mahāsenā. In a verse attributed to Guhasiva, the Dāṭhāvamsa states that Mahāsenā sent many valuable presents to him in order to obtain the Tooth Relic.¹ The Sinhalese king is further described as a piya sahāyo (good friend) of Guhasiva.² Commenting on this relationship Liyanagamage remarks that it may well have been based on a valid foundation.³ The Account of Wang-Hiuan-Tse contains a reference to an embassy to the court of Samudragupta sent by Mahāsenā's son and successor Siri Meghavanna (Chi-mi-kia-po-mo) for the purpose of securing facilities for Ceylonese pilgrims to the Bō-Tree. A Sanskrit inscription found at the site of the Bō-Tree which refers to the establishment of a shrine by a certain Mahānāma of Laṅkā,⁴ suggests some connexion with Siri Meghavanna's embassy to the Gupta emperor. Further, Samudragupta, in his Allahabad Praśasti, claims that Siṅhala was among the countries which sent friendly gifts to him.⁵ These indications point to the fact that Mahāsenā's successor maintained friendly relations

1. Day., v.301.

2. Ibid., v.301.

3. Liyanagamage, op.cit., pp.23-25.

4. JRAS(CB)., XXIV, no.68, p.75 ff; Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, III, ed., J.F.Fleet, Varanasi, 1963, pp.274-79; Vincent Smith, Ind.Ant., XXXI, pp.192-97.

5. Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum., III, pp.8, 14.

with such distant cities as Pāṭaliputra which in turn suggests the possibility that Mahāsenā might have maintained such relations with Kāliṅga, an area closer to Ceylon than Pāṭaliputra.

This assumption gains further strength from some other considerations. From the Mahāvamsa we learn that Mahāsenā accepted non-Theravāda Buddhist teachings as a result of his association with a certain Saṅghamitta.¹ It has been suggested that such teachings were making progress in the Andhra Pradesh,² and that it was probably from here, that they inspired the Ceylonese monks. Andhra influence in Ceylonese sculpture too is evident during this period.³ There are even indications of the import of some sculptures as well as a type of stone which was used by Mahāsenā to engrave an inscription.⁴ Further the friendly relations of Ceylon with the Buddhist centres in Andhra Pradesh are confirmed by epigraphic evidence from Nāgārjuna Koṇḍa.⁵ This evidence indicates that Ceylon had close cultural contacts with eastern India where Buddhism was flourishing during the period. Hence it is not unlikely that Mahāsenā maintained friendly relations with a ruler of this part of India in order to obtain the Tooth Relic.

1. Mv., 37.1 ff.

2. UHC., I, pt.I, pp.203-05.

3. Ibid., pp.264-67.

4. Ibid., p.266; ARASC., 1952, p.24; Ep.Zeyl., IV, p.274.

5. Ep.Ind., XX, pp.22-23.

Nevertheless, the internal evidence of the Dāṭhāvamsa still leaves room for some doubts concerning the validity of this detail. As the ruler of Kāliṅga with whom Mahāsenā is said to have maintained friendly contacts is not found in any Indian source one may naturally be reluctant to attach much significance to the information. There is another objection which can be raised in this connexion. The request of Guhasiva to deliver the Relic to the king of Ceylon in the event of his defeat¹ suggests that he thought that Mahāsenā was alive at the time of the invasion. It is not known when the invasion took place but when Hēmamālā and Dantakumāra arrived in Ceylon Mahāsenā was dead and his successor, Siri Meghavanna had reached his ninth regnal year.² Since the fugitives are said to have stayed in a hideout for some time³ it is not impossible that they could not leave India soon after the death of Guhasiva. Nevertheless, even after making allowances for possible delays one must conclude that a minimum of nine years⁴ is too long a period for a journey from Kāliṅga to Ceylon. This suggests that the ruler of Kāliṅga was not aware of the death of Mahāsenā. Further this raises

1. Dav., vv.298-302.

2. Dav., v.340; Dal.S., p.34; Cv., 37.92.

3. Dav., v.306; Dal.S., p.31.

4. This is based on the assumption that Mahāsenā was in his last regnal year at the time of the invasion of Guhasiva's kingdom. It is not unlikely that the invasion took place even earlier.

the doubt as to whether the request of Mahāsenā for the Relic too was an invention of the author.

It has been remarked by Liyanagamage that the close association of the Tooth Relic with the Abhayagiri and the lack of enthusiasm of the Mahāvihāra towards it might have been the result of the interest taken by Mahāsenā in obtaining the Relic. As Mahāsenā was an ardent supporter of the Abhayagiri, Liyanagamage further suggests that Mahāsenā might have made arrangements to entrust the Abhayagiri with the Tooth Relic. Although this is a plausible explanation of the situation there is yet another consideration which may perhaps suggest a way in which Mahāsenā could have come into the narrative even if he had no connexion with the procurement of the Tooth Relic. It is probable that the Eḷu Daladā Vamsaya contained a reference to Sīri Meghavanna's decree that the Relic should be taken annually to the Abhayagiri-vihāra.² This was followed even after a century, as witnessed by Fa-Hsien,³ and there is no valid reason to suspect that it was not prevalent even in later times. The association of the Relic with this institution is evident from the Cūlavamsa too.⁴ Further Mahāsenā's patronage towards the Abhayagiri may have

-
1. Liyanagamage, op.cit., p.24.
 2. See below, pp.132.
 3. See below, p.132.
 4. See below, p.189.

been well known to later writers. Hence it is possible that a later writer like Dhammakitti who set out to write the chronicle of the Tooth Relic - an object entrusted to the Abhayagiri and most of the past of which was quite unknown - should have thought that it was Mahāsenā who took the initiative in obtaining the Relic. In that case his appearance in the narrative would be quite understandable. This however, is at best a possibility.

It is again difficult to identify the other two rulers, Cittayāna and Khīradhāra, found in the Dāṭhāvamsa. Although they are referred to by name, the contexts in which they were found do not help one to understand where they ruled. The Sinhala Daḷada Vamsaya describes Cittayāna as the bāna¹ of Paṇḍu but gives no further details. As to Khīradhāra the Rājāvaliya states that he was the ruler of Sāvātnuvara² (P. Sāvātthi) but no corroborative evidence for this is found elsewhere. Hence the validity of these details found in much later works as well as the historicity of the two personages remain somewhat doubtful.

Of the personages mentioned in the Dāṭhāvamsa, the historicity of Hēmamālā, who is said to have brought the Relic to Ceylon can be established without much doubt. The

1. Sin.Dal.V., p.14.
2. Rjv., p.37.

Dāṭhāvamsa provides the detail that she and her husband, Dantakumāra, came to Ceylon in the guise of Brahmans.¹ The Cūlavamsa partly substantiates this view as it states 'a Brahmin woman brought the Relic from Kāliṅga'² thus implying that the woman might have been Hēmamālā who was in the guise of a Brahmin. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that no mention is made in the Cūlavamsa of Hēmamālā's husband, Dantakumāra. It is not unlikely that Hēmamālā was accompanied by her husband, but Dantakumāra was certainly not his original name, rather one by which he later came to be known. It is evident from the Mahābodhivamsa that the custodian of the Bō-Tree was known as Bodhigupta,³ a name which designated his profession. As Dantakumāra was the custodian of the Tooth Relic,⁴ his name too is very likely to have been given because of his function.

The detail that the Tooth Relic was brought to Ceylon from Dantapura in Kāliṅga seems to have been based on a firm tradition. Although Dantapura is mentioned as the place where the Relic was worshipped, the context in which the name is found

-
1. Dav., vv.298, 304, 306. The detail that they stayed in a dēvāla (Hindu shrine) too indicates this, see Dav., v.340.
 2. Cv., 37.92.
 3. Mbv., pp.100-102.
 4. Dav., v.294.

is of no help in identifying its location. The city finds mention in Buddhist literature as located in Kāliṅga and its rulers are often mentioned in Jātaka stories.¹ The Jaina literature refers to the city as the capital of king Dantavakka.² The Mahābhārata too, refers to a city named Dantakura in Kāliṅga which is believed to have been the Dantapura of Buddhist and Jain Literature.³ But, since Kāliṅga was a geographical area, not a definite state, one is still left in doubt as to the exact location of Dantapura.

Cunningham identifies this city with Rajamahendry (Rajamahendravaram) on the northern bank of Gōdāvarī. This identification is based on Pliny's description of Calingae (Kāliṅga). Pliny records that the territory extended as far as the promontory of Calingon and the city of Dandagula which was about 625 Roman miles (c.574 British miles) from the mouth of the Ganges. Cunningham identifies Calingon with modern

-
1. Dīgha Nikāya (PTS)., II, p.235; Sumāṅgala Vilāsinī (PTS)., II, p.662; Mahāvastu., III, p.364; Jātaka., III, p.376, IV, p.228, V. p.144.
 2. Abhidhāna Rājendra, A Lexicon of Jain Prakrit, ed. Muni Dīpavijaya, Vol.V, Ratlam, 1921, p.186; For references s.v. Dantavakka.
 3. Mahābhārata, (Udyogaparvan), ed. S.K.De, Poona, 1940, 5.23.23; Sylvain Lévi, Jean Przyluski and Jules Bloch, Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidian in India, Calcutta, 1929, p.167 ff.

Coringa situated on a projection of a land at the mouth of Gōdāvārī, on the basis that Coringa agrees substantially with the name Calington and is situated at about the distance given by Pliny. The description of Pliny further implies that Calington and Dandagula were close to each other. Considering this implication and the detail that Dandagula was situated on the northern bank of a river, Cunningham identifies the city with Rajamahendry.¹

Sylvain Lévi identifies Dantapura with modern Palura (Palur), a place near the Chilka lake, about six miles to the north-east of Ganjam. The etymology of the word has been explained by Caldwell as Tamil Pāl-ūr, (பாலூர்) 'the city of milk'.² But, considering the fact that pal, (பல), palu (பலு) and its variation pallu (பல்லு) in most south Indian languages denote 'tooth' and ūr (ஊர்) means 'city', Lévi explains Palur as 'city of Tooth' and identifies it with Dantapura of Buddhist literature.³ Przulski⁴ and Ratilal N.Mehta⁵ agree with this identification.

-
1. A.Cunningham, The Ancient Geography of India, London, 1871, pp.517-18: See map on p. 513.
 2. R.Caldwell, Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian or South-Indian family of Languages, London, 1875, Introduction, p.104.
 3. J.A., 1925, p.46 ff; Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidian in India, p.163 ff; JBORS., XXI, 1935, pp.137-38.
 4. Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidian in India, pp.137-41.
 5. Pre-Buddhist India, Bombay, 1939, pp.401-02.

It would seem that this identification rests solely on etymological grounds. Apart from the fact that Palur, in the third century, was a Buddhist centre of some importance as revealed by an inscription of Nāgārjuna Koṇḍa, there is no other evidence to suggest any connexion between the city and the Tooth Relic. Nor is there a legend known from this locality of Kāliṅga concerning the Relic. Hence one would be reluctant to accept Lévi's identification.

This leaves the question of how Palur got its name. A plausible explanation would be that this was because of its trade in ivory. Przyluski points out that Pal in Palur may have been derived from bal which signifies 'horn' in the Austro-Asiatic languages and suggests that the word may mean tusks of elephants. To explain this derivation he cites the Khmer and Kon-tu examples of Phluk bhluk and palō respectively which show that the initial sonant b can be softened into a sound p.¹ On the other hand, Pal (പാൾ), pal (പാൾ) or palu (പാലു) (pallu)² (Tamil, Toda and Telugu respectively), represent Sanskrit danta which denotes not only human teeth but also elephant tusks (ivory).³ Hence, although

1. Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidian in India, pp.139-40.

2. A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary, ed. T.Burrow and M.B. Emeneau, Oxford, 1961, p.267.

3. Monier Williams, Sanskrit-English Dictionary, s.v. danta.

pal in Dravidian languages usually denotes tooth,¹ it is not unlikely that in this context it was used also to mean elephant tusks.

This explanation in fact derives strength from a well known geographical fact. Kāliṅga was famous in ancient times for its huge elephants. When giving an example of a poetical description which contradicted a well-known fact, the Kāvyādarśa states 'kāliṅgavanāsambhūtamṛgaprāyā matangajāḥ', meaning 'the elephants born in the forests of Kāliṅga are like deer in size',² i.e. are very small. This implies that there were large elephants in the forests of Kāliṅga. In Jainā literature there is a reference to a Saccavatī, the queen of king Dantavakka of Dantapura, who wanted to have a palace built for her entirely of ivory. It also refers to the wife of a merchant (Dhanamitra) who also entertained a similar desire and continues to state the measures taken by them to collect ivory from the forests of Kāliṅga.³ Further, Hiuan Tsiang, who passed through Kāliṅga in the seventh century, observed that 'the country produces the great tawny wild elephants much prized

-
1. Tamil Lexicon, IV, p.2526 gives 'tusks of elephants' as a meaning for pal, palu and pal of Tamil, Telugu and Malyalam respectively.
 2. Kāvyādarśa, ed. V.Narayana Iyer, Madras, 1952, chapter III, v.165.
 3. Abhidhāna Rājendra, V, p.186, s.v. pacchitta; Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidian in India, p.166.

by the neighbouring provinces'.¹ These references to the plentitude of elephants and ivory suggests that there may have been cities in Kāliṅga dealing mainly in elephants and ivory. Paloura is known to Ptolemy as an ancient town of Kāliṅga.² It is very likely that this town, as the name itself suggests, was known for the trade in ivory. If this is a plausible explanation of the derivation of the name, it would follow that Palur came to be known as such not because of the Tooth Relic but because of the trade in ivory.

Nilakanta Das holds the view that Dantapura of the Buddhist literature and Dandagula of Pliny were one and the same town, which he identifies with Puri. The Buddha, according to him, is worshipped in the Jagannath temple as an incarnation of Viṣṇu and the object which is changed from an old image to a new one every twelve years is nothing but the Tooth Relic. The Relic was brought to Kāliṅga long before the reign of Aśoka and was, later on, captured by the Kośalas from a tribe called the Odas (Udras). He adds that the story of Indradyumna in the Padma Purāṇa has some connexion with this incident.³

In 1958 a writer of the same name, perhaps Nilakanta Das himself, expressed a view in direct contrast to the one mentioned

-
1. Buddhist Records of the Western World, Transl., S.Beal, London, 1906, p.207.
 2. G.E.Gerini; Researches on Ptolemy's Geography, London, 1909, p.743.
 3. JAHS., II, No.1, 1927, pp.21, 22, 26.

above. He states that Jainism is the religion of the land; that nātha in Jagannātha is the name used by Jain Tīrthankaras and that Jagannātha is identical with Jagatpuruṣa (universal soul). It is the aim of the Jains to identify themselves with this universal soul. The symbol worshipped at Puri is similar to Jaina images. Taking these into consideration he concludes that Puri was originally a Jain centre and later became a Vaiṣṇava centre. It had no connexion with the Tooth Relic, and the story was a deliberate attempt of the Ceylonese Buddhists to explain, in their own way, the symbol of Jina worship in Puri.¹ Indeed this explanation raises serious doubts concerning its validity, but, whatever its truth may be, one can reasonably agree with one detail, i.e. Puri has no connexion with the Tooth Relic. The legend of the Tooth Relic being hidden in the image of Jagannatha is clearly a later invention and reminds one of a similar story of the unburnt heart of Śrī Kṛṣṇa inside the image.² Further these legends find no confirmation in either literary or archaeological sources. Hence Puri cannot be taken to be Dantapura.

Krishnarao proposes to identify Dantapura with Dantavuram, a place situated on the southern bank of the river Vamśadhārā. This identification is based on the account of Pliny, which

1. OHRJ., VII, pt.I, 1958, pp.23-36.
 2. Ibid., p.35.

Cunningham utilized to identify Dantapura with Rajamahendri.¹

Krishnarao rejects Cunningham's argument on the ground that Calingon has more similarity to Kāliṅga or Kāliṅgapaṭam and likewise Dandagula to Dantapura than to any other name.

Pliny's description that Calingon was on the projection of land at the mouth of a large river fits in well with the location of Kāliṅgapaṭam at the mouth of Vamsadhārā. As Dandagula is said to have been situated close to Calingon, Krishnarao identifies the city with Dantapuram which is close to Kāliṅgapaṭam.²

This identification gains further strength from other considerations. The Korni Copper Plate Grant of Anantavarman Coḍaganga (A.D.1078-1148) dated Śaka 1034 records that Kāmārṇava I, the ancestor of the later Gāṅga dynasty, had Dantapuram as his capital.³ This detail has been repeated in the Vizagapatam Copper Plate Inscription of the same ruler.⁴ We further learn that Kāmārṇava II, nephew of Kāmārṇava I, had Nagara as his capital.⁵ Nagara has been identified with Mukhalingam on the northern bank of Vamsadhārā.⁶ One of the

-
1. See above, pp.103-04.
 2. JBORS., XV, pt.I, no.7, pp.110-15.
 3. JAHS., I, pt.3, p.108.
 4. Ind.Ant., XVIII, pp.167-68.
 5. Ibid., p.168; JBORS., XV, pt. I, p.110.
 6. Ibid., pp.105-15.

inscriptions issued from this city (Mukhalingam) records a land grant in Dantapura made to the shrine of Madhukēśvara in Nagara.¹ This indicates that Dantavuram was under the jurisdiction of Mukhalingam, but this detail is of little help as the location of Mukhalingam is controversial. Nevertheless, a tradition cited by Krishnarao,² which provides an explanation to account for the change of capital from Dantavuram to Nagara, indicates that the former city was on the southern bank of Vaṃśadhārā, close to Chicacole.

Three Gāṅga Copper-Plate Charters issued from Dantapura make this explanation plausible. One such charter issued from Dantapura by Gāṅga Indravarman in Gāṅga Era 39 is found in Jirgingi, a place near Tekkali in the Ganjam District of the Madras Presidency.³ Another set of copper plates issued in Gāṅga Era 149 is found in Purle, a village near Palakonda.⁴ The third charter, assigned to the tenth century on palaeographical grounds, was found in Andhavaram in the Narasannapeta Taluk of the Srikakulam District.⁵ It would seem that all these places

1. Ibid., p.111.

2. Ibid., pp.111-12.

3. Ep.Ind., XXV, no.29, pp.281-88.

4. Ibid., XIV, no.27, pp.360-63. The plates refer to a donation of the Village Bhukkukūra in the Kūrakarāṣṭra (modern Bhukkur in the Palakonda Taluk). Lévi states that the element kūra in the name Kūrakarāṣṭra is identical with pura and suggests that it may perhaps have been an ancient expression, retained in a long use, for designating the territory near the capital of Dantapura. Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidian in India, pp.167-73.

5. Ep.Ind., XXXI, no.26, pp.199-204.

were located not far from Dantavuram which suggests that the latter was probably the place identified by Krishnarao with the help of local traditions.

This leaves the question of determining whether Dantavuram is identical with the Dantapura mentioned in the Dāthāvamsa. Although no conclusive evidence is available, this identification seems plausible, especially in consideration of the fact that many Buddhist sites have been discovered in the area surrounding Dantavuram. Siddhantam (Siddhārthaka-Grāma), which is close to Dantavuram, was a Buddhist site where, it is believed, had settled the Buddhists who came to see the miracles of the Tooth Relic.¹ An inscription of the third century found in Nāgārjunakonda records that three apavārakas at the stūpa of Hirumu had been made by a certain upāsikā Bodhisiri.² Hirumu has been identified with the modern Hiramandalam on the Nāgāvali river about 12 miles north of Siddhantam, where many Buddhist remains have been found. It has also been suggested that Hiramandalam is a corruption of Īramaṇḍala (Tamil Īlamaṇḍala), the ancient Tamil name of Ceylon, and that it might have been inhabited by Ceylonese Buddhists.³ A detailed discussion of the

1. Ibid., XIV, no.27, p.361.

2. Ibid., XX, p.22.

3. Ibid., XIV, no.27, p.361.

plausibility of this need not concern us here but if it were to be accepted it would provide substantial evidence of friendly relations between Kāliṅga and Ceylon in earlier times. Further, on the summit of the Salihundama hill on the southern bank of Vaṃśadhārā, within a few miles of Dantavuram, another Buddhist site has been discovered. The most attractive feature of this site is a circular mahācetiya which differs in style from other such monuments in Andhradeśa as it has on its surface none of the usual decorations of the wheel, spokes and hub.¹ There was an apsidal cetiya in front of this monument, while a number of votive stūpas as well as monastic dwellings have been found on the slopes of the hill.² These indicate a flourishing Buddhist centre in Salihundam, which according to an inscription found in the site, was in existence even in the second century A.D.³

Although no Buddhist sites have so far been unearthed in Dantavuram, it is evident from the above mentioned references that the area surrounding this city was full of flourishing Buddhist centres, some of which, according to local traditions, had some connexion with the Tooth Relic. Hence it seems reasonable to hold that Dantavuram and Dantapura are identical

-
1. Ibid., XXVIII, pp.133-37; N.K.Sahu, Buddhism in Orissa, pp.184-85.
 2. Ibid., pp.184-85.
 3. Ep.Ind., XXVIII, no.27, p.135.

and that this was the place from where the Tooth Relic was taken to Ceylon.¹ Whether the city, as in the case of Palur, got its name because of the trade in ivory or because of the Tooth Relic, is a matter of conjecture.

It is thus understandable how the Dāṭhāvamsa tradition took its present form. The historical basis of the tradition is confined to the transfer of the Tooth Relic to Ceylon from Dantapura in Kāliṅga by a Brahmin woman - perhaps Hēmamālā accompanied by her husband - in the ninth regnal year of Siri Meghavanna. The similarities between some details of the tradition and those of the Mahāvamsa, Mahābodhivamsa, Mahāparinibbānasutta, Jātakas, Mahābhārata and the Purānas show the borrowings of either the author of the Elu Daḷadā Vamsaya or Dhammakitti. The latter seems more likely to be responsible for many additions that are found in his work. The purpose of the borrowings was to enable him to present a complete history of the Tooth Relic.²

-
1. Paranavitana identifies Dantapura with Tandaforti, a place south of Mergui which appears in a Portuguese map of A.D. 1595 (Ceylon and Malaysia, Colombo, 1966, pp.97-99). This identification is based on the theory that Kāliṅga was in the Malay Peninsula (JRAS(CB)., NS., VII, pt.I, pp.1-42; VIII, pt.I, pp.330-77; Ceylon and Malaysia, p.94 ff). This has been subjected to serious criticism in the past. Since it is established that Kāliṅga was not in the Malay Peninsula, Paranavitana's identification can easily be rejected as unconvincing. For details see, K.A.Nilakanta Sastri, 'Ceylon and Sri Vijaya', JRAS(CB)., NS., VIII, 1962, pp.125-40; JRAS(CB)., NS., XI, 1967, pp.101-06; CJHSS., NS., I, no.1, pp.11-47.
 2. For a similar discussion about the growth of the Vijaya legend of the Mahāvamsa cf. G.C.Mendis, 'The Vijaya Legend' Paranavitana Felicitation Volume, ed. N.A.Jayawickrama, Colombo, 1965, pp.263-92.

Chapter III

The History of the Tooth Relic
from c.A.D.300 to 1000

The arrival of the Tooth Relic in Ceylon in the first decade of the fourth century is an important landmark in the history of Ceylon. This relic, in the course of time not only became an object of the utmost religious importance but also the palladium of the Sinhalese state, a position which persists even at present. The interdependence of the state and the Tooth Relic can be studied in detail only after the rise of Sinhalese power from a new capital, Polonnaruva, in the eleventh century. It would however be useful to have an outline of its history during the Anurādhapura period (c.300-1000) for a better understanding of the events that followed.

The history of the Tooth Relic during these seven centuries can be studied in two sections; one from Siri Meghavanna to Moggallāna III (A.D.311-618) and the other from Silāmeghavanna to the downfall of the Anurādhapura kingdom (A.D.619-1017). This division is made not only for the sake of convenience but also for considerations of the nature and availability of sources.

I

The first period begins with the arrival of the Relic in the reign of Siri Meghavanna. Among the works which record this event the Dāṭhāvamsa is foremost, for it contains an elaborate account of the arrival of the Relic in Ceylon as well as the worship accorded to it by Siri Meghavanna. According to this work, Hēmamālā¹ and Dantakumāra, the royal couple who brought the Relic to Ceylon, arrived at Laṅkāpaṭṭana² in the ninth regnal year of Siri Meghavanna.³ They spent their first night in Ceylon in a Brahmin's⁴ house and with the guidance they received from him, started their journey for Anurādhapura the next morning to deliver the precious object to Mahāsena, 'the unseen royal friend'. It was only after reaching the outskirts

-
1. Hēmajālā according to the Jinakālamālī, p.68; The Cūlavamsa simply states that a Brahmin woman brought the Relic (brāhmaṇī kāci ādāya.... Cv., 37.92). This seems to corroborate the account of the Dāṭhāvamsa that the royal couple came to Ceylon in the guise of Brahmans (Dav., vv, 304, 306).
 2. The Daladā Pūjāvaliya too has this name (Dal.Pjv., p.40). The Dalada Sirita, on the other hand, states that they came to Māvatu (P.Mahātitttha) (Dal.S., p.34). Taking this into consideration Paranavitana identifies Laṅkāpaṭṭana with Mahātitttha. (Ep.Zeyl., III, p.135). W.B.M.Fernando identifies Laṅkāpaṭṭana with the modern Ilankaturai situated in the Trincomalee district in the Kottiyar-ṭattu. Ilankaturai according to him is a direct Tamil rendering of Laṅkāpaṭṭana. (ARASC., 1962-63, p.G.75).
 3. Dav., v. 340; Dal.S., p.34; Cv., 37.92; Dal.Pjv., p.40; Pjv., p.16; Jkm., p.69.
 4. He was the Brahmin chaplain according to the Jinakālamālī; p.70. See above, p.69.

of the city that they learnt that Mahāsēna had been dead for a long time. Being heart-broken on hearing this unexpected news they lamented but later became consoled when they came to know that the ruling king too was devoted to the 'Three Gems'. They also became aware of a certain mahāthera in the Meghagiri-vihāra who was closely associated with the king. They went there, introduced themselves and handed the precious relic to him. The mahāthera, it is said, was delighted to receive the Relic; he placed it in his own vihāra and sent another monk to inform the king of its arrival. The narrative goes on to record that the king too rejoiced, as if he had received the wheel of a Cakkavatti, and left at once for the Meghagiri-vihāra. On seeing the Relic he is said to have been so impressed that he dedicated the whole island to it as an offering. After witnessing the miracles wrought by the Relic, he brought it to the city.¹ The Relic was placed on the king's throne, on a silver carpet surmounted by a white umbrella, and then enthroned in a building founded especially for it.² The escorts of the

-
1. The Gūlavamsa summarises these details in one verse saying that Meghavanna welcomed the Relic with the highest honours. Cv., 37.93.
 2. The Gūlavamsa differs from the Dāṭhāvamsa in this detail. It states that Meghavanna brought the Relic to the building called the Dhammacakkagēha built by Devānāpiya Tissa in the royal courtyard and that the building was known thereafter as the Temple of the Tooth Relic (Cv., 37.95-96). This seems more probable, for on the one hand, there is every likelihood of the existence of a Dhammacakkagēha since the time of Devānāpiya Tissa (see below, chapter V, pp.256-61) and on the other hand according to the context of the Dāṭhāvamsa and the Dāḷadā (Contd. on next page.....)

Relic were granted valuable gems, garments and villages inhabited by rich people. Later at the request of the people the Relic was exhibited at a place outside the city.¹ The king spent 9,00,000 kahāpanas for the worship of the Relic and decreed that the same worship should be accorded annually by taking the Relic to the Abhayuttara-vihāra.² Although varying in some details, a basically similar narrative is found in the Daladā Sirita.³

Two important questions arise from the aforementioned narrative of the Dāṭhāvamsa. One is the identification of the Meghagiri vihāra which according to the Dāṭhāvamsa and the Daladā Sirita was the first resting place of the Tooth Relic in Anurādhapura.⁴ The other is the identification of the place where the Tooth Relic was first shown to the people of Anurādhapura.

The identification of the Meghagiri vihāra rests mainly on the evidence found in the Dāṭhāvamsa and the Daladā Sirita

(.....contd. from previous page)

Sirita, it is hardly possible that Meghavanna should have had time to build a new relic temple as soon as he received the Relic. However the existence of this edifice has been proved by archaeological evidence. For different identifications see Geiger, Cv., Transl., fn.1 to 37.96 ; MASC., III., 1935, p.14; S.Bandaranayaka, op.cit., pp.498-504.

1. See below, pp.130-34.
2. Dav., v.340-408; see below, p.132.
3. Dal.S., pp.34-41.
4. Dav., v.346; Dal.S., 35.

for this vihāra as such is not mentioned in any other source of information available to us.¹ But in using the material of these two works one is beset with certain difficulties. One is that there is no uniformity between the two accounts as regards the location of this vihāra. The other is that there is a discrepancy among the various glossaries of the Dāṭhāvamsa in this respect. The relevant verse of the Dāṭhāvamsa runs as follows:

...'Tassānurādhanagarassa puruttarāya
āsāya taṃ sapaḍimeghagirim vihāraṃ'...

In some glossaries of the work 'puruttarāya āsāya' has been rendered into Sinhalese as vāyavyādikhi, i.e., north-west.² But unless reconstructed as aparuttarāya āsāya this term does not denote north-west³ for the correct term which denotes that meaning is paccimuttara which in fact has been used in the Jinakālamālī in this context.⁴ If puruttara in puruttarāya is taken as purāca uttarassāca disāya yaṃ antarālaṃ sā puruttarā⁵ (puruttara is the direction which lies between east and north) it may be taken to mean north-east,⁶ which seems to be a more

-
1. The Mahābodhivamsa Granthipada Virarānaya (ed., Ratmalane Dharmarama, Colombo, 1910, p.134) refers to a Metgiri-vehera. But the context does not help one to determine where this was located.
 2. Dav., ed., Halavegoda Silalankara, Alutgama, 1914, p.90; ed., Asabhatissa, Kālaṇiya, 1883, p.90; the latter however, points out that this rendering is wrong. Ibid., p.4.
 3. Ibid., p.4.
 4. Jkm., p.70.
 5. Dav., ed., Asabhatissa, p.4.
 6. Ibid., ed., Maiyave Ananda, Udugampola, 1956, p.168.

appropriate meaning. Whatever the exact meaning of the term may have been it is clear from these glossaries that they suggest the location of the Meghagiri-vihāra in a northerly direction. The Daladā Sirita on the other hand states that it was in the Mahamevunā uyana (P.Mahāmeghavana) which naturally implies the park of that name in the south of Anurādhapura.

Following the implication of the Daladā Sirita both Sorata and Paronavitana locate the Meghagiri-vihāra in the Mahāmeghavana in the south.¹ Paronavitana goes a step further and identifies the Meghagiri with modern Isurumuni which is situated in the Mahāmegha park or rather south of it.² Ancient Isurumuni, according to this scholar, was a place where people practised rain-making ceremonies from ancient times, even before the introduction of Buddhism. This is evident by the presence in the precincts of the vihāra of sculptures of a man and a horse which represent Parjanya and Agni, the 'rain makers' of Vedic mythology. The Tooth Relic too was regarded as bringing rain, and that was the reason why Isurumuni was selected for the keeping of the Relic. Further this scholar suggests that the Metgiri-vehera found in the Mahābōdhivamsaya was the same as the Meghagiri, i.e. Isurumuni.³

-
1. Dal.S., pp.87-90; Artibus Asiae, XVI, 1953, pp.181-87.
 2. Ibid., pp.181-87.
 3. Ibid., pp.181-87; Mahābōdhivamsa Granthipada Vivaraṇaya, ed. R.Dharmarama, Colombo, 1910, p.134.

It would seem that Parnavitana's identification is based on two factors; his interpretation of the sculptures of the man and the horse, and his view that the Tooth Relic was a rain-making object. Serious objections may be made to this view. First, the identification of the two sculptures is in itself a much-debated question. Ananda K. Coomaraswamy identified the man with the sage Kapila¹ and was supported in that identification by Vincent Smith.² This identification has been subjected to criticism by William Cohn³ and Vogel; the latter especially argued on the grounds that the presence of the horse provides no proof that the man was the sage Kapila.⁴ Hence it appears that there is no unanimity among scholars on the identification of these sculptures. In the circumstances Parnavitana's identification cannot be taken as decisive unless and until further evidence which strengthens his view is brought to light.

Second, although Parnavitana supports his identification by stating that the Tooth Relic was considered a rain-making

-
1. Spolia Zeylanica, VI, p.132.
 2. History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon, Third edition, Bombay, 1961, p.133.
 3. Indische Plastik, Berlin, 1923, p.81.
 4. Buddhist Art in India Ceylon and Java, Oxford, 1936, p.84, fn.1.

object, there is no evidence to suggest that this belief was in vogue at the time the Relic was delivered to Ceylon; nor is there evidence to suggest that such a practice prevailed throughout the Anurādhapura period. The Cūlavamsa occasionally makes mention of rain-making ceremonies performed by rulers when the country was afflicted by droughts and pestilence. One such reference is found in the reign of Upatissa. It is said that the country was afflicted by a drought during his reign. The king, with the advice of the Saṅgha, made an image of gold, laid the stone Alms-Bowl of the Buddha filled with water in the hollow of its hands, and placed the image on a chariot. He then instituted a great Alms-giving ceremony, decorated the city, and, with the monks who were reciting the Ratana Sutta and sprinkling water, walked about the principal street of the city in the three watches of the night and thus warded off the danger of the drought.¹ Sena II is said to have removed the danger of a plague by taking around the city an image of Ananda while the monks recited paritta and sprinkled paritta water.² In a hot area like the dry zone of Ceylon where Anurādhapura is, plagues are often a consequence of drought. Hence it is possible

1. Cv., 37, 189-98.

2. Cv., 51.80-81; W.Rahula, The History of Buddhism in Ceylon, Colombo, 1956, p.277.

that what the chronicler meant in this context was the bringing down of rain. Moreover, these two methods bear a close resemblance to what had been practised in the time of the Buddha. When Vesāli was afflicted by three dangers - famine, pestilence and evil spirits - the Buddha visited it on the invitation of the Licchavis and recited the Ratanasutta. This was taught to Ananda: accompanied by Licchavi princes, he went around the city reciting the sutta and sprinkling water from the Buddha's Alms-Bowl. By this means the city was saved from the calamity.¹ The similarity of this ceremony to those performed in Ceylon to produce rain suggests that the latter were mere imitations of a method practised in the Buddha's lifetime.

The lack of any reference to the Tooth Relic in rain magic does not necessarily show that the Relic was not used for this purpose during the Anurādhapura period. Droughts and such other calamities were regarded in those times as disturbances of the Order, and it is not unlikely that ceremonies other than those mentioned above were performed in different monasteries and the Tooth Relic may perhaps have been used for this purpose.

1. Suttanipātaṭṭhakathā (Paramattajōtikā), (SHB.,) VII, pp.204-05; Catubhānavaraṭṭhakathā (Sāratthasamuccaya), (SHB.,) XXVII, p.97 ff.

It is also not impossible that the author of the Cūlavamsa, from obvious sectarian feelings,¹ deliberately avoided the mention of the Tooth Relic as being used for rain magic.

But one may ask what purpose the Tooth Relic was expected to serve by being kept in the Isurumuni if the latter too was a place where rain magic had been practised. If, as Parānavitana suggests, both the Tooth Relic and the practices in Isurumuni were able to produce rain the result would have been the same even if they had been kept apart. Hence there is little reason to believe that the Tooth Relic was kept in the Isurumuni because both these were reputed for the potentiality of rain-making.

Parānavitana's identification seems improbable for another consideration viz. Isurumuni was an institution affiliated to the Mahāvihāra. As has been suggested elsewhere the Mahāvihāra fraternity ignored or paid little attention to the Tooth Relic even though in other Buddhist circles it was worshipped as an object of the highest religious importance.² This attitude is further demonstrated in the Pali commentaries of the fifth century written by the monks associated with the Mahāvihāra in which doubts were cast on the authenticity of the Tooth Relic.³ The only plausible explanation that can be

-
1. See above, pp.20-24.
 2. See below, pp.157-59.
 3. Sumaṅgalavilāsinī (PTS), p.615.

offered to account for the lack of interest in the Cūlavamsa and the doubts of the Pali commentaries is that the Tooth Relic was brought to Ceylon under the aegis of non-Theravada Hīnayāna sects and that it was entrusted to the monks of the Abhayagiri. It would then be natural for the authors of these works to give little or no attention to a relic belonging to a rival fraternity, the Abhayagiri. In these circumstances it would be extremely difficult to believe that a monk in the Isurumuni¹ - an institution affiliated to the Mahāvihāra - should have been as pleased as if 'his body was besmeared with the juice of ambrosia'² when he heard that the Tooth Relic had been brought to Ceylon.

Above all, the material which Parānavitana utilized to formulate his view also demonstrates the improbability of his identification of the Meghagiri with Isurumuni. Parānavitana seems to have used the Daladā Sirita edited by Sorata. In his edition of the work, Sorata maintains that the Mahamevunā-uyana found in the Daladā Sirita is the park of that name in the south.³ The earlier editions of the work of Rajasekhara and Ratnasuriya, as well as some manuscripts in the British museum have, nuvara

-
1. Meghagiri according to Parānavitana.
 2. Dav., v, 347.
 3. Dal.S., pp.88-90.

visituru uturu vāsala dorin gos mahamevunā giri vehera vāda¹
 meaning (the king) 'reached the Mahamevunā giri-vehara by
 going through the excellent northern gate of the city'. On the
 assumption that Siri Meghavanna was in the city at the time he
 heard the news on the arrival of the Relic, Sorata rejects this
 reading as incorrect on the ground that it was improper for the
 king to use the northern gateway to go to the Mahāmeghavana in
 the south. Had the king used the northern gateway, he says,
 the king would have used a circuitous route to get to the
 Mahāmeghavana which is very unlikely in this case.² In order
 to make the reading more convincing Sorata reconstructs the
 passage by inserting anuturu (south) instead of uturu (north) and
 reads as nuvara visituru anuturu vāsala dorin gos mahamevunā
vehera vāda,³ (reached the mahamevunā-vehera by going through
 the southern gateway). This reconstruction of Sorata made
 Paranavitana suggest that the Meghagiri was the Isurumuni in the
 Mahāmeghavana.

There is however an important point which received the
 attention of neither of these scholars. Both the Dāṭhavaṃsa

-
1. Dal.S., ed., Rajasekhara, Kandy, 1920, p.41; ed., V. Ratnasuriya, Colombo, 1949, p.37; Br.Mus.Ms., Or.6606(30), Folio, gam; Or.6606(29), folio, khu.
 2. Dal.S., pp.89-90.
 3. Ibid., pp.36, 89-90.

and the Daladā Sirita state that Siri Meghavanna was enjoying in the royal garden with the women of the harem (purāṅganān) when the monk from the Meghagiri came there to inform him of the arrival of the Tooth Relic.¹ This royal garden can be none other than the Nandanavana which is sometimes referred to as the Jōtivana.² An examination of a map of the ancient city of Anurādhapura would reveal that this garden was situated to the immediate south of the southern wall of the city.³ To the further south of the Nandanavana was situated the Mahāmeghavana, and Isurumuni was situated even beyond the latter.⁴ Now, if Sorata's reading of the passage is accepted, it would follow that the king went from the Nandanavana to the Mahamevunā-vehera through the southern gateway. This is impossible for the king was already in the Nandanavana i.e. beyond the southern gate. One could accept Sorata's reading only on the assumption that the king first went back to the city and afterwards went again through the southern gateway to the mahamevunā-vehera. Such a reconstruction would however be in direct conflict with the Dāḥāvamsa and the Daladā Sirita which suggest that the

-
1. Dav., v.349; Dal.S., p.36.
 2. Mv., 15.2; Transl., fn. to 11.2.
 3. Mv., Transl., map facing page 137.
 4. Mv., 15.11.

king hastened to the Meghagiri-vihāra as soon as he heard the news of the Relic.¹ Hence it appears that Sorata's reconstruction is improbable in this context. From this it follows that Meghagiri cannot have been the present Isurumuni as proposed by Paranavitana.

As suggested by the Dāḥāvamsa,² the Meghagiri-vihāra appears to have been located in a northerly direction. The Daladā Sirita makes this fact clear when it states that the king went through the northern gateway in order to get to the Meghagiri.³ The reference of this work to the Mahamevuna-uyana appears to be misleading since it implies the park of that name in the south; but nevertheless it does point to the correct location of this vihāra. A tenth century inscription found near the site of Kiribatvehera makes mention of a Utur Mēgiri vatta found therein is evidently the Sinhalese rendering of Pali Meghavana, and the adjective utur points to its location. This reference therefore suggests that apart from the well known Mahāmeghavana in the south, there was another in the north which bore the same name. Considering the fact that the inscription belongs to a later date i.e. the tenth century,

-
1. Dav., v .352; Dal.S., p.36.
 2. Dav., v .352.
 3. See above, p.125.
 4. Ep.Zeyl., I, p.159.

Paranavitana argues that this park was not in existence in earlier times.¹ Nevertheless, it is quite possible that it did exist and was called the Utur Megiri vatta (northern Meghagiri Park) in order to be distinguished clearly from the park of the same name in the south. It is also possible that a vihāra in the park was called after its name as the Meghagiri-vihāra. If this explanation is plausible, it would follow that the author of the Daladā Sirita had the northern Mahāmeghavana in mind when writing about the Meghagiri.

There is yet another consideration which justifies the location of the Meghagiri in the north. Hemamālā and Dantakumāra who brought the Relic to Ceylon are said to have arrived at Lankāpaṭṭana² from where they continued their journey towards Anurādhapura. It is natural that someone arriving at Anurādhapura from the north or north-west, first comes into contact with the northern part of the city unless one has special reasons to avoid that area. A clear example of such an instance is found in the Mahāvamsa where it is stated that Devānampiya Tissa brought the Bō-sapling from Jambukola in the north to Anurādhapura by the northern gate.³ It is therefore

1. Artibus Asiae, XVI, p.182.

2. Dav., v.339; Māvaṭu (Mahātittha) according to the Daladā Sirita, p.34; see above, p.115 fn.

3. Mv., 19.39-41.

likely that those who brought the Tooth Relic too, followed the same route and first came to the northern part. This was the region where stood the Abhayagiri and the institutions affiliated to it. The Abhayagiri, as we know, was famous for the patronage it received from Mahāsenā, who is credited in the Dāṭhāvāṃsa with the request for the Tooth Relic.¹ The close connexion between the king and the Abhayagiri as well as the fact that the Relic was entrusted to the monks of the latter institution leaves room for a reasonable doubt as to whether Mahāsenā had made any arrangements to hand over the Relic to the Abhayagiri-vāsins.² Again if Hemamālā and Dantakumāra were themselves Mahayanists³ or adherents of a non-Theravāda Hīnayāna sect flourishing at the time in Andhra Pradesh, it is quite natural that they first came into contact with those who held similar views viz. the monks of the Abhayagiri. It should be added however, that although these considerations suggest a northerly location of the Meghagiri it is by no means possible, at the present state of our knowledge, to determine the exact location and identification of this

1. Dav., v.301.

2. See above, pp.100-101.

3. Rahula, op.cit., p.97.

vihāra. Therefore our conclusion is that the Mēghagiri-vihāra found in these works was not the modern Isurumuni as Parānavitana suggested but either the Abhayagiri or rather one of the vihāras affiliated to that institution in the northern Meghagiri park.

The other question which arises from the aforementioned narrative of the Dāṭhāvamsa is where the Tooth Relic was first displayed. The relevant passage of the Dāṭhāvamsa refers to an episode of a miraculous nature. It records that the Tooth Relic was kept on a chariot which was without a charioteer, and that the king asked it to go to a suitable place for exposition, as the Lord himself went to the Bō-Tree for enlightenment, to the Deer Park of Isipattana to preach the first sermon, and to the Tree of Gandhabba to subdue the heretics.¹ The narrative continues that the chariot, after going round the city, went through the northern gateway and stopped at the place which had been purified by the preaching of dhamma by the Arahat Mahinda. It was exhibited there and was later brought back to the city and kept in the Tooth Relic temple.²

The corresponding account of the Daladā Sirita differs from this account in that it omits the detail that the Tooth Relic

1. Dav., v. 392 ff.

2. Ibid., v. 398 ff.

itself decided the place where it should be exhibited; the composition of the procession which brought the Relic to the place of exposition is also different.¹ Above all it mentions that the Relic was displayed at a place in the Mahamevunā-uyāna where Mahinda had given a discourse on the dhamma.² This detail is again misleading as it is not specified whether this was the northern or the southern Mahāmegha park. The reference to the discourse of Mahinda especially leads one to assume that what is referred to was the southern Mahāmegha park which according to the Mahāvamsa was sanctified by Mahinda.³ It is however unlikely that what is implied in this context was the southern Mahāmeghavāna for, as has been seen above,⁴ the author of the Dalādā Sirita had the northern park of that name in mind when he referred to the Mahāmeghavāna. This supposition in fact gains further strength from the Dāṭhāvamsa which states that the Relic was shown somewhere outside the northern gate⁵ and also from the fact that even in later times, it was displayed in the north.⁶

-
1. See below, pp.424, 428.
 2. Dal.S., p.40.
 3. Mv., 15.8-9, 11, 25-26.
 4. See above, pp.127-28.
 5. Dav., v̄v. 398-99.
 6. See below, p.132.

Thus it would seem that both these works suggest that the place to which they refer in this context was situated in the north, but we are still left in doubt as to what it was. In its reference to the decree of Siri Meghavanna, the Cūlavamsa states that the king ordered that the Relic should be brought every year to the Abhayuttara vihāra, and that the same festival of offerings should be observed by spending 9,00,000 kaḥāpaṇas.¹ The corresponding account of the Daḷadā Sirita states that the king's decree was that the Relic should be brought annually to the Uturu vehera.² The Abhayuttara and the Uturu vehera found in these works were none other than the Abhayagiri vihāra.³ Fa-Hsien who visited Ceylon about a century later records that the Relic was taken to the Abhayagiri for the annual celebrations.⁴ None of these sources, though they refer to the place of exhibition in later times, indicate the place where the Relic was first shown.

The Dāṭhāvamsa, on the other hand, is more explicit on this point. The decree of the king according to this work, runs as follows:

-
1. Cv., 37.97-98.
 2. Daḷ.S., p.41.
 3. Ep.Zeyl., I. pp.221,236,256; MASC., I. p.12; Cv., Transl., fn. to 37.97.
 4. The Travels of Fa-Hsien (399-414 A.D.) or Record of the Buddhistic Kingdoms, transl., H.A.Giles, Cambridge, 1923, pp.70-71.

'dhātum vihāramabhayuttarameva netvā
pūjam vidhātumanuvaccaramevarūpaṃ'¹ meaning

(the king) decreed that the Relic should be taken to the Abhayuttara-vihāra alone and the same sacrificial festival observed. The use of an emphatic particle 'eva' (Abhayuttarameva) in this context is particularly noteworthy. It suggests that the decree required the display to be made only at the Abhayagiri, which in turn implies that the original place of display may have been the same vihāra. This implication gains support from the Vēlaikkāra Inscription according to which the original place of deposit of the Relic was the Abhayagiri.²

One question remains unanswered. Could Mahinda ever have given a discourse on the dhamma outside the northern gate as suggested by the Dāḥāvamsa and the Daḥadā Sirita,³ where the Abhayagiri was built in later times? The evidence furnished by the Mahāvamsa does not support this view for, according to this work, Mahinda preached in the city⁴ and in the precincts of the Mahāvihāra⁵ but not outside the northern wall. This raises the question as to how this idea crept into the chronicles

-
1. Dav., v.406; The Sinhalese paraphrase has abhayattara vihārayaṭama.
 2. Ep.Zeyl., II, p.254.
 3. Dav., v, 398; Daḥ.S., p.40.
 4. Mv., 14.58 ff.
 5. Ibid., 15.1 ff.

of the Tooth Relic. One possibility is that the authors of these works wanted to show that Mahinda was aware of the future greatness of the Abhayagiri, the monks of which were entrusted with the Relic, and preached the dhamma at that spot in order to make it a holy place as he had done elsewhere.¹ The other possibility is that the author of the Mahāvamsa (who belonged to the Mahāvihāra fraternity) may have ignored an older tradition according to which the dhamma was first preached at a site where, a few centuries later, the Abhayagiri was to arise: this might be explained as an indication of the aversion of the monks of the Mahāvihāra to the Abhayagiri. It is not possible to know which of these alternatives is correct until further evidence is brought to light; but, as is evident from the Dāthāvamsa, it seems reasonable to hold that the Tooth Relic was first displayed at the Abhayagiri-vihāra.

After Siri Meghavanna the Cūlavamsa, which is our main source of information for the later history of the Tooth Relic, remains silent for nearly a century until the reign of Mittasena (A.D. 428-29). The homage paid to the Relic by two rulers during this interval is known to us from other sources. The Dāthāvamsa states that Buddhādāsa (A.D. 337-65) worshipped the Relic in divers manners observing the rules decreed by his

1. Mv., 15.27 ff.

father Siri Meghavanna.¹ Similarly the account of Fa-Hsien and the Sung-Shoo furnish us with some information on the Tooth Relic during the reign of Mahānāma (A.D. 406-28). As will be discussed in detail elsewhere,² Fa-Hsien describes a Tooth Relic festival which he witnessed during his sojourn in Ceylon. The initiative of the festival, according to him, was taken by the king,³ a reference probably to the king at the time i.e. Mahānāma. This indicates that although Mahānāma is not credited in the chronicle with the homage paid to the Relic, he was a patron of it. The Sung-Shoo on the other hand, records that a model of the Tooth Relic temple was sent to the emperor of China in the fifth century by the king of Ceylon, Cha-cha-mo-ha-nan. This name, according to Tennant, coincides with Rājā Mahānāma⁴ who, in fact, had friendly relations with the Chinese.⁵ This reference as it appears does not indicate any worship accorded by Mahānāma to the Relic. It nevertheless suggests that even at this early stage, the fame of the Tooth Relic was spreading overseas through cultural contacts.

1. Dav., v, 407.

2. See below, p.405 ff.

3. The Travels of Fa-Hsien, p.70.

4. History of the Northern Sung Dynasty, A.D.487 b.XLVII, p.6, Quoted in Tennant, Ceylon, I, p.615, fn.1, p.620.

5. For details see UCHC., I, pt.I, pp.291-92.

The Cūlavamsa contains a miraculous story concerning the reign of Mittasena. According to it, there was a feast in the city in which the people wished the king should join. Mittasena decided to agree to this request but when the royal elephant was brought to him he told the people who brought it that it was not the right elephant for him and pointed to a stone elephant at the Tooth Relic temple. Having become aware of the king's intention, the stone elephant began to move and Mittasena mounted it; he then rode round the city. When he reached the eastern gate by the Paṭhamacētiya, Mittasena restored the elephant to the Relic temple.¹

No doubt this story was inserted in the chronicle to demonstrate that Mittasena was chosen to be a king by a miracle which worked owing to his merit acquired in a previous birth. But it also suggests some association between the feast and the Tooth Relic temple which perhaps could imply that it was a festival connected with the Tooth Relic. This implication gains further support from the Pūjāvaliya. While reporting the incident, this work states that it occurred when Mittasena was returning to the palace after paying homage to the Tooth Relic.² This is very likely to have been the case for even the

-
1. Cv., 38.6-9; Buddhadatta points out that there is no word in Cv., 38.9 to suggest that Mittasena restored the elephant to the Tooth Relic Temple. UCR., VIII, p.98.
 2. Pjv., p.17.

Cūlavamsa suggests some connexion between the festival and the Tooth Relic temple. If so, it is reasonable to hold that Mittasena, too, was a patron of the Tooth Relic.

The next reference to the Tooth Relic is found in the reign of Dhātusena (A.D. 455-73) a little over 25 years after the death of Mittasena. This king is said to have repaired the dilapidated temple of the Tooth Relic; he also dedicated a valuable casket for the Relic and made numerous other offerings to it.¹ Of these what is of particular importance is the detail that Dhātusena repaired the Relic temple for this seems to suggest that the temple had fallen into disrepair during the preceding period. This raises the question as to who was responsible for the neglect of the Relic temple. It is unlikely that Mittasena should be held responsible for it, for as suggested by the Pūjāvaliya, he was a patron of the Relic, and therefore would not have destroyed or damaged the Relic temple. Hence the Relic temple might have fallen into decay during the rule of his successors.

It is worthy of note that Ceylon, during the period preceding the reign of Dhātusena, was under Tamil domination imposed by Paṇḍu, who slew Mittasena.² There was a protracted

1. Cv., 38.70-72.

2. Cv., 38.11.

struggle for the throne among the six Tamils who ruled in succession until the last of them was ousted by Dhātusena. These Tamils, unlike others who invaded Ceylon and held sway there, appear to have been patrons of Buddhism. The Anurādhapura Slab Inscription of Khudda Pārinda, registers a land grant made by his queen to a Buddhist monastery.¹ As the donation was made by the queen it does not itself confirm that Pārinda was a Buddhist; but there can be little doubt that he was, in view of the epithet Buddhadāsa (servant of the Buddha) applied to him in the same inscription.² Another slab inscription found in Kataragama (probably intended to register a land grant made to pay for the ritual at the Maṅgala Mahā-Cētiya at Kataragama) indicates that Mahadāli Mahanā (Dāṭhika), a member of the same Tamil dynasty, was a patron of Buddhism.³ These two examples clearly indicate that at least two of the six Tamils were patrons of Buddhism. The others may not have been patrons, of course, but it is noteworthy that even the chronicler does not take a strong line against them,⁴ which may suggest that at least they did not persecute Buddhism.

1. Ep.Zeyl., IV, pp.111-15.

2. Ibid., IV, p.114 II, line 1.

3. CJS(G), II, pp.181-82; Ep.Zeyl., II, pp.216-18.

4. Cv., 38.11 ff.

Since there is no evidence to suggest that they were hostile towards religion, it would be rash to suggest that they caused the destruction of the Tooth Relic temple.

However, it is possible that they neglected the proper maintenance of the Relic temple as some Sinhālese rulers had done. There were numerous occasions on which the custodians of the Tooth Relic temple removed the Relic from its sanctuary to a safer place when there were foreign invasions or when undesirable persons ascended the throne.¹ The same thing may have happened on this occasion i.e. when Paṇḍu invaded the country, and if so, it would not be surprising if the Tamil rulers, even if patrons of Buddhism, had neglected the maintenance of the Temple. This was probably the reason why the Relic temple fell into ruins. Later, after the restoration of Sinhālese authority Dhātusena restored the temple before the relic could be brought back.

After Dhātusena, the chronicle is again silent about the Tooth Relic for nearly a century till the accession in A.D.571 of Aggabōdhi. During Aggabodhi's long reign of 33 years (A.D.571-604) the Tooth Relic seems to have enjoyed special attention, for the Cūlavamsa records that the king decorated the Relic temple with 'brightly gleaming precious stones and also

1. See below, pp. 172, 188.

had made a golden reliquary for the Relic'.¹ Similarly, Moggallāna III (A.D.614-19) is said to have worshipped the Relic with precious offerings.²

II

One of the remarkable features of the history of the Tooth Relic during the next four centuries until the downfall of the Anurādhapura kingdom is that there are only three direct references to offerings made to the Relic in the chronicle. There are long gaps - in one case of two centuries - between references. This period is also characterised by the frequent destruction of the Tooth Relic temple by invaders. These four centuries when compared with the first three centuries may be considered a period during which the Tooth Relic received less worship.

The assassination of Moggallāna III in A.D. 619 was the beginning of a period of political chaos which lasted until the accession of Mānavamma.³ The chronicle occasionally mentions gifts and donations made to Buddhist establishments by the rulers of the period but Buddhism on the whole may not have been in a flourishing state as the country suffered from serious

1. Cv., 42.33.

2. Ibid., 44.45.

3. Cv., 44.60 ff; UCHC., I, pt.I, pp.300, 306-14.

political disturbances. The Tooth Relic too was no exception and, as the Cūlavamsa would have us believe, suffered great hardship. While referring to the reign of Dāṭhapatissa (A.D. 639-50) the chronicle states that the king dissipated all the property of earlier rulers and seized all the valuable objects in the three fraternities and in the Relic temples.¹ It further records that the canoes in the Mahāpāli were left to the mercy of the Damiḷas (Tamils) who burned down the royal palace together with the relic temple (dhātughara).²

It has been suggested that the burning of the relic temple (dhātughara) in this context implies the destruction of the Tooth Relic temple.³ This suggestion seems plausible for more than one consideration. The Tooth Relic temple, as has been referred to above,⁴ stood in the royal courtyard and was therefore very close to the royal palace. The proximity to the palace and the close association of the Tooth Relic with the rulers would explain why someone attacking the palace would also destroy the Tooth Relic temple, and this is probably what

1. Cv., 44.131.

2. Ibid., 44.134.

3. Cv., Transl., fn. to 44.134. Here Geiger refers to Cv., 37.95 according to which the Relic was deposited in the Dhammacakkageha built by Devānampiya Tissa in the royal courtyard.

4. See above, pp. 116-17.

happened on this occasion as implied by the Cūlavamsa. However, it is possible that the Relic had been taken to safety when the political atmosphere of the capital became unstable.

Apart from a vague reference in the reign of Aggabōdhi VIII (A.D. 804-15), no data on the Tooth Relic are found in the chronicle during the next two hundred years. As is well known, this was a period during which the rulers of the line of Mānavamma were ruling in peaceful succession till the time of the disastrous invasion of Śrī Māra Śrī Vallabha. There are numerous references in the chronicle to the meritorious works by these rulers, viz., the restorations effected at or benefactions made to the Thūpārāma,¹ Mahāvihāra,² the Bō-Tree and its temple,³ the Maricavaṭṭi,⁴ the Abhayagiri-vihāra,⁵ the Jetavana,⁶ the Lohapāsāda,⁷ the Mahāpāli,⁸ and various other places, some of them relatively insignificant. These references suggest that the rulers of this period attempted to restore Buddhism, which had suffered great hardship to a flourishing state.

-
1. Cv., 44.142,148; 45.28; 48.66,140; 49.81.
 2. Ibid., 49.14; 50.70-71.
 3. Ibid., 49.74-77.
 4. Ibid., 44.149.
 5. Ibid., 45.29; 48.65,135; 50.68,83.
 6. Ibid., 50.65.
 7. Ibid., 46.30.
 8. Ibid., 45.1,25; 46.3; 49.78.

The absence of any reference to the restoration of the relic temple which was believed to have been destroyed by the Tamil troops of Dāṭhōpatissa raises the doubt as to whether the Tooth Relic received worship during this period. The Cūlavamsa states, in the account of the reign of Aggabodhi VIII, that this king instituted a festival for relics (dhātupūjā) worthy of all virtues of the Master (satthu sabbagunārahama).¹ What is meant by dhātupūjā in this context is not clear. It might be thought to refer to a festival celebrated in honour of all the relics, both those enshrined in the stūpas and those kept in the temples. Yet it seems hardly possible that the festival was meant for the worship of the relics enshrined in stūpas for, if such had been the case, the chronicler would clearly have stated where the offerings were made as he usually does elsewhere.² It is more likely to have been a festival for such relics as the Tooth Relic, the Bowl Relic and the Hair Relic which were kept in temples. This does not explain why the chronicler did not mention the particular relics worshipped; there is no apparent reason for this strange treatment, unless the chronicler used a collective term (dhātupūjā) to imply the worship of all relics which were

1. Ibid., 49.44.

2. See above, p. 142.

enthroned in temples. What other considerations were taken into account in the use of this term cannot be determined in the present state of our knowledge.

In the reign of Sena I (A.D. 833-53) there occurred the disastrous invasion of Śrī Māra Pāṇḍya. When the Sinhalese troops were defeated by the invader, Sena is said to have fled towards Malaya with his most valuable possessions,¹ leaving the city behind to the invader to plunder at will. Śrī Māra's looting of Anurādhapura is described thus in the Cūlavamsa:

'The Paṇḍu king took away all valuables in the treasure house of the king and plundered what there was to plunder in vihāra and town. In the Ratanapāsāda the golden image of the Master (Buddha) the two jewels which had been set as eyes in the stone (image of the) Prince of Sages, likewise the gold plates on the cetiya in the Thūpārāma, and the golden images here and there in the vihāras - all these he took and made the Island of Lankā deprived of her valuables leaving the splendid town in a state as if it had been plundered by yakkhas'.²

The corresponding account of the Pūjāvaliya includes two more objects, jayabera and minipā, the precise meaning of which is uncertain.³

It is evident from the foregoing account of the Cūlavamsa that all the vihāras and stūpas as well as secular buildings in Anurādhapura fell victim to Śrī Māra's plunder. The Tooth Relic temple may not have been an exception and it is very likely

1. Cv., 50.12-20; UCHC., I, pt.I, p.326.

2. Cv., 50.33-36.

3. Pjv., p.21.

therefore, that the property of the Tooth Relic was plundered by the invader. But the Relic seems not to have been among the booty for, had this been the case, it would have been mentioned in either of these sources. The Cūlavamsa confirms this view in a later passage when it states that, before his Pāṇḍya invasion, Sena II (A.D. 853-87) instituted a grand festival for the Relic.¹ This points to the fact that the custodians of the Tooth Relic had once again brought the Relic to safety. As it is evident that the Hair Relic also was not captured,² it is reasonable to suggest that Śrī Māra may not have taken any special interest in the capture of the relics, probably because his main concern was the plunder of the city's treasures.

After Sena II, two further doubtful references are found in the chronicle's accounts of the reigns of Kassapa IV (A.D. 898-914) and Sena III (A.D. 938-46). According to the chronicle, Kassapa instituted relic festivals, to the delight of the people,³ while Sena III held regular festivals of worship for the Relics.⁴ The term used in both cases is dhātupūjā and the relics are not specified. It is worth mentioning, however, that in the reign

-
1. Cv., 51.22.
 2. Ibid., 50.71.
 3. Ibid., 52.36.
 4. Ibid., 53.37.

of Kassapa the Cūlavamsa first refers to his meritorious works done at the Mahāvihāra, the Three Fraternities (Mahāvihāra, Jētavana and Abhayagiri), the Abhayagiri, Mahiyāṅga¹ and the donations made to the bhikkhus of the Theriya School, Dhammarucikas, Sāgalikas, and the Paṃsukulikas,² and later mentions the relic festivals. Sena's dhātupūja too, is described in the Cūlavamsa in a similar manner.³ As these references specifically mention all the meritorious works done at various places or almost all the places of worship at Anurādhapura and elsewhere, it is possible that dhātupūjā in these contexts implies festivals celebrated in honour of the Tooth Relic as well as other relics enthroned in temples.

The reign of Udaya IV (A.D. 946-54) witnessed the invasion of Parantaka Coḷa, who invaded Ceylon in order to capture the Pāṇḍyan insignia of royalty,⁴ entrusted by a Pāṇḍya ruler to the Ceylonese king, Dappula IV.⁵ The invader seems to have entered the capital without much opposition as the Sinhalese troops were weak and therefore could easily be defeated. Subsequently Udaya IV took his crown and other treasures and fled to Rohaṇa. What happened to the Tooth Relic on this occasion

1. Cv., 52.11-14, 33-35.

2. Ibid., 52.17-22.

3. Ibid., 53.29-37.

4. Ibid., 53.41-46; UHC., I, pt.I, pp.344-47.

5. Cv., 53.9.

is not certain. It is possible that the Tooth Relic was carried away to Rohaṇa or elsewhere and may have been kept hidden during this invasion. However, it was back again in Anurādhapura in the reign of Sena IV (A.D. 954-56) who is said to have fashioned for the Relic a casket ornamented with precious stones and held festivals in its honour.¹ The Jētavanārāma Slab Inscription, the first epigraph to give some information on the Tooth Relic, records that Mahinda IV (A.D. 956-72) also made a valuable casket for the Relic.²

Among numerous references to Mahinda's works of piety, the chronicle describes how the king restored the ruined temple of the Tooth Relic in the centre of the town.³ The restored temple was, as the Jētavanārāma Slab Inscription describes it, 'like unto a big ship'.⁴ Mahinda's restoration works at the Relic temple suggest that the building had been destroyed before his accession, but no evidence is found as to who was responsible for the destruction. Parānavitana assumed that it was burnt down by the Coḷa army which invaded Ceylon in the reign of Udayā IV.⁵ This assumption seems plausible for two

-
1. Ibid., 54.5.
 2. Ep.Zeyl., I, p.219.
 3. Cv., 54.45.
 4. Ep.Zeyl., I, p.219.
 5. MASC., III, p.14.

considerations. One is that there is no evidence to suggest that either Sena III or Sena IV caused the destruction of the Relic temple. These two rulers, in fact are credited in the Cūlavamsa with their patronage of the Order and for that reason it is very unlikely that they caused any harm to the Tooth Relic temple. The other is that it is very likely that the Coḷa army, followed the example of previous invaders and plundered the riches of the temple. If this is accepted it would follow that, although Sena IV, Mahinda's predecessor, 'had fashioned for the Relic a valuable casket', he had not repaired the Relic temple. Two possible reasons can be suggested for this negligence. One is that Sena could not restore this temple as he had a short reign of three years.¹ The other is that the Relic temple was not badly damaged and in that case Sena would not have taken the trouble to repair it. The former supposition, however, seems more likely as there were many other ruined temples which were reconstructed during the reign of Mahinda IV.

The death of Mahinda IV in A.D. 972 marks the end of an era of prosperity and the beginning of the decline which subsequently led to the ultimate collapse of Anurādhapura. Mahinda was succeeded by his son, Sena V, who was then twelve

1. Cv., 54.6.

years old. His reign is characterized by the power of the Kāliṅga faction which came into prominence after Mahinda's marriage to a Kāliṅga princess. According to the chronicle, Sena felt some dissatisfaction with the Kāliṅgas, and the latter in turn used their power to bring the king under their control. Sena ultimately became a mere figure head. During his reign the Tamil mercenaries plundered and ravaged the country and brought disaster to the kingdom.¹ The king was helpless and could not put down the lawlessness that arose. Later on he became addicted to liquor and died in his tenth regnal year.² His younger brother Mahinda, the fifth of that name then became king.³ During his reign (A.D. 982-1029) Anurādhapura was full of disorderly mercenaries. The peasants refused to pay the customary taxes owing to the weakness of the king, and Mahinda had no means of enforcing his authority - his soldiers were disloyal to him as they had not been paid. Ultimately, as he proved unable to meet the demands of the army, the soldiers surrounded the palace and by stopping the food supplies for the king tried to starve him into submission. The king is said to have escaped through an underground tunnel and fled to Rohaṇa, leaving the city to the troops both native and

-
1. Ibid., 57-69; UCHC., I, pt.I, p.341.
 2. Cv., 54.72.
 3. Ibid., 55.1.

foreign. While Ceylon was in this chaotic condition the Coḷas invaded the Island, established their own authority in Polonnaruva, and thereby caused the downfall of the Anurādhapura kingdom.

When political conditions were deteriorating during the reigns of the above-mentioned rulers, it was inevitable that the religious and other cultural institutions should also decline, as they always depended on the political stability and prosperity of the country as well as the generosity of the rulers. The vihāras and stūpas at Anurādhapura may have been neglected by the kings and may well have been damaged when the Tamil mercenaries were in quest of the means of living when they were not paid by the king. Besides, these rulers are said to have been strongly addicted to liquor and other sensuous pleasures¹ which, according to Wijetunga, may perhaps suggest their inclination towards some forms of Tantric worship.² In this case their negligence of Buddhism is quite understandable.

Thus at a time when Buddhism, as a whole, was declining, it is unlikely that the Tooth Relic should have received the patronage of the rulers. In fact no information about it is found during this period but, considering the later experiences, it may be assumed that the Tooth Relic had been

1. Cv., 54.70-71; 55.3.

2. Wijetunga, op.cit., p.317.

brought to safety by its custodians although its riches have been plundered.¹ With the accession in A.D. 1070 of Vijayabāhu at Polonnaruva the Tooth Relic once again appears in the religious sphere.

It is relevant at this stage to examine the importance of the Tooth Relic in the religious sphere during the seven centuries till the end of the Anurādhapura period. The Tooth Relic, when compared with other relics brought to Ceylon and enshrined either in stūpas or in vihāras, appears to have been an object of supreme sanctity.² But it is striking that a comparison between the worship received by this relic and that accorded to other religious institutions, especially those affiliated to the Mahāvihāra, reveals that the references to the homage paid to the latter are much more numerous than those to the former. This relic has been mentioned only eight times, whereas the Mahāthūpa, the Bō-Tree and the Thūpārāma have been mentioned fifteen, eighteen and seventeen times respectively. This suggests that those three institutions enjoyed more regular worship than the Tooth Relic from the rulers of the period.

This suggestion gains further strength from the offerings made to the religious objects and institutions by the rulers.

1. See below, pp.171-72, 188, 320-21.
2. See below, pp.257, 262.

When the Bō sapling was transferred to Ceylon, Devānaṃpiya Tissa bestowed kingship upon it,¹ as had been done earlier by his illustrious friend Aśoka,² and as a further mark of his respect towards the Bō-sapling he entrusted the kingship to the kulas who were commissioned with the guardianship of the sapling and himself remained a dovārika (gate keeper).³

Duṭṭhagāmaṇī bestowed kingship on some relics of the Buddha which can no longer be identified, on the occasion of their enshrinement in the Mahāthūpa.⁴ Aggabodhi II dedicated the Island, together with his own person to the relic shrine at the Thūpārāma.⁵ Mahinda II, after building the Ratanapāsāda, dedicated the whole kingdom to the Buddha.⁶

Offerings of a similar kind were made to the sāsana, to the bhikkhu community or to individual bhikkhus too, as can be seen throughout the Anurādhapura period. 'Five times, each time for seven days', states the Mahāvamsa, 'did the ruler (Duṭṭhagāmaṇi) bestow the rank of the ruler of the Island upon the doctrine'.⁷ Saddhātissa offered the dignity of kingship

-
1. Mv., 19.30-31, 59.
 2. Ibid., 18.35-36, 59-60, 66; 19.13.
 3. Ibid., 19.32; Smp., p.99.
 4. Mv., 31.90-92, 111.
 5. Cv., 42.61.
 6. Ibid., 48.135-38.
 7. Mv., 32.36.

to the elder Kāla Buddharakkhita who promptly gave it back to the king, admonishing him to govern the country in righteousness.¹ Mahadhāṭhika Mahānāga offered himself, his queen, his two sons, the state elephant and the state horse to the bhikkhu community, a gift which the latter discreetly refused.² The king therefore, redeemed them all by paying the bhikkhus in money and gifts.³ Moggallāna I, as a mark of distinction, presented the community of monks with his umbrella,⁴ the symbol of his royal dignity, but the latter, as if they were not willing to accept the burden of kingship, returned it to him. Similarly, Aggabōdhi VIII, made his mother offer him as a gift to the bhikkhus and, after paying a sum equal to his own value, redeemed himself.⁵

No offering of this kind, made to the Tooth Relic, is mentioned in the chronicle throughout the seven centuries after its arrival in Ceylon. It is worth mentioning however, that both the Dāṭhāvamsa and the Daḷadā Sirita state that Siri Meghavanna dedicated the whole of Laṅkā as an offering to the Tooth Relic.⁶ A note of caution is necessary in

-
1. Papancasūdani, II, p.295.
 2. Mv., 34.86.
 3. Ibid., 87-88.
 4. Cv., 39,31.
 5. Ibid., 49.63.
 6. Dav., v.360; Daḷ.S., p.37.

accepting this statement at its face value, for as these two works are the chronicles of the Tooth Relic it is quite understandable that such a laudatory statement should have crept into them, since the intention of the authors was to glorify the Relic, the history of which they narrated. But the absence of any such reference in an authoritative work like the Cūlavamsa seems to indicate that the Tooth Relic was not regarded as the most important symbol of Buddhism during the Anurādhapura period.

There is yet another factor which enables us to evaluate the position of the Tooth Relic during this period. In the reign of Siri Saṅghabodhi, the Mahāvamsa records a drought which inflicted great suffering on the people. The king, in order to arrest the danger of famine, is said to have prostrated himself in the courtyard of the Mahāthūpa and made a firm resolution that he would not rise unless the god brought rain.¹ By this means he warded off the danger of the drought. Sena II, according to the Cūlavamsa, received his consecration at the Mahāthūpa and decreed that this ceremony should be performed every year.² These two instances, which appear in the

1. Mv., 36.74-79.

2. Cv., 51.82.

chronicle prior to and after the arrival of the Tooth Relic, no doubt suggest that the Mahāthūpa was regarded as a suitable place not only to make resolutions to bring down rain but also for a state function like the consecration ceremony. It is noteworthy that no reference is found in the chronicle to a ritual or a ceremony of a similar kind performed at the Tooth Relic temple. Further, as has been referred to above,¹ the Tooth Relic was not used in connexion with the rain magic during this period. Thus taken together, all this evidence would seem to confirm the impression of the relatively insignificant position of the Tooth Relic in this period.

This seems to have been determined by two interconnected factors. As has already been referred to,² the Relic was delivered to Ceylon in the first decade of the fourth century, about five and a half centuries after the establishment of Buddhism in the Island. Amidst the strong opposition of the two major fraternities (named the Abhayagiri and Jētavana), the Mahāvihāra, which came into being with the introduction of Buddhism, still dominated the religious sphere during the period under discussion.³ Affiliated to the Mahāvihāra were those institutions which, more than any others, attracted the

1. See above, p.120 ff.

2. See above, p. 115.

3. See above, pp.22 ff, 123-24, 142.

multitude and the generosity of the rulers, i.e. the Mahāthūpa, Thūpārāma, Maricavaṭṭi, the Bō Tree and its temple.¹ Thus the Tooth Relic was introduced in the fourth century into a religion dominated by the Mahāvihāra. It is therefore natural that, being newly introduced, it should receive less worship, irrespective of its importance, until it had taken deep root. Moreover, the crucial factor which determined its position during this period was that it was entrusted to the Abhayagiri, the doctrinal rival of the Mahāvihāra. The monks of the former institution held or at least considered views which were unacceptable to the Mahāvihāra, and for that reason earned their displeasure. There was constant struggle between these two fraternities to gain supremacy.² Owing to this rivalry and doctrinal dissension the Mahāvihāra-vāsins seem to have developed an enmity not only towards the Abhayagiri but also towards the Tooth Relic. This dislike is clearly reflected in such works as the Pali Commentaries and the Cūlavamsa,³ written by the monks associated with the Mahāvihāra. It is very likely therefore that the Mahāvihāra used every possible means to undervalue the importance of the Tooth Relic. The relatively

1. See above, p. 142.

2. W. Rahula, op.cit., p. 84 ff; UHC., I, pt. I, pp. 248 ff, 378-84.

3. See above, pp. 20-24, 123.

insignificant position of the Relic in the religious sphere may have been the result of such attempts of victimization.

This supposition raises a question as to whether the information of the Cūlavamsa, on which depends the greater part of the foregoing discussion, is conclusive for a correct evaluation of the importance of the Tooth Relic during the Anurādhapura period. There are indications which suggest otherwise. As has been referred to above, the Tooth Relic temple was in the royal courtyard.¹ This location suggests that unlike other religious institutions which were situated outside the city, the Tooth Relic temple was closely associated with the Sinhalese royalty, perhaps because the Relic was considered a very special object of worship. Such a close association seems to have been the result not only of the religious sanctity but also the political importance of the Relic. For, as will be discussed in detail elsewhere,² it was the clearest expression of a ruler's adherence to Buddhism, emphasizing his determination to wield his authority in the name of the Buddha and the dhamma. The occasional references in the Cūlavamsa to the existence of the Temple in the royal courtyard

1. See above, pp.116-17.

2. See below, p.262.

and the homage paid by the rulers to the Relic suggest that its political significance remained intact throughout the Anurādhapura period.

What is more, the monks of the Abhayagiri who were charged with the protection of the Relic seem to have considered it an object of the highest religious importance. In the later Sinhalese works the Relic was regarded as an object which enjoyed the touch of the 84,000 fold teachings of the Buddha,¹ and it is very likely that such a consideration was prevalent even in earlier times, i.e. at the time the Relic was delivered to Ceylon. Besides, the Tooth Relic was the only authoritative object which so far had come into the custody of the Abhayagiri.² Hence the Abhayagiri-vāsins seem to have held it in great veneration for, as witnessed by Fa-Hsien, the festivals celebrated in its honour were very elaborate.³ The fact that they protected the Relic during invasions and political turmoil also emphasizes the care taken.

-
1. Dal.S., p.36, 'Budurajānan vahansēgē suvāsūdahasak damamāvaturehi gilunāvū' (immersed in the ambrosial flood of the eighty-four thousand teachings of the Lord Buddha); Sal.Sand., v.16, 'ladamuṇḍā damkaṇḍa pahasa manabāṇḍī', (that enjoyed the touch of the body of doctrine which originated in the Sage's mind).
 2. It is not known what particular relic was enshrined in the Abhayagiri-stūpa.
 3. See below, pp. 405 ff.

The Tooth Relic, in all probability, was used by the Abhayagiri-vāsins as a lever to attract the multitudes¹ and the patronage of the rulers as well as to survive the attempts at victimization by the Mahāvihāra. These considerations therefore make one believe that the Relic was of considerable importance to the Sinhalese royalty and at least to a section of the religious Order.

These aspects of the importance of the Tooth Relic appear in direct contrast to the position assigned to it in the Cūlavamsa, suggesting that it received less worship than the other symbols throughout the Anurādhapura period.² The only explanation that can be given to account for such a contradiction is that the relative importance of the different symbols depended on sectarian factors. For the Abhayagiri-vāsins who were charged with the care of the Relic, it was of the greatest importance, which explains why they and the patrons of the Abhayagiri celebrated great festivals in its honour. But to the Mahāvihāra-vāsins it was not of primary significance since

-
1. Fa-Hsien records that there were 5000 monks in the Abhayagiri whereas there were only 3000 in the Mahāvihāra. (The Travels of Fa-Hsien, p.67.) Although the popularity of the Abhayagiri cannot be explained as a result only of its possession of the Tooth Relic, that too might have been a factor which attracted multitudes towards this institution.
 2. See above, p. 151 ff.

according to the commentary on the Dīgha Nikāya¹ some even doubted the authenticity of the Tooth Relic, probably on account of sectarian bias. As the monks associated with the Mahāvihāra wrote the chronicle² it is inevitable that this sectarian bias crept into the chronicle too. In these circumstances it is reasonable to hold that the place assigned to the Tooth Relic in the chronicle is not decisive in determining its significance in the Anurādhapura period.

1. See above, p. 123.
2. See above, pp. 20-24.

Chapter IV

The History of the Tooth Relic

from c. A.D. 1000-1500

The period under survey is important for the present study for many reasons. Unlike the rulers of Anurādhapura almost every ruler of the period was a patron of the Tooth Relic. The interest taken by foreign powers in obtaining the Relic is also characteristic. Both these features point to the importance of the Tooth Relic as an object of religious worship and political significance during these five centuries. Another particularly noteworthy feature is the abundance of source material. In addition to the three parts of the chronicle¹ which deal with the period, numerous other literary and archaeological sources available to us provide very useful information for the study of the history of the Relic.

It is necessary however, to draw attention at the outset to a certain limitation under which this study is carried out. Various aspects of this period (political,² economic,³

-
1. Parts, 2, 3 and 4; see above, pp.25-32.
 2. W.M.K.Wijetunga, op.cit; S.Wickramasinghe, op.cit; G.S.Ranawella, op.cit; A.Liyanagamage, op.cit; K.Indrapala, Dravidian Settlements in Ceylon and the Beginnings of the kingdom of Jaffna, Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, 1965; S.Pathmanathan, The Kingdom of Jaffna, (c.A.D.1250-1450), Ph.D. Thesis, (Contd. on next page.....)

religious,¹ and the social²) have been thoroughly examined recently in a number of publications and doctoral theses. Hence great care has been taken not to repeat the researches of these scholars. Some of their findings have been utilized, whenever necessary, to understand certain problems connected with this study.

I

The Rise of the Tooth Relic

(c. A.D.1000-1232)

The Coḷa rule established in Rājaratṭha with Polonnaruva as its capital lasted for 77 years.³ The Island as a whole never accepted the Coḷa rule and stubborn resistance arose in southern Ceylon. The history of this period, as revealed by the chronicle, is dominated by the struggle between the Coḷas who tried to maintain their position and the Sinhalese who, sometimes with the help of foreign powers, tried to oust the Coḷas and liberate the country. The political history of the period has been discussed in detail elsewhere.⁴

(.....contd. from previous page)

- University of London, 1969; G.P.V.Somaratna, op.cit.
3. W.I.Siriweera, Economic Conditions of Ceylon (c.A.D.1070-1344) Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, 1970.
 1. R.A.L.H.Gunavardhana, op.cit.; Y.Dhammavisuddhi, op.cit.; H.B.M.Ilangasinha, op.cit.
 2. Cult.Ceyl.Med.Times, M.B.Ariyapala, Society in Mediaeval Ceylon, Colombo, 1956.
 3. 86 years according to the Nikāya Saṅgrahaya and the pūjāvaliya. Nks., p.17; Pjv., p.23. This reckoning is from the third year of Mahinda V, i.e. A.D.984.
 4. W.M.K.Wijetunga, op.cit.; UCHC., I, pt.II, pp.417-27.

The Coḷa occupation seems to have affected many aspects of Sinhalese life. Buddhism especially suffered great hardship for the Coḷas were no patrons of Buddhism and the Sinhalese chiefs were no longer in a position to support it. The great monasteries at Anurādhapura and elsewhere were abandoned; the great dāgābas were ransacked and their valuables plundered from the relic chambers.¹ This was a time when even the members of the royal families had to survive on roots and leaves, as is disclosed by the Panākaḍuva Copper Plate Charter. As such, it would have been hardly possible for the people to protect or feed the Saṅgha.² Some members of the Saṅgha, therefore, being unable to maintain themselves in Rājaraṭṭha or in Rōhana, crossed the seas and went to countries like Burma where Buddhism was flourishing, while others certainly must have given up the robes and become laymen. The pathetic condition of the Buddhist Order during this period is revealed by the Cūlavamsa which states that Vijayabāhu I was unable to find even five fully ordained monks (panca-vagga-gana) to perform the ceremony of admission into the Order and other religious acts.³ No data

-
1. Cv., 55.20-21; UHC., I, pt.II, p.563.
 2. W.M.K.Wijetunga, op.cit., p.328.
 3. Cv., 60.4-5.

on the destiny of the Tooth Relic during this period is found in our sources.

The accession of Vijayabāhu I in A.D. 1055 brought some unity to the resistance against the Coḷas. This king expelled the Coḷas in A.D. 1070 and then devoted his efforts to restoring political, economic, religious and social life in the country. His acts of piety by which he brought Buddhism back to a flourishing state are described in glowing terms in the chronicle.¹ It is during his reign, nearly a century after the reign of Mahinda IV (A.D. 956-72), that we hear again of the Tooth Relic.

The Vēlaikkāra Inscription records that a temple for the Tooth Relic was built at Polonnaruva by a dignitary called Nuvarakal Dēva Senevirattār on Vijayabāhu's order.² The chronicle makes no mention of the dignitary but states that the king built a beautiful and costly temple for the Relic.³ This Tooth Relic temple has been identified with the ruin now known as Vihāra no.2 in the quadrangle or Tooth Relic terrace, immediately to the north of the palace grounds.⁴ The

1. Ibid., 60.2-23, 56-73.

2. Ep.Zeyl., II, p.254.

3. Cv., 60.16; Dal.Pjv., p.47.

4. ARASC., 1903, pp.8-11; UCHC., I, pt.II, pp.430, 591-92.

building of the Relic temple by Vijayabāhu is important for it suggests that the custodians of the Relic who had probably removed it from Anurādhapura when the Cōlas invaded the country, had brought it back to Polonnaruva when Vijayabāhu re-established Sinhalese authority there. This king is also said to have celebrated throughout his reign a great festival for the Relic¹ which appears to have been under the protection of the Uttaramūla-pariveṇa, a section of the Abhayagiri.²

A request made by a contemporary Burmese ruler to obtain the Tooth Relic finds mention in the Hmannan, a nineteenth century chronicle of Burma. According to this work, king Aniruddha of Pagan (A.D. 1044-77) requested the Sinhalese king to send the Relic to Burma but received only a replica of it which was enshrined in the Shwezigon Pagoda.³ This story, however interesting it may be, can hardly be considered authentic. According to this work, the Ceylonese contemporary of Aniruddha was Dhātusēna⁴ and not Vijayabāhu which in fact was the case.⁵ The confusion in naming the

1. Cv., 60.16.

2. Ep.Zeyl., II, p.254.

3. The Glass Palace Chronicle, Transl., Pe Maung Tin and G.H.Luce, London, 1923, pp.88-91.

4. Ibid., pp.89-90.

5. Cv., 58.8-10; 60.4-8.

Ceylonese king suggests either that there was an error in the recording of the story or that the detail was not taken from a contemporary record but was a later addition. The latter is very likely for the Ceylonese chronicle which lays much emphasis on Vijayabāhu's relations with Aniruddha¹ does not mention the latter's request for the Relic nor do the contemporary Burmese sources. If there was any request for the Tooth Relic from the Burmese king, it would certainly have been mentioned in the Sinhalese chronicle. The lack of any contemporary evidence makes it extremely difficult to rely on a detail found in a much later chronicle especially when it stands alone and is 'more than usually wrong'.²

The period between the death of Vijayabāhu, I and the accession of Parākramabāhu I is an important stage in the history of the Tooth Relic. It witnessed the investiture of a group of foreign mercenaries in the protection of the Tooth Relic, the plunder of its riches by a Sinhalese ruler, and the delivery of the Relic to Rohaṇa. Above all, this was a time when the Relic played an important role in politics.³

1. Ibid., 58.8-10; 60.4-8.

2. G.H.Luce, Ancient Burma, Early Pagan, I, New York, 1969, p.39.

3. The political significance of the Relic will be dealt with in detail in another chapter. See below, chapter V.

With the death of Vijayabāhu I the political unity of the country was lost and there began a period of protracted warfare bringing widespread devastation to the three independent kingdoms which arose in Rājarat̥ṭha, Rohaṇa and Dakkhinadesa. The rulers of these kingdoms,¹ as the Cūlavamsa graphically describes 'in their instability and money lust squeezed out the whole people as sugar cane in a sugar mill by levying excessive taxes'.²

The Vēlaikkāra Inscription sheds valuable light on the affairs of the Tooth Relic during this turbulent period. As has already been mentioned,³ this record provides evidence of the building of the Tooth Relic temple by Vijayabāhu I. In addition it furnishes some information not found elsewhere. It records that the Tooth and the Bowl Relics which were at Uttaramūla, which was the chief fane at the Abhayagiri mahāvihāra, the original place of deposit of the Relics, and that they were entrusted to the Vēlaikkāras, a group of foreign mercenary troops, by Mugalan mahāthera, the royal preceptor and grammarian, of the uttaramūla.⁴ The Vēlaikkāras

-
1. Vikramabāhu II in Rājarat̥ṭha, Mānābharāṇa in Dakkhinadesa, Kitti Siri Megha and Siri Vallabha in Rohaṇa. Cv., 61.21-26.
 2. Ibid., 61.53; Ranawella, op.cit., pp.224-33.
 3. See above, p.164.
 4. Ep.Zeyl., II, p.254, lines 25-30. Paranavitana reads Utturūlmūla as Uturolmūla and Uttorūlmūla (Ep.Ind., XVIII, 1925-26, pp.332,337; Bell has it as Uttarol-mūlai. (ARASC., 1912, p.112.)

named the temple as 'the great temple of the Tooth Relic belonging to the illustrious Vēlaikkāra (army) of the three divisions'¹ and made a solemn promise to protect the Relics as well as their riches as long as their lineage lasted.²

The information furnished by this record is of considerable importance for many reasons. One is its reference to the Uttaramūla-pariveṇa where the Relic is said to have been kept during this period. On an earlier occasion the Cūlavamsa too stated that the chief incumbent of the Uttaramūla was entrusted with the care of the Tooth Relic by a certain king named Mānavamma.³ But no further details are given in the work as to whether the Relic was under the care of the Uttaramūla during this period too. The information given in the epigraph is invaluable in this respect because it indicates that the Uttaramūla was the place where the Relic was kept, thus implying that the monks of the Uttaramūla were in charge of it. This implication is supported by the fact that Mugalan mahāthera entrusted the Relic to the Vēlaikkāras for protection,⁴ an unprecedented

1. Ep.Zeyl., II, p.255.

2. Ibid., p.255.

3. Cv., 57.20-22.

4. Ep.Zeyl., II, p.254.

practice which, in addition to the references to the riches and privileges of the temple,¹ is the most interesting detail revealed by the epigraph. It points to the extent of the prevailing insecurity, and also suggests that the Vēlaikkāras were considered a community powerful enough to protect the most venerable object of the Sinhalese.

A relevant question which arises at this stage is whether the power of the Vēlaikkāras was the only factor which determined their selection. From the Cūlavamsa we learn that these mercenaries once revolted against Vijayabāhu I when the latter was preparing for an expedition against the Coḷas. They were suppressed on this occasion, but, as a consequence of the revolt, the projected campaign had to be given up.² In the reign of Gajabāhu II, Kitti Siri Megha and Siri Vallabha tried to win the Vēlaikkāras over to their side.³ A few years later they rose in rebellion against Parākramabāhu I in alliance with Keralas and the people of Rohaṇa.⁴ Their strength had been demonstrated on all these occasions; and it is very likely that it was for this reason that Mugalan mahāthera considered

1. Ibid., p.255.

2. Cv., 60.35-44.

3. Ibid., 63.24.

4. Ibid., 74.44 ff.

them powerful enough to protect the relic temple. But it is not impossible that Mugalan mahāthera preferred the Vēlaikkāras to Sinhalese troops, because he remembered the political calamity resulting from the plot against Vikramabāhu, and feared that Sinhalese might include sympathisers of Vikramabāhu who believed that he had been deprived of his legitimate position. The ultimate defeat of the faction which plotted against Vikramabāhu clearly illustrates that the latter may have been more powerful than the former because he received popular support. It may be, indeed, that the services of the Vēlaikkāras were obtained because they were mercenaries and, if paid, readily available for any purpose irrespective of justice. Such a tendency is evident later,¹ and thus it is not unlikely that it was a consideration which actuated the entrusting of the Relic to them.

The safety measures taken for the protection of the Relic appear to have failed. The Vēlaikkāras had sworn to protect it and its wealth and to give asylum to those who came to the temple, even at the risk of their lives,² but the chronicle

1. See below, pp 171-72.

2. Ep.Zeyl., II, p.255.

suggests that they were not faithful to this vow.

Vikramabāhu is said to have distributed the maintenance villages of the Saṅgha among his followers and converted

the monasteries into barracks for his foreign soldiers

(desantariyānaṃ bhaṭānaṃ).¹ Whether the Vēlaikkāras too

were implied in this context is not certain, for the

Cūlavamsa does not explicitly refer to them here as it does

elsewhere.² But since the Vēlaikkāras were foreign soldiers

it is not unlikely that they too were included in the general

term 'desantariyānaṃ bhaṭānaṃ'. Another passage of the

Cūlavamsa supports this: it states that Vikramabāhu took

possession of the precious stones, pearls and such treasures

presented by the pious as offerings for the Relics of the Alms-

Bowl and the Tooth.³ Thus the king was powerful enough to

plunder the riches of the Tooth Relic even though they were

entrusted to the Vēlaikkāras. This may have resulted from a

defeat of the Vēlaikkāras at the hands of Vikramabāhu; but

one cannot rule out the possibility that they were in

Vikramabāhu's employ - that he had won them over to his side,

1. Cv., 61.55.

2. Ibid., 60.36; 63.24.

3. Ibid., 61.55-57.

as Kittisiri Mēgha and Siri Vallabha were able to do on a later occasion. In such a case the allocation of monastic property to foreign soldiers, including Vēlaikkāras, would be quite understandable. At the least it is quite evident from the above-cited evidence that the Vēlaikkāras were unable to protect the riches of the Tooth Relic temple.

When Vikramabāhu was treating the Order in this rough manner, the Tooth and the Bowl Relics were no longer secure in Polonnaruva. The Paṃsukulika bhikkhus¹ therefore took them to Rohaṇa an act which brought about far reaching results.² The relics seem to have been preserved in Rōhaṇa throughout the reign of Vikramabāhu and that of his son Gajabāhu II (A.D. 1132-53).

The next reference to the Tooth Relic is found in the chronicle in its account of the tripartite war among the new rulers of Rājaraṭṭha, Dakkhinadeṣa and Rōhaṇa - the successors

-
1. The paṃsukulika bhikkhus mentioned here must have been the members of the Uttaramūla-parivena for as we learn from other sources, the latter were in charge of the Relics. See above, pp.167-68; According to the Cūlavamsa they came into prominence in the reign of Mānavamma. (Cv., 47.66). They seem to have originally belonged to the Abhayagiri and separated from it as a distinct group about a century and a half later. Cv., Transl., fn. to 47.66; W.Rahula, op.cit., p.108.
 2. See below, p.264 ff.

of those who were engaged in the war of succession after the death of Vijayabāhu I. This part of the chronicle, as has been stated elsewhere, is an eulogy of the new ruler of Dakkhinadesa, i.e. Parākramabāhu, who ascended the throne after the death of Kitti Siri Megha.¹ The encounters of Parākramabāhu with Gajabāhu of Rājarat̥ṭha and Mānābharana of Rohana are described in detail in the Cūlavamsa and have been extensively studied by modern scholars.² Hence this discussion is mainly concerned with the movements of the Tooth Relic, its recovery by Parākramabāhu, and his acts of goodwill towards it.

At one stage of this struggle Parākramabāhu's forces captured Polonnaruva, but he could not hold it for long as his misguided generals and soldiers began to harass the people of Rājarat̥ṭha. When the civilians of Polonnaruva could no longer bear these torments, they gathered together, conferred, and invited Mānābharana of Rohana to come to their rescue, promising him supreme rule in Rājarat̥ṭha.³ Mānābharana hastened to Polonnaruva on the pretext of rescuing the civilians and Gajabāhu. He defeated Parākramabāhu's forces and captured the throne. Soon afterwards he put to death all the high and influential officials of Rājarat̥ṭha, seized Gajabāhu, and threw him in a

1. Cv., 67.88 ff.

2. Ibid., chapters 70-72; CHJ., IV, nos.1-4, 1954-55. Special number on the Polonnaruva period; S.Wickramasinghe, op.cit.; UCHC., I, pt.II, pp.442-501.

3. Cv., 70.254-57; UCHC., I, pt.II, pp.451-52.

dungeon.¹

The Cūlavamsa then states that Mānābharana brought the Tooth Relic from Rohaṇa together with the Bowl Relic, his mother, and wives.³ The reference to the bringing of the Relics is particularly noteworthy in this context as it suggests that Mānābharana was in possession of them by this time. This also indicates that the relics, when they were taken out of Polonnaruva during the reign of Vikramabāhu, were entrusted to the royal family of Rohaṇa and were preserved there throughout the reigns of Vikramabāhu and Gajabāhu.

Though Mānābharana had brought the Tooth and the Bowl Relics he could not retain them for long in Polonnaruva. It is said that, in consultation with his mother and court officials, Mānābharana decided to put Gajabāhu secretly to death and that he proceeded to ill-treat him intending to poison him eventually. Aware of Mānābharana's intentions, Gajabāhu sent a secret message to Parākramabāhu begging him to help save his life.³ In response Parākramabāhu rushed to his rescue and defeated Mānābharana, who took the Tooth and Bowl Relics and fled back to Rohaṇa with his mother and wives.⁴ He captured

1. Cv., 70.258-65; UCHC., I, pt.II, pp.451-52.

2. Cv., 70.266.

3. Ibid., 70.271-73.

4. Ibid., 70.274 ff; 310.

Polonnaruva once again but was driven away by Parākramabāhu.¹

Mānābharāṇa died subsequently of an illness said to have been caused by fear of Parākramabāhu; but the relics remained in Rohaṇa, now under the custody of Sugalā, mother of the late king. Sugalā and the chieftains of Rohaṇa are said to have revolted against Parākramabāhu by strengthening their defences.² Parākramabāhu had to wage war against Rohaṇa, and eventually captured the Relics³ and Sugalā.⁴ The Daladā Pūjāvaliya states that the relics were captured from the rebels of Rohaṇa in the fourth regnal year of Parākramabāhu.⁵ But in some manuscripts of the work the seventh year is mentioned.⁶

There are some particularly noteworthy aspects of the above-mentioned narrative of the Cūlavamsa. This work refers to the delivery of the relics to Rohaṇa, their return to Polonnaruva, and their subsequent delivery to Rohaṇa; but nowhere does it state exactly where in Rohaṇa the relics were

-
1. Ibid., 72.148 ff; UCHC., I, pt.II, pp.451-59; G.S.Ranawella, op.cit., pp.259, For a detailed discussion of the war between Parākramabāhu and Mānābharāṇa, see Ranawella, op.cit., pp. 253-76.
 2. See below, p.272 ff.
 3. Cv., 74.22-197.
 4. Ibid., ch.75. The military operation against Sugalā has been discussed in detail in the UCHC., I, pt.II, pp.465-73 and by Ranawella, op.cit., pp.285-317.
 5. Dal.Pjv., p.48.
 6. Ep.Zeyl., V, pt.I, pp.15-16; CALR., IX, p.184.

preserved during this period. It suggests that they were captured in the district called Uruvelā during the Rohaṇa campaign of Parākramabāhu.¹ The Daḷadā Pūjāvaliya, however states that the invading troops of Rājaratṭha captured the Tooth and the Bowl Relics which were preserved at a place close to Amaragiri rock in Ududora² (P.Uddhanadvāra). The Sinhala Daḷadā Vamsaya contains the same tradition.³ Thus the information of these two works seems to differ from that of the Cūlavamsa. Preference has to be given to the information furnished by the Cūlavamsa; but it is nevertheless necessary to examine the reasons which brought Ududora into the narrative of the Daḷadā Pūjāvaliya.

According to the Cūlavamsa, Uddhanadvāra (Ududora) was a capital of Rohaṇa from which Mānābharāṇa's father Siri Vallabha, ruled the region of Aṭṭhasahassaratt^ha while Vikramabāhu was at Polonnaruva.⁴ In its reference to the delivery of the Relics during the reign of Vikramabāhu, the chronicle states that they were taken to Rohaṇa⁵ but no further details are given. But in a later passage, the same work states that Mānābharāṇa,

1. Cv., 74.125-26.

2. 'Ruhunu ududora amaragiriparvata samīpayehi surakshita koṭa vasā tibū daḷadā pātra dhātun vahansē vaḍā genvā'...
Dal.Pjv., p.48.

3. Sin.Dal.V., p.36.

4. Cv., 61.24-25.

5. Ibid., 61.61- ; see above, p.172

son of Siri Vallabha, brought the relics from Rohaṇa when he came to the throne at Polonnaruva. This suggests that the relics came into the custody of Mānābharāṇa some time before his encounter with Parākramabāhu. The most likely explanation for this is that the relics were delivered to Uddhanadvāra during Siri Vallabha's reign and were later entrusted to Mānābharāṇa. Thus the Daḷadā Pūjāvaliya may have recorded a tradition concerning Udundora perhaps because it was well-known in those days as the place of deposit of the relics.

But this should not necessarily lead one to suggest that the relics were kept at Udundora throughout the period under discussion. After Mānābharāṇa (i.e. Parākramabāhu's father) had died, Kitti Siri Megha of Dvādahasahasakaraṭṭa (S. Dolosdahasaraṭṭa) moved to Dakkhinadesa, thus leaving Rohaṇa to Siri Vallabha.¹ The latter moved his capital from Udundora to Mahānāgahula,² which appears also to have been the capital of his son, Mānābharāṇa. There is no mention of Siri Vallabha or Mānābharāṇa bringing the relics to Mahānāgahula when they abandoned Udundora, but there is good reason to believe that they did so. Ever since the Tooth Relic's arrival in Ceylon, it was customary to keep it in the immediate vicinity of the royal

1. Cv., 63.1-3.

2. Ibid., 61.4.

palace. This practice was followed, except on one occasion,¹ throughout the period under discussion. Thus it is very likely that Siri Vallabha and Mānābharāṇa had the Tooth Relic at Mahānāgahula; and this gains further strength from another consideration, namely that Mānābharāṇa, as already stated, brought the Tooth and the Bowl relics to Polonnaruva when he came to ascend the throne there, and fled with them whenever he was forced to retreat.² The Cūlavamsa does not mention the place to which he retreated with the relics but the fact that he came from Mahānāgahula leaves little doubt that he retreated to the same place.

The implication is that the relics were at Mahānāgahula during the reign of Mānābharāṇa. We know that this was the case with his successor Sugalā. In later times, the relics were taken from place to place by the retreating army of Rohaṇa until they were captured in Uruvelā.³ Taking all this into consideration, the explanation that can be given to account for the discrepancy between the Cūlavamsa and the Daladā Pūjāvaliya is that the former work mentioned the actual place at which the relics were captured while the latter recorded a tradition concerning the place where they were preserved after

-
1. In the reign of Vijayabāhu III of Daṁbadeṇiya, see below, p. 191.
 2. See above, pp. 174-75.
 3. Cv., 74.125-26.

they had first been taken to Rohaṇa. The evidence however, is not conclusive, and there is reason to believe that the relics were preserved at Mahānāgahula as well.

Also worthy of attention is the detail that Mānābharana and Sugalā abused the riches of the Tooth and the Bowl Relics. The chronicler attributes the following words to Mānābharana to show the latter's repentance at his death:

'Rich treasures, that were sacrificed to the venerable Tooth Relic and to the sacred Alms-Bowl by believing sons of good family, and besides these divers villages belonging to the bhikkhu order have I seized and destroyed, swayed by the lust of kingly power'.¹

The chronicle then states that he entered the world of Yama, a fit punishment for his evil deeds. Mānābharana's mother, Sugalā, is also depicted in the chronicle as one who abused the riches of the relics for her own purposes.² It is, however, interesting to examine whether the evidence of the chronicle is decisive in evaluating the characters of Mānābharana and Sugalā.

In the passage cited, Mānābharana is accused of laying waste villages belonging to the Saṅgha. This is a clear indication of the author's prejudice for, as Wickramasinghe has pointed out, Mānābharana and Parākramabāhu were both equally

1. Ibid., 72.304-05.

2. Ibid., 74.36-38.

responsible for the destruction of villages.¹ Further, this passage is in direct contrast to what the chronicler stated earlier about Mānābharana. In reference to the early life of this prince, the Cūlavamsa describes him as one who was distinguished by many virtues and who won all the people for himself.² This characterisation finds support in the Kaṭagamuva Slab Inscription, which registers a land-grant, thirteen amunas in extent, made by Mānābharana to a monastery called Talāmuhundugiri.³ Taken together, these references suggest that he was on good terms with the Saṅgha during the earlier part of his reign. One wonders, therefore, why the Cūlavamsa expresses such a harsh view in a later passage.

Ranawella seems to be in favour of the view expressed by the chronicler. He states that although Mānābharana was in good terms with the Saṅgha in the earlier part of his reign, he may have seized the property belonging to religious institutions when he became involved in the contest for the throne of Rājaraṭṭha.⁴ But there is reason to believe that this accusation does not rest on a valid foundation.

It is worth considering the fact that the Tooth Relic

1. S.Wickramasinghe, op.cit., p.168.

2. Cv., 63.17.

3. Ep.Zeyl., V, pt.I, pp.142-46; Ranawella, op.cit., p.280.

4. Ibid., p.280.

remained in Rohaṇa throughout the reign of Mānābharana and that of Sugalā. In his earlier campaigns Mānābharana brought the relics to Rājaraṭṭha and took them back when he was forced to retreat. The movements of the Tooth Relic should not be understood in the limited sense that the Relic was taken here and there by the king, for as we shall see elsewhere¹ there were special groups of servitors, both clergy and laity, who were entrusted with the care and ritual of the Relic and no doubt accompanied it during its removals. Indeed the movements of the Relic suggest that its custodians supported Mānābharana. It is evident that on other occasions, should the ruler be treating the Order and the relics with disrespect, the custodians would bring the relics to safety.² The same thing would presumably have happened with Mānābharana had he been at fault.

There is yet another consideration which supports this more favourable view. The possession of the Tooth and the Bowl Relics, as we shall see elsewhere, was a determining factor in a prince's claim to the throne during this period.³ Hence, any disrespect towards them would have brought very grave

1. See below, p. 417 ff.
 2. Cv., 61.58-61; 81.17-19.
 3. See below, p. 262 ff.

consequences (as in the case of Vikramabāhu I).¹ One would not expect a prince like Mānābharana, who certainly realized the value of the possession of the relics,² to dishonour them and thereby jeopardise his hopes for the throne of Rājaraṭṭha.

Why then should the author of the Cūlavamsa change his early attitude and villify the character of Mānābharana? The reason is quite apparent. This part of the chronicle, as has already been remarked, is an eulogy of Parākramabāhu and bears mahākāvya elements.³ It is one of the characteristics of a mahākāvya that the hero's activities are free from blame and are therefore praised while his opponent is usually described as a villain. As the opponents of Parākramabāhu, Mānābharana and Sugalā were thus liable to denigration. In the circumstances it is reasonable to maintain that the evidence found in the Cūlavamsa cannot be taken as decisive in evaluating their character. This explanation also suggests that Parākramabāhu's struggle for the throne and the unification of the Island may not always have been in keeping with rights or traditions. Mānābharana's 'repentance'⁴ in fact is a word of justification for Parākramabāhu's actions.

-
1. See below, p.264 ff.
 2. See below, p.268 ff.
 3. See above, pp. 26-27.
 4. See above, p.179.

Parākramabāhu is said to have rejoiced greatly on hearing that the Relics had been captured and that they were gradually coming nearer to Polonnaruva. He considered this the finest fruit of his labours for the realm.¹ According to the chronicle, the Tooth Relic and the Bowl Relic, were welcomed and provisionally kept at a place which was a yojana's distance from the city.² No further details are given. But when describing the procession in which the Tooth Relic was brought to the city, the chronicle states that the road was decorated for the distance of a yojana from the king's gate (rājadvāraṃ) onwards.³ This suggests that the Tooth Relic was kept somewhere outside the city facing the king's gate but we are still left in doubt as to where this place was, for the exact location of the king's gate is not known.

The king's gate (rājadvāraṃ), according to the chronicle, was the splendid (visitthaṃ) gate of Polonnaruva,⁴ but the context in which it is mentioned does not help one to understand its exact location. Considering the fact that the relics were brought to Polonnaruva from Rohaṇa in the south, Geiger

1. Cv., 74.183-85.

2. Ibid., 186-87. Geiger writes that a yojana is equal to nine miles. He considers that this distance was computed from the king's gate.

3. Ibid., 74.199.

4. Ibid., 73.160.

assumed that the king's gate lay in that direction.¹ This assumption derives strength from the Cūlavamsa which refers to two other gates called the Māyā gate and the Mahātitttha gate² which, as the names suggest, may have faced Mahātitttha (north-west) and Māya (Māyāraṭṭha). One might have expected a gate facing Rohaṇa to be named in a similar fashion after that region. This is not to say that the King's gate could not have faced south, because it was clearly named for its grandeur without reference to the place to which it led. But, on the other hand, it is equally possible that there was a Rohaṇa gate facing south, and that the king's gate faced in another direction: for it would presumably be appropriate to bring in the relics through the noblest gateway (wherever it faced) as a mark of respect.

After paying homage to the relics at the outskirts of the capital, the king is said to have had a precious jewel hollowed out, filled it with sweet smelling powder and placed the Tooth Relic in it. He then laid the jewel in a casket of precious stones which in turn was placed in a costly box of gold.³ Then the Relic was conducted in procession⁴ and placed in a temple

1. Cv., Transl., fn. to 74.199.

2. Cv., 73.162-63.

3. Ibid., 74.209-10.

4. Ibid., 74.199-248.

which had been built in the middle of the city. This temple, as the chronicle puts it, was 'like the hall of Assembly, Sudhammā'.¹ The king also instituted a grand festival for the Relic.²

In addition to this temple, two other relic temples were built in the reign of Parākramabāhu I. One pāsāda was built by a certain dignitary called Mahinda, even before the arrival of the Relic from Rohaṇa.³ Again the king built a beautiful round temple wholly of stone for the Tooth Relic 'adorned with glorious pillars, staircases, outer walls and so forth'.⁴ The Pūjāvaliya states that he celebrated relic festivals annually.⁵ In the light of all this evidence it is reasonable to conclude that Parākramabāhu's reign was one of the glorious periods of the history of the Tooth Relic.

The next reference to the Tooth Relic is found in the inscriptions of Nissankamalla who claims to have built a Tooth

-
1. Ibid., 74.198; Dal.Pjv., p.48.
 2. Cv., 74.248.
 3. Ibid., 73.124-35.
 4. Ibid., 78.41. Geiger identifies this temple with the Vaṭadāgeya (Rotunda) situated on the quadrangle opposite the Hāṭadāge (Cv., Transl., fn. to 78.41). See also, Bell, ARASC., 1904, pp.5-6; The Pūjāvaliya on the other hand, attributes the Vaṭadāgeya to Nissankamalla who claims in his inscriptions to have built it. Pjv., p.24. Ep.Zeyl., II, p.89, II, line 19; S.Wickramasinghe, op.cit., p.42.
 5. Pjv., p.24.

Relic temple.¹ The Cūlavamsa corroborates this detail when it states that, immediately after his accession to the throne, the king built in stone a splendid relic temple.² The Pūjāvaliya adds that the temple was built in sixty hours³ but no further details are given. This edifice has been identified with the ruin now known as the Hātadāge.⁴

The reign of Nissāṅkamalla is of particular importance in this study for another reason. The king records in his inscriptions that he offered his son and daughter to the Relic and redeemed them by offering a golden dāgāba and other riches.⁵ The importance of this detail, as will be discussed elsewhere,⁶ lies in the fact that this is the first reference available to us concerning the dedication of people to the Tooth Relic. Further Nissāṅkamalla is said to have dedicated villages and lands to the Relic. This evidence clearly establishes that Nissāṅkamalla's reign, though lasting for no longer than nine years, was a time when the Tooth Relic received highest veneration.

After Nissāṅkamalla, the chronicle remains silent about the

-
1. Ep.Zeyl., II, p.89. II lines 19-20, p.113. II, B. line 24, C. line 1.
 2. Cv., 80.19.
 3. Pjv., p.24; Rrk., p.36; Rjv., p.42.
 4. ARASC., 1903, pp.13-14; Ep.Zeyl., II, p.167; UCHC., I, pt.II, p.573.
 5. Ep.Zeyl., II, pp.113. II, B. line 24, p.173. II, lines 20-22.
 6. See below, pp. 320, 348 ff.

Relic until the accession of Vijayabāhu III of Dambadeniya in A.D.1232. The intervening period is characterized by a series of short reigns and the decline of monarchical authority owing to intrigues and the rivalries of generals and ministers which led ultimately to the establishment of foreign rule in Ceylon. The Sinhala Daladā Vamsaya states that almost every ruler of this period, including Māgha, was a patron of the Tooth Relic.¹ It is true that the Dāṭhāvamsa was written during the reign of Līlāvati,² and the writing of this work no doubt suggests that there was a growing interest among the people concerning the Relic. But this should not necessarily be taken to mean that the rulers of this period patronized it. In fact, Līlāvati, during whose reign the Dāṭhāvamsa was written is not credited in it with patronage of the Tooth Relic. Moreover, it is well known that Māgha was a persecutor of Buddhism and that the Tooth Relic together with the Bowl was delivered to Kotmalē during his rule.³ In view of this evidence, much reliance cannot be placed on the claim of the Sinhala Daladā Vamsaya - especially as this is a much later work, and its report is not corroborated by any contemporary or near contemporary source.

-
1. Sin.Dal.V., p.38.
 2. Dav., vv, 4-9.
 3. Cv., 81.17-19.

In its account of the career of Vijayabāhu III, the Cūlavamsa flashes back to the adversity suffered by the country during the rule of Māgha and provides the following details concerning the misfortunes of the Tooth Relic. The relevant passage runs as follows:

'During these disturbed times all the grand theras with Vācissara at their head, had carried away from Pulatthinagara the Alms-bowl Relic and the Tooth Relic of the Master, had gone forth, had betaken themselves to Māyāraṭṭha and there on the mountain Kotthumala (Kotmalē) in a safe region had buried both the relics carefully in the earth and so preserved them'.¹

This tradition has also been recorded in other literary works dealing with the period.²

Among the information given in this passage, the detail that the thera Vācissara delivered the Tooth Relic to Kotmalē is of particular importance as it implies that he was in charge of the Relic during this period. But we are left in doubt as to who he was and to what parivena he belonged. The Pali Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa sheds light on this. Although it does not refer by name to the thera who delivered the relics this work states that he was the chief incumbent of the Uttaramūla (Uttaramūla vāsino mahāyatayo),³ thus indicating the parivena to which he belonged. This detail is recorded

1. Ibid., 81.17-19.

2. Pjv., p.26; Hvv., p.30; Elu.Av., pp.67-68; Dal.S., pp.43-44; Rjv., p.44.

3. Hvv., p.30.

also in the Elu Attanagalu Vamsaya.¹

There is reason to believe that the information furnished by the Pali Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa is creditworthy. In its account of the descent of Vijayabāhu I, the Cūlavamsa makes mention of a monk in the Uttaramūla parivēṇa who was a brother of a ruling king in Anurādhapura, to whom was entrusted the Tooth Relic and its servitors.² From the Vēlaikkāra inscription we learn that Mugalan mahāthera who entrusted the Relic to the Vēlaikkāra mercenaries was of the Uttaramūla parivēṇa.³ The Daladā Sirita informs us that the chief incumbent of the Uttaramūla was in charge of the Relic even in the fourteenth century.⁴ These three references clearly indicate that the custodianship of the Relic was vested continuously in the chief incumbent of the Uttaramūla from about the seventh century to the fourteenth century. The evidence of the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa makes it clear that the same thera was in charge of the Relic at the time of Māgha's invasion, and his name may well have been Vācissara⁵ as is mentioned in the Cūlavamsa. However, the Tooth Relic seems to have been secluded in Kotmalē throughout the rule of

1. Elu.Av., pp.67-68.

2. Cv., 57.4 ff.

3. Ep.Zeyl., II, p.254.

4. Dal.S., pp.51-53.

5. Malalasekara identifies him with the first thera of that name. Pali.Lit.Ceyl., pp.216-19.

Māgha, as suggested by popular traditions prevailing in the area.¹

II

The Tooth Relic Pre-eminent

(c. A.D.1232-1326)

At the time of his accession to the throne at Daṁbadeṇiya in A.D.1232, Vijayabāhu is said to have asked the mahātheras who had fled to the mainland during the rule of Māgha and returned at his invitation to tell him where the Tooth and the Alms-Bowl Relics were preserved. When the king heard that they were hidden in Kotthumala he went there with his army, performed a festival, and brought the Relics to Daṁbadeṇiya in a grand procession. There they were welcomed by the people

-
1. There is a tradition that the Tooth Relic was hidden at Mallāva, a village close to Pusulpiṭṭiya, where a temple named Dāṭhākarandārāmaya is found. (Dal.S., ed. V.Ratnasuriya, Introduction, p.Li.). Another tradition records that the relics were preserved in the Pusulpiṭṭiya-vihāra of Kotmalē. The Tooth Relic is said to have been found in a campaka tree (*Michelia Campaka*) in the precincts of this vihāra. The tree which was called ginihapuva is said to have been in existence until recently (N.Mudiyanse, op.cit., p.39). Whatever the exact place may have been the following stanza known to the elders of Kotmalē confirms the tradition that the relics were preserved in that area.

'Lovaga muniraju pirinivana ran denehi daṁbaran pilimasudilī
 Nisaga soṇda maha maliyadev ā rahat utuman visū bābilī
 Biyaga daḷadā pādāda rāki rankotda ran puhul pahalī
 Kiyaga kotmala raṭaṭa vāḍi vena raṭak āddai melaka siyalī
 (N.Mudiyanse, op.cit., p.37.)

with a grand and splendid festival. The king thenceforth celebrated daily festivals of offerings in honour of the relics.¹

Vijayabāhu built a temple for the Tooth Relic at Billasela (Beligala), a place situated far away from the capital. This is important because Vijayabāhu was the first ruler to keep the Relic away from the capital instead of near the royal palace. This temple which was 'like to a divine palace descended from the world of the gods',² consisted of three storeys.³ Vijayabāhu also laid out a park around this palace, built many pāsādas, mandapas, and bathing ponds for the community, and set up a military guard similar to that at the royal palace.⁴ Further, he decreed a regular offering of alms for the theras who attended to the relics, and ordered the performance of daily ceremonies.⁵ Shortly before his death Vijayabāhu entrusted the Tooth and the Bowl Relics, the mahāsaṅgha, and the people to his eldest son, Parākramabāhu, a convention which symbolised that the latter was accepted as his successor.⁶

1. Cv., 81.17-30; Pjv., p.26.

2. Cv., 81.35; Pjv., pp.26-27; Dal.S., p.44; Hvv., p.30; Elu.Av., p.68; Rrk., p.38.

3. Ktk.Sng., pp.7-8; Dal.S., p.44.

4. Pjv., p.27.

5. Cv., 81.38-39; Pjv., p.27.

6. For details see below, p.289 ff.

With the accession in A.D. 1236 of Parākramabāhu, the second of that name, there begins another remarkable stage in the history of the Tooth Relic. Besides the Cūlavamsa, numerous other literary works, some of them contemporary, provide information on the homage paid to the Relic by this ruler.¹ Soon after his accession to the throne, Parākramabāhu brought the Relic from Beligala to Daṁbadeṇiya. The change of residence was actuated, according to the Cūlavamsa and the Pūjāvaliya, by the king's desire to perform a festival of offerings before going to war with the Damilas (Tamils).² In order to worship the precious Relic whenever he wished, he had a costly temple built for it in the vicinity of the royal palace.³ The building of the Relic temple in the royal courtyard suggests that Parākramabāhu was reverting to a practice of previous rulers. This temple, known as the Vijayasundarārāma,⁴ was of three storeys,⁵ was decorated with paintings⁶ and

1. See above, p.52 ff.

2. Cv., 82.5-7; Pjv., p.29; Rrk., pp.40-41. The damilas mentioned here are, no doubt, Māgha's soldiers. Māgha himself came from Kāliṅga but most of his soldiers were Tamils and Keralas. For details, see K.Indrapala, op.cit., pp.432-59.

3. Cv., 82.8-9; Pjv., p.29; Dal.S., p.44; Rrk., p.41.

4. Pjv., p.37; Rrk., p.41.

5. Pjv., p.37; Dmb.A., p.31; It was customary to have three-storeyed relic temples. For instance, see the relic temples of Vijayabāhu III, Parākramabāhu IV and Parākramabāhu VI (Dal.S., p.44; Cv., 90.66-67; 91.17). It is not known what particular importance was attached to a relic temple of three storeys. It may perhaps have been a symbol of the Buddha's spiritual overlordship of the Three Worlds or a representation of the Three Gems (Buddha, Dhamma, Saṅgha).

6. Pjv., p.37.

contained a splendid throne with a costly covering on which was kept the Relic.¹ The Relic temple at Polonnaruva was also reconstructed during the reign of Parākramabāhu,² but we have no further details of this.

Parākramabāhu is further credited with many offerings to the Relic. He is said to have offered three caskets of precious stones, gold and silver, and to have celebrated many relic festivals.³ One such festival occurred soon after his accession to the throne when the Relic is reported to have performed a miracle at the request of the king.⁴ Another relic festival was celebrated for seven days on the occasion of the dedication to the Saṅgha of a vihāra built at Siri Vaddhanapura, Parākramabāhu's birth place.⁵ Again, having restored the Relic temple at Daṁbadeṇiya, he placed the Tooth Relic therein and celebrated another festival for seven days.⁶ The last of these festivals was celebrated after Parākramabāhu's second consecration at Polonnaruva. This time, Vijayabāhu, Parākramabāhu's son, who was then in charge of the administration,

1. Cv., 82.10; Pjv., p.29.

2. Cv., 89.40-41; Pjv., p.49.

3. Cv., 82.11-14; Pjv., p.29; Hvv., p.31; Rrk., p.41.

4. Cv., 82.15 ff; Pjv., p.29; Hvv., pp.31-32; Rrk., p.41; see below, pp. 290-94.

5. Cv., 85.1-58; Pjv., p.34-35; Rjv., p.44; UHC., I, pt.II, p.615.

6. Cv., 85.90-93; Pjv., p.37.

is said to have brought the Tooth and the Bowl Relics in a grand procession to Polonnaruva,¹ placed the Tooth Relic on a gem-set throne in the reconstructed relic temple; made many offerings to the Relic, and celebrated a festival for three months.² Numerous offerings, both animate and inanimate, are said to have been made to the Relic on all these occasions.³

Parākramabāhu's reign is important in the history of the Tooth Relic for yet another reason. Candrabhānu, who invaded Ceylon twice⁴ during the reign is said to have demanded the surrender of the Tooth and the Bowl Relics. This claim is of the utmost importance for our study, for this was the first time since the Relics had been brought to Ceylon, that a foreign ruler had demanded their surrender.⁵ The Sinhalese king, however, was able to retain the Relics as the invader was defeated in battle.⁶

-
1. This festival was celebrated sometime after 1262/63 after the second victory over Candrabhānu, Liyanagamage, op.cit., p.152; UHC., I, pt.II, p.628.
 2. Cv., 89.13-46; Liyanagamage, op.cit., p.165.
 3. The significance of these offerings will be discussed in another chapter, see below, p. 344 ff.
 4. For details of these invasions, see, Liyanagamage, op.cit., p.133 ff.
 5. See below, p.296 ff.
 6. According to Paranavitana, Candrabhānu was killed in battle (UHC., I, pt.II, p.627). Liyanagamage supports this view. (op.cit., pp.156-58.) Patmanathan casts doubts on this view on the ground that the Cūlavamsa and the Pūjāvaliya do not state that Candrabhānu lost his life at the hands of
(Contd. on next page.....)

Parākramabāhu venerated not only the Tooth Relic of the Buddha but also a Tooth Relic of Mahā Kassapa, the great disciple of the Master. It is said that during his sojourn in Māyāraṭṭha, Parākramabāhu came to know that a Tooth of Mahā Kassapa was preserved in the vihāra of Bhīmatittha (Bentoṭa) in the province of Pancayojana. He went there with his four-fold army and celebrated for three days a great festival of offerings.¹

Parākramabāhu II was succeeded by his son Vijayabāhu IV, who reigned for two years until assassinated by a general named Mitta.² The Cūlavamsa does not mention any of this ruler's benefactions towards the Relic, but the Daḷadā Sirita

(.....contd. from previous page)

Vijayabāhu and Vīrabāhu who led the Sinhalese troops. This reference, according to him, was first found in the Elu Attanagalu Vamsaya and its Vīdāgama version, works written about 150 years after the time of Candrabhānu. He therefore suggests that one has to be cautious in accepting their evidence in preference to that of the Cūlavamsa and the Pūjāvaliya. (Patmanathan, op.cit., p.151.) This however is not a serious argument for the Pali Haṭṭhavanagallavihāravamsa, a contemporary work, states that Candrabhānu was sent to the city of Yama (antakabhavanam upanīya), a popular usage which implies the death of a person. (Hvv., p.32) For another instance in which similar terms have been used, see Cv., 72.309 which has 'yamapuram gato' to denote the death of Mānābharana.

1. Cv., 85.80-84; Pjv., p.36.
2. Cv., 90.1-3.

states that when Vijayabāhu became king (after the death of Parākramabāhu , who had performed many meritorious deeds) he brought the Relic in procession to Polonnaruva and celebrated a grand festival there.¹ This is repeated in the Rājaratnākaraya.²

These two works refer to a ceremony of higher ordination performed at Dahastoṭa (P.Sahassatittha) immediately after this festival. But the context³ in which the two ceremonies appear indicates that some confusion may have occurred in the record. From the Cūlavamsa and the Pūjāvaliya we learn that a higher ordination ceremony was performed by Vijayabāhu at Dahastoṭa, some time after the 26th regnal year of Parākramabāhu.⁴ On that occasion, too, the Tooth Relic was brought to Polonnaruva and a grand festival was celebrated for three months.⁵ Although the festivals were celebrated by Vijayabāhu, the Cūlavamsa and the Pūjāvaliya make it very clear that they were performed in the name of Parākramabāhu II,⁶ evidently because the latter was the reigning king. No such ceremonies performed after the accession of Vijayabāhu are

1. Dal.S., p.45.

2. Rrk., p.43.

3. Dal.S., p.45; Rrk., p.43.

4. Cv., 89.47 ff.; Pjv., p.49; Liyanagamage, op.cit., pp.165-66.

5. Cv., 89.13-46; Pjv., p.49.

6. Cv., 89.69; Pjv., p.49.

recorded elsewhere except in the Daladā Sirita and the Rājaratnākaraya. The similarity of these ceremonies in detail and sequence, and the fact that the later occasions are not mentioned elsewhere, suggest that these two works may have confused the ceremonies performed by Vijayabāhu in his father's name, and recorded them as Vijayabāhu's.

There is, moreover, a reason which could have given rise to this confusion. In the Alutnuvara Dēvālaya Karavīma we read that Parākramabāhu II was afflicted with an incurable disease in his 22nd regnal year.¹ This finds no confirmation in other contemporary works. Nevertheless, there is reason to believe it. The Cūlavamsa states at one point that Parākramabāhu entrusted Vijayabāhu with the administration of the kingdom as well as with the Relics,² and, on several other occasions after this prominence was given to Vijayabāhu rather than to the ruling king. This suggests that the reigning king, for some unknown reason, became inactive, and that the actual control of the country was in Vijayabāhu's hands.³ It is very likely that Vijayabāhu took over in the 22nd year of Parākramabāhu after the king was afflicted with the ailment

1. Sin.Sā.Lipi., p.67; UCHC., I, pt.II, p.763; Liyanagamage, op.cit., p.151.

2. Cv., 87.73-74; Pjv., p.43.

3. Cv., 87.62 ff; Pjv., p.43 ff.

recorded by the Alutnuvara Dēvālaya Karavīma. The Cūlavamsa and the Pūjāvaliya quite understandably attribute the tasks accomplished by Vijayabāhu during this period to the reigning king, Parākramabāhu, but it appears from the Daḷadā Sirita and the Rājaratnākaraya, that these later works were merely assuming that the latter was in reality ruling at the time. The extent of confusion of this extent would also explain why the Daḷadā Sirita should state that Vijayabāhu performed his celebrations after the death of Parākramabāhu.¹

When reading through the lines of the Cūlavamsa concerning the meritorious deeds of Vijayabāhu performed in the name of his father, one would naturally expect him to perform such duties even after he became king. But one would be disappointed; for strangely enough the Cūlavamsa makes no mention of any such deeds, but simply records Vijayabāhu's assassination by Mitta.² This silence leaves one in doubt as to whether Vijayabāhu paid no homage to the Relic or whether he did and the chronicler failed to mention it. If one take Vijayabāhu's earlier activities into consideration one would naturally tend to believe that he did pay homage but there is a reason which suggests otherwise. As has already been said, the

1. Daḷ.S., p.45. (...lōsasun babuluvā ikut saḥḍa)

2. Cv., 90.1-3.

Cūlavamsa and the Pūjāvaliya state that the Tooth Relic was taken to Polonnaruva for a relic festival.¹ But nowhere do they mention whether or not it was brought back to Daṁbadeṇiya. Indeed, the Sinhala Daladā Vamsaya would have us believe that Bhuvanekabāhu I, Vijayabāhu's successor, brought the Relic to Yāpahuva from Polonnaruva (polonnaru nuvara parana daladāgeṭa vaḍā puda pavatvamin siṭi daladā sāmīn yāpavu nuvaraṭama vaḍāgena gos....),² thus suggesting that the Relic had been at Polonnaruva ever since it was taken there for the festival. If it occurred, this would be strange conduct on the part of Vijayabāhu, for, except for a single occasion,³ the Relic was kept in the capital. But if by any chance, the Relic was kept at Polonnaruva it would be likely that Vijayabāhu could not pay much attention to it, and in that case the chronicler's silence would be quite understandable. The truth of this cannot be determined in the present state of our knowledge.

Vijayabāhu's assassin met his death at the hands of a general designated as Thakūraka, who paved the way to the throne for Bhuvanekabāhu I, the younger brother of Vijayabāhu IV.⁴ This ruler, who had Yāpahuva as his capital,⁵ is credited in the Cūlavamsa with the celebration of daily festivals of

1. See above, p.196.

2. Sin.Dal.V., p.43.

3. See above, p.191.

4. Cv., 90.24-30; CALR., X, p.88; UCHC., I, pt.II, pp.629-30.

5. Cv., 90.35; Dal.S., p.45; Sin.Dal.V., p.43.

offerings for the Tooth Relic.¹ The Daḷadā Sirita, the Daḷadā Pūjāvaliya, the Rājaratnākaraya and the Sinhala Daḷadā Vaṃsaya too state that he made numerous offerings to the Tooth Relic.²

The Cūlavāṃsa states that Bhuvanekabāhu died after having reigned for eleven years.³ Immediately after this, it refers to a famine which was followed by a Pāṇḍya invasion led by Ārya Cakravarti who captured the Tooth Relic and delivered it to the Pāṇḍya king Kulasekhara.⁴ But Geiger has detected a hiatus in the Cūlavāṃsa immediately after Bhuvanekabāhu's reign.⁵ Thus it is not clear whether Ārya Cakravarti captured the Tooth Relic from Bhuvanekabāhu or from some other ruler who succeeded him and is not mentioned in our sources.

The Daḷadā Sirita provides a clue to the proper understanding of these events. The work mentions that Ārya Cakravarti's invasion took place in erajahugē rājyāntarayehi⁶ which can literally be translated as 'the rājyāntara of that king'; but what is implied by erajahugē and rājyāntara in this context is not certain. Codrington believes that rājyāntara in this context denotes 'in the reign of', i.e. in the reign of

1. Cv., 90.41.

2. Dal.S., p.45; Dal.Pjv., p.50; Rrk., p.43; Sin.DalV., p.43.

3. Cv., 90.42.

4. Ibid., 90.43-47.

5. Cv., Transl., fn. to 90.43.

6. Dal.S., p.45; Sin.Dal.V., p.43.

Bhuvanekabāhu.¹ Sorata agrees with this interpretation.¹ But there is reason to believe that this interpretation is unlikely. Immediately before the reference to the rājyāntara and the invasion of Ārya Cakravarti, the Daladā Sirita states that Bhuvanekabāhu I, after having performed many works of piety for the furtherance of the laity and the Order, wished for heavenly pleasures (sura siri risvī).³ It is not clear what sura siri risvī stands for in this context. In Sinhalese and Pali works the usages, purāṇdurupura sapatvī⁴ (entered the city of Puraṇduru i.e. Sakka), suriṇḍupura giya⁵ (went to the city of Suriṇḍu, i.e. Sakka), divaṃ gatō,⁶ tidivaṃ gatō⁷ and other such expressions usually denote the death of a person. Thus it is not impossible that sura siri risvī in this context implies the death of Bhuvanekabāhu; but it is not necessarily so, for the phrase might just as well mean that the king performed the meritorious deeds with a view of attaining heavenly riches. The Cūlavaṃsa and the Rājaratnākaraya, moreover, help to clarify this ambiguity. The former states that Bhuvanekabāhu entered heaven after a reign of eleven years and then mentions the invasion of Ārya Cakravarti.⁸ The latter, even more

1. CALR., X, p.89.

2. Dal.S., p.97; Śri Sumaṅgala Śabda Koṣaya, II, p.802.

3. Dal.S., p.45.

4. Ibid., p.16.

5. Ibid., p.35.

6. Cv., 90.42.

7. Ibid., 37.178; see also Cv., 37.208.

8. Ibid., 90.42 'ekādasavassāni rajjaṃ katvā divaṃ gato'.

precisely, states that this invasion took place after the death of Bhuvanekabāhu (eraju āvāmehi).¹ From this evidence it follows that Ārya Cakravarti's invasion took place after the death of Bhuvanekabāhu and for that reason Codrington's interpretation is unlikely.

Paranavitana thinks that the correct reading of rājyāntara should be rājantara, found on many occasions in the Cūlavamsa, and takes it to mean 'interregnum'.² He supports this interpretation by showing that the term arājītayeka (interregnum) is once used in the Pūjāvaliya as the Sinhalese equivalent to Pali rājantare found in the Cūlavamsa,³ concerning the rule of Māgha. It is necessary to inquire whether this interpretation is plausible.

When used as the second element of a compound, antara in Sanskrit and Pali denotes 'another'.⁴ The term is used in this sense many times in the Cūlavamsa. In its account of the reign of Mahinda V, the work states that at that time Anurādhapura was full of people from other countries (desantarajanākule).⁵ Again it mentions that Māgha's soldiers decided to go to another country

1. Rrk., p.44.

2. UCHC., I, pt.II, pp.631-32.

3. Cv., 81.1,31; Pjv., p.26.

4. Monier Williams, Sanskrit-English Dictionary, pp.496, 907, see meanings given to Desāntara and Lokāntara; T.W.Rhys Davids and William Stede, Pali-English Dictionary, (PTS), s.v.loka; Sorata, Śri Sumangala Śabdakōṣaya, I, p.63, II, pp.802, 840.

5. Cv., 55.2.

(yāma desantaraṃ iti)¹ for even the kings of other countries (desantarānarindā pi) had come under the influence of Parākramabāhu II.² Accordingly the same meaning can be given to antara in rājantara quoted by Parānavitana. Indeed rājantara cannot be interpreted here as 'interregnum' for the Culavamsa, referring elsewhere to the reign of Māgha, states that he reigned for twenty one years (ekavīsativassāni laṅkārajjam akārayi).³ The chronicle uses the term rājantara on three more occasions with reference to Magha's rule, and Geiger quite convincingly interprets it as 'alien rule'.⁴ Elsewhere, it is true, he once uses 'interregnum' to translate rājantara⁵ - an instance also cited by Parānavitana - but even on this occasion he seems to have meant 'alien rule' for the context implies a rule like that of Māgha.

Further, the term arājītayeka, though literally meaning 'interregnum', need not necessarily be taken in that sense when it occurs in the Pūjāvaliya. Since it is evident from other sources that the Tooth and the Bowl Relics were delivered to Kotmalē owing to the disastrous rule of Māgha, the term arājītayeka may possibly have been used in this context to

-
1. Cv., 83.26; Pjv., p.32, 'mehi noraṅḍā raṭa yama'.
 2. Cv., 83.23; Pjv., p.32, 'paradēsāyehi rajadaruvōda'.
 3. Cv., 80.79.
 4. Cv., Transl., 81.1; 84.7; 87.46.
 5. Ibid., 81.31.

denote a non-Sinhalese rule. It is worthy of note that in the eyes of the authors of ancient Pali and Sinhalese works, only a ruler who patronized religion and thereby won the goodwill of the Saṅgha was a lawful person to hold sway in Laṅkā. If a ruler acted against accepted norms, despite his power and legitimacy, he was considered unsuitable for the throne. A classic example of such treatment is the reign of king Dhammapāla of Kōṭṭē who is completely ignored in the chronicle. The only explanation that can be offered to account for this kind of treatment is that Dhammapāla became an apostate and therefore was considered unworthy of inclusion among Sinhalese rulers. If such was the case, one can well imagine the extent of ill-feeling against a foreigner, i.e. Māgha, who persecuted Buddhism and earned the enmity of the Saṅgha. The view that he was not a lawful king is in fact, clearly expressed in the Pūjāvaliya when it states

'pihiṭṭi rajaya mulullehi balātkārayen ekvisi havuruddak hiṅḍinā māgharaja'¹ meaning 'king Māgha who for twenty one years, is holding the entire pihiṭṭirajaya (P.Paṭhiṭṭha-raṭṭha) by force'. It would be natural therefore that the author of the Pūjāvaliya should consider the rule of Māgha arājītayeka; and the facts that the latter was not in possession of the Tooth Relic - the symbol of sovereignty, and that he was the adversary of Paṭākramabāhu II,

1. Pjv., p.30.

the patron of the author of the Pūjāvaliya, would be other reasons for such treatment, All this evidence, taken together, indicates that 'alien rule' or 'another king' is more plausible than 'interregnum' as an interpretation of the term rājantara found in the Cūlavamsa.

It is necessary at this stage to inquire whether rājantara is the correct reading of rājyāntara found in the Daḷadā Siritā. The term rāja in Sanskrit means, 'king', 'sovereign', or 'best of its kind'¹ and antara has one of several meanings such as 'between', 'within', 'among' and 'another'² the last of which seems more appropriate in this context. Hence rājantara means 'another king'. On the other hand, rājya in the term rājyāntara may have one of several meanings such as 'kingly', 'princely', 'royal', 'royalty', 'kingship', 'sovereignty' and 'empire',³ the last of which seems more probable in this context. Rājyāntara therefore stands for 'another empire' or 'another kingdom', the corresponding Pali term of which is rajjantara.

-
1. Sanskrit-English Dictionary, p.872 s.v. rāja; Pali-English Dictionary, s.v. rājā; Śrī Sumāngala Śabdakoṣaya, II, p.800, s.v. rāja.
 2. Sanskrit-English Dictionary, pp.43-44, s.v. antar, antara; Pali-English Dictionary, s.v. antara; Śrī Sumāngala Śabda-Koṣaya, I, p.63.
 3. Sanskrit-English Dictionary, p.875, s.v. rājya; Pali-English Dictionary, s.v. rajja; Śrī Sumāngala Śabdakoṣaya, II, p.802, s.v. rājya.

Hence it appears that there is a slight difference in the meaning of these two terms although they both imply a kingdom other than the Sinhalese one.

This explanation leads us to the question as to what the interpretation of rājyāntara tells us about the ruler from whom Arya Cakravarti captured the Tooth Relic. In view of the facts that the account of the Cūlavamsa does not condemn the invader who seized the most coveted relic of the Sinhalese, while the Pāṇḍya ruler under whose direction the invasion was carried out had been given many complimentary epithets,¹ Parnavitana suggests that Ceylon at that time was under the control of someone towards whom the chronicler was not well-disposed. He identifies this ruler with Candrabhānu's son who is referred to as Sendermain (Candrabhānu) by Marco Polo in A.D. 1292.² Moreover, he states that this ruler was installed on the throne by the Pāṇḍya ruler and that he was ruling in Yāpahuva at the time of the invasion of Arya Cakravarti.³

This suggestion, although not conclusive, seems to fit in well with the explanation given to rājyāntara. If, as Parnavitana suggests, the ruler of Jaffna was powerful enough to capture the Sinhalese kingdom by some means and enforce his authority there, he was, doubtless, considered by the Sinhalese

-
1. Cv., 90.47.
 2. Foreign Notices of South India from Megasthenes to Ma-Huan, ed., K.A.Nilakanta Satri, Madras, 1939, p.157.
 3. UHC., I, pt.II, pp.631-32.

an unlawful person and a stranger, and his kingdom too may have been called 'another kingdom' (rājyāntara). Although rājantara does not usually mean the same as rājyāntara, it may be that it did so in this context as there was 'another king' i.e. a non-Sinhalese king, and therefore his kingdom could be called 'another kingdom' in a secondary sense. These considerations lead us to conclude that there was a non-Sinhalese rule in Ceylon after the reign of Bhuvanekabāhu I, and that Arya Cakravarti captured the Tooth Relic from the person who established that rule. But whether he was the son of Candrabhānu as Parānavitana suggests or some-one else cannot be determined in the present state of our knowledge.

Whoever the person may have been, the suggestion that Arya Cakravarti captured the Tooth Relic from a non-Sinhalese ruler is of considerable importance for this study. For it indicates that for the first time in its history in Ceylon, the Tooth Relic had passed into the hands of two non-Sinhalese rulers within a short period and had been taken out of the country. There is no means of ascertaining whether in these circumstances the Relic received the same worship as was accorded to it by Sinhalese rulers; but, as will be discussed elsewhere, it is quite possible that it was used as a lever to strengthen the claims of the foreigners to the Sinhalese kingdom.

In the Cūlavamsa Parākramabāhu III, the next ruler, is credited with the recovery of the Tooth Relic from the Pāṇḍyas. Accordint to this work, he maintained friendly relations with them, and personally visited the Pāṇḍya king, won his favour by daily conversations, and consequently succeeded in recovering the Relic.¹ On his return to Ceylon he placed the Tooth Relic in the ancient temple at Polonnaruva and performed festivals daily in its honour.²

More information on the Tooth Relic is found in the reign of Bhuvanekabāhu II who ousted Parākramabāhu III in A.D. 1293 and made Hatthigiripura (Kurunāgala) his capital. A noteworthy feature of his reign is that the Cūlavamsa says nothing about his bringing the Relic to the new capital and the homage he paid to it. However, the Daḷadā Sirita, written shortly after the reign, provides the information that, after ousting Parākramabāhu, Bhuvanekabāhu brought the Relic to his capital and made regular offerings in its honour.³ This detail is

-
1. Commenting on the emergence of the Jaffna kingdom, Gunavardhana presumes that the Jaffna Peninsula was given to the Pāṇḍyas as a ransom for the Tooth Relic. (CALR., III, pt.I, p.13). This assumption however, is not very convincing for the Sinhalese king had no control over the northern parts of Ceylon during this period as there had been an independent kingdom since the time of Māgha. See, Indrapala, op.cit., pp.432-76; Pathmanathan, op.cit., chapters II, III.
 2. Cv., 90.48-57; Dal.S., p.45; Rrk., p.44; UHC., I, pt.II, p.633.
 3. Dal.S., pp.45-46.

repeated in such works as the Rājaratnākaraya and the Sinhala Daḷadā Vaṃsaya.¹

The accession to the throne at Kurunāgala in A.D. 1302 of Parākramabāhu IV, Son of Bhuvanekabāhu II, marks the beginning of another glorious period of the Tooth Relic. Soon after he had ascended the throne, this king built in the royal courtyard a splendid three storeyed temple for the Tooth Relic.² The internal decorations and the magnificence of this building are vividly described in the Cūlavāṃsa and the Daḷadā Sirita.³ These two works also credit the king with the celebration of many relic festivals and with making numerous offerings to the Relic.⁴ The Sinhala Bōdhi Vaṃsaya, written by Vilgammula Saṅgharāja during the reign of this king, also eulogises him as one who often venerated the two sacred relics, the Tooth and the Bowl.⁵

Apart from the worship accorded to the Relic, the most remarkable event in the reign of Parākramabāhu was the compilation of the Daladā Sirita.⁶ Even the Daḷadā Pūjāvaliya is believed to have been written during his reign.⁷ These two works, especially the former, present a vivid picture of the worship and ritual of the Relic during this period. The writing of these

-
1. Rrk., p.44; Sin.Dal.V., p.44.
 2. Cv., 90.66-67.
 3. Ibid., 90.68-72; Dal.S., pp.48-49.
 4. Cv., 90.73-76; Dal.S., p.49 ff.
 5. SBV., p.3.
 6. Cv., 90.77-79; Dal.S., p.54.
 7. See above, p.43.

works reflects above all the growing importance of the Relic.

III

The Relic in times of political instability

(c. A.D. 1326-1500)

Parākramabāhu IV is said to have been succeeded¹ by Vanni Bhuvanekabāhu III who in turn was succeeded by Vijayabāhu V - two rulers whose origin, regnal years and relationship to the dynasty of Parākramabāhu IV are still uncertain² and who are no more than mere names in traditional history. The reasons for the change of the royal seat from Kurunagāla to Gampola are not apparent but it is possible that it is connected with the increasing power of the Arya Cakravarti of Jaffna who, even in the reign of Parākramabāhu IV, launched an attack on the Sinhalese kingdom.³ During this reign (A.D.1341-51) there were many other rulers in the Island. They were Parākramabāhu V (A.D. 1344-59) in Dādigama,⁴ Arya Cakravarti in Jaffna and Alagakkōnāra in Kunakar (Rayigama).⁵ Bhuvanekabāhu was

-
1. According to the Mādavala Copper Plate Parākramabāhu was murdered in the rebellion of BōdāMāpānandā. Ep.Zeyl., V, pt.III, p.473 II.A line 5 ; S.Pathmanathan, op.cit., pp.249-50.
 2. UCHC., I, pt.II, pp.636-38.
 3. S.Pathmanathan, op.cit., pp.249-50.
 4. UCHC., I, pt.II, pp.638-43.
 5. Ibn Battuta, Travels in Asia and Africa, 1325-1354 A.D. transl., H.A.R.Gibb, London, 1929, p.256 ; UCHC., I, pt.II, pp.637-41; G.P.V.Somarathna, op.cit., pp.99-100.

succeeded by his brother Parākramabāhu V who seems to have spent his last days as a refugee in Rohaṇa, having been compelled to leave his domains owing to an invasion by Ārya Cakravarti.¹ The Nikāya Saṅgrahaya, written shortly after the reign of Parākramabāhu, records that this ruler was succeeded by his nephew Vikramabāhu III (A.D. 1357-74).² This king's successor, Bhuvanekabāhu V (A.D. 1372-1408), a member of the Alakēśvara family,³ was the first to make Jayavardhanapura Kōṭṭē his capital.⁴

One striking feature of this period of about half a century from the death of Parākramabāhu IV to the accession of Bhuvanekabāhu V, is the absence of any reference in the chronicle to the Tooth Relic. This silence of the chronicle even raises the doubt as to whether the Tooth Relic, which attained a supreme position in the preceding period was neglected by the rulers of

-
1. Nks., p.22; RKD., p.85; UHC., I, pt.II, pp.638, 642; Ep.Zeyl., IV, p.161 ff.
 2. Nks., p.22; UHC., I, pt.II, pp.642-43.
 3. UHC., I, pt.II, p.655; Somaratna, op.cit., pp.85-87.
 4. Srk., pp.293-94; Cv., 91.9; Somaratna, op.cit., pp.85, 87-93. This city was built by Nissanka Alakēśvara during the reign of Vikramabāhu III to take firmer measures against the king of Jaffna who was powerful enough to collect taxes from some parts of south Ceylon. Nks., pp.22-23; Srk., pp.292-93; Rrk., p.46; Rjv., p.46; Alak.Yuddh., p.20; Somaratna, op.cit., pp.79-80.

this period. However, there is reason to believe that the rulers of this period too, paid homage to the Relic.

The Sinhala Daḷadā Vaṃsaya furnishes us with the information that the Tooth Relic was kept in the Niyāṅgampāya temple at Gampola during the reigns of Parākramabāhu V and Vikramabāhu III and that these rulers held festivals in its honour.¹ Since this data is found in a much later work one may naturally be reluctant to attach much reliance to it. Nevertheless, the Sinhala Daḷadā Vaṃsaya seems to record a tradition based on a valid foundation. Two inscriptions issued during the reigns of these two rulers provide substantial evidence in this connexion. The Hapugasatāna Inscription, issued in the fifteenth year of the reign of Parākramabāhu V (Śaka. 1281, A.D. 1359), records a donation of a tract of fields made by a certain dignitary called Sivalkolu Lakdivu Adhikāra.² Another donation of fields made to the Tooth Relic by the same personage together with four other dignitaries is recorded in the Vīgulavatta Inscription issued in Śaka 1282 (A.D. 1360), in the fourth regnal year of Vikramabāhu III.³ Since the donations were made by state officials and the king's name was used only for the purpose of dating, the inscriptions do not necessarily mean that Parākramabāhu V and Vikramabāhu III were

1. Sin.Dal.V., p.43; N.Mudiyanse, op.cit., p.35.

2. JRAS (GB)., XXII, no.65, 1912, pp.362-63.

3. Ibid., p.363; RKD., pp.78-79; Br.Mus.Ms., Or.6606(165) folio kū.

patrons of the Tooth Relic. The Hapugastāna Inscription states that one of the purposes of the donation was the accumulation of merit¹ but since it is not specified for whom, the passage naturally implies the accumulation of merit for the donor. The Vīgulavatta Inscription more specifically mentions that its purpose was the acquisition of merit for the ruling king, the dignitaries and the people.² The acquisition of merit for the king is particularly noteworthy for it suggests that the donation was made with the consent of the king which would have been the case with the other donation too, for it was customary to get the ruler's approval for such activities. At the least these two donations suggest that the Tooth Relic received homage during the reigns of these two rulers and since it was customary to have the Relic at the capital, it is quite possible that it was at Gampola during this time. The temple of Niyāṅgampāya may well have been the place where it was enthroned as in fact is suggested by the Sinhala Daḷadā Vaṃsaya.

The next king, Bhuvanekabāhu V was a patron of the Tooth Relic. The Cūlavāṃsa, after a silence of about half a century

-
1. JRAS (CB)., XXII, no.65, 1912, p.362, line 11.
 2. Ibid., p.363, lines 13-17; Br.Mus.Ms.., Or.6606(165), folio, ku, lines 3-4.

states that the king made regular offerings to the Relic and that he fashioned a casket worth seven thousand silver coins to keep it.¹ After this reference no further information on the Tooth Relic is given in the chronicle until the accession of Parākramabāhu VI at Kōṭṭē. The intervening period is not wholly devoid of any mention of the Tooth Relic but in order to understand the homage it received, it is necessary to draw attention to some important political events of the day.

The most remarkable feature of the reign of Bhuvanekabāhu V was the power of the Alakēśvaras who had gained a predominant position in the political arena in the time of Vikramabāhu III. Although the members of this family did not gain the sovereign power, that was within their grasp for sometimes they reduced the ruling king to a mere figure-head. It was a truism that they ruled while the king reigned.² With the death of Niśśaṅka Alakēśvara, the most prominent member of the family, the fortunes of Alakēśvaras took a different turn owing to the dissensions among them. Niśśaṅka Alakēśvara was succeeded by his son Kumāra Alakēśvara who in turn was succeeded by the brother (bāna) of the former, Vīra Alakēśvara.³ He seems to have been living in Rayigama at the death of Kumāra Alakēśvara

1. Cv., 91.12.

2. N.Mudiyanse, op.cit., p.14.

3. Srk., p.294.

which, according to Somaratna, must have been advantageous to him in his succession to the position of prabhurāja.¹

Vīra Alakēśvara could not hold this position for long as it was challenged by his younger brother Vīrabāhu, who was known as Āpā, yuvarāja and the suhurubaḍu (brother-in-law) of Bhuvanekabāhu V, and lived at Gampola.² Vīrabāhu, being the favourite of the reigning monarch must no doubt have enjoyed the latter's support and subsequently Vīra Alakēśvara was defeated in battle at Rayigama. This defeat resulted in Vīra Alakēśvara fleeing the country. Thereupon Vīrabāhu became the prabhurāja and as the Saddharmaratnākaraya suggests, lived in Rayigama.³

The keen interest taken by Vīrabāhu (yuvarāja) to eliminate Vīra Alakēśvara, the prabhurāja, raises the question as to whether the title and position of prabhurāja was more prestigious than those of the yuvarāja. The term prabhurāja may be translated literally as 'noble king' but what actually was designated by it is difficult to ascertain. The Nikāya Saṅgrahaya, in order to justify the title borne by the Alakēśvaras, refers to five categories of persons who are eligible to use the title rāja. They are Dīpādhirāja (ruler

1. Somaratna, op.cit., p.111.

2. May.Sand., vv. 20-21; Nks., p.24; Somaratna, op.cit., pp.108-109.

3. Srk., p.294.

of the Island), Māṇḍalika rāja (ruler of a district), Pradeśarāja (ruler of a province), Antarabhogika rāja (feudatory noble) and Anusāsaka rāja (councillor).¹ From the history of the prabhurājas it is evident that they were not joint kings who shared power with the reigning king, nor were they yuvarājas. But they lived in Rayigama while the reigning king was at Gampola. This leads one to the suggestion that the term prabhurāja may have corresponded to Māṇḍalika rāja, a district ruler, who was second in rank only to the reigning king. Their secondary position too was nominal for, as has been stated earlier, they sometimes reduced the king to a mere shadow by gaining actual control of the affairs of the country. In the circumstances it is quite understandable why Vīrabāhu, the yuvarāja, rose against the prabhurāja and took over his position. He no doubt would have been motivated by the desire to wield the actual authority over the Island.

It is worthy of note that the Cūlavamsa makes no mention of these rivalries among the members of the Alakēśvara family but simply states that a man called Vīrabāhu attained royal dignity (pāpunitvāna rajjam) after Bhuvanekabāhu died having

1. Nks., p.24; see also Srk., p.293.

reigned for twenty years.¹ This detail has been repeated in the Narendracaritāvalōkanapradīpikāva which borrowed material from the Cūlavamsa.² However, this information does not seem to rest on a valid foundation. The Nikāya Saṅgrahaya records that Vīrabāhu āpāna, the suhurubaḍu of king Bhuvanekabāhu, attained the position of raja in his reign.³ This is a contemporary work, for it tells us that it was completed in the twenty fifth year of the reign, when the king was living in Gampola.⁴ This evidence does not mean that Vīrabāhu became the sovereign lord of the country, for as both Jayatilaka and Somaratna have pointed out, there are some instances in which the dignitaries of the kingdom too were referred to as raja.⁵ The term rajatān pat in the Nikāya Saṅgrahaya may therefore be taken to mean that Vīrabāhu became the prabhurāja which in fact was the case.

1. Cv., 91.13-14.

2. Ed., C.A.Hevavitarana, Colombo, 1926, p.134. Buddhadatta assumed that Vīrabāhu assumed the position of raja after twenty years of Bhuvanekabāhu's reign while the latter was still alive. UCR., VIII, p.176; Somaratna, op.cit., pp.89-90.

3. Nks., p.24.

4. Ibid., p.26.

5. Sēnālankādhikāra is referred to as raja in the Lankātilaka Inscription. Sin.Sa.Lipi., p.125; UCR., XVIII, no.1, 1960, pp.4-14. Alakēsvara too, is referred to in the Niyangampāya document as raja while the reigning king, Vikramabāhu is mentioned in it. Br.Mus.Ms., Or.6606(165) folio 1; Sin.Sa.Lipi., pp.125-26. Somaratna, op.cit., pp.109-11.

Vīrabāhu remained in the office of prabhurāja for less than nine years.¹ Although the measures taken by him for the furtherance of the Order are vividly described,² no reference to his benefactions towards the Tooth Relic is found in contemporary or near contemporary works. The Sinhala Daḷadā Vamsaya however, credits him with the worship accorded to the Tooth Relic.³ This may perhaps be possible but as has been stated earlier,⁴ its authenticity remains somewhat doubtful as there is no confirmation of this detail by other sources.

Vīrabāhu was succeeded by his son Vijaya Āpā who in turn was succeeded by Tunayesa. The duration of their office is yet uncertain.⁵ Meanwhile, Vīra Alakēśvara, who remained in India⁶ as long as Vīrabāhu and Vijaya Āpā were in power, returned in B.E. 1944 (A.D.1400-01), with the aid of a South Indian ruler, probably Vijayanagara, defeated Vīrabāhu's second son Tunayesa and took power.⁷ This time he held power for twelve years⁸

-
1. Ibid., p.112; According to the Vatuvatte Pemananda edition of the Rājāvaliya it lasted for twenty years while according to the Rājaratnākaraya his rule lasted only for twelve years. V.Rjv., p.74; Rrk., p.47.
 2. Nks., pp.24-26.
 3. Sin.DalV., p.51.
 4. See above, p.49.
 5. Somaratna, op.cit., pp.112-14.
 6. The Saddharmaratnākaraya states that he was in exile, 'desāntara gatava'. Srk., p.294.
 7. Somaratna, op.cit., pp.113-14.
 8. Srk., p.294; UHC., I, pt.II, p.650.

until he ultimately came into conflict with the Chinese mission led by Cheng-Ho.

The Chinese sources furnish us with some information on the conflict between Vīra Alakēśvara and Cheng-Ho. The Pien-i-tien states that the king of Ceylon during this period was A-lie-kou-nai-enl,¹ while the Ming-Shih refers to the same person as Ya-lieh-ku-nai-erh.² These names can easily be identified with Vīra Alakēśvara of the Saddharmaratnākara for according to this work, it was he who had dealings with the Chinese.³ It appears that he was known to the Chinese by his family name or rather by its Tamil equivalent Alagakkōnāra.⁴

Alagakkōnāra is described in the Pien-i-tien as one who observed heretical practices and did not observe the teachings of the Buddha. He also did not worship the sacred Tooth Relic of the Buddha which was enshrined in a magnificent building near the palace. He was cruel to his subjects too. The Pien-i-tien further states that Cheng-Ho, during his first expedition, arrived in the Island with pious offerings and made an attempt to persuade A-lie-kou-nai-enl to follow the teachings of the Buddha and give up heretical practices. The king felt irritated and

1. JRAS(CB)., XXIV, p.98.

2. Ibid., p.119.

3. Srk., p.294.

4. Somaratna, op.cit., p.126.

seemed determined to use force against the Chinese. Realizing the danger of the situation, Cheng-Ho withdrew and returned to his junks.¹

In his second expedition² in A.D.1411 it is said that Cheng-Ho brought presents from the Chinese emperor but this time Vīra Alakēśvara was more hostile than he had been on the first occasion. He sent 50,000 armed men to block the way of Cheng-Ho while other troops were charged to plunder the ships. Word of these preparations however, leaked from some underlings of Alagakkōnāra; and subsequently Cheng-Ho managed to secure his ships, make a sudden attack on the capital with 3000 men, and take possession of it. There he fought with the Sinhalese troops for six days but finally escaped to his ships with Alagakkōnāra taken captive.³ He then embarked after paying homage to the Tooth Relic of the Buddha.⁴ Fei-Hsin, who most probably was a member of Cheng-Ho's crew, furnishes us with a similar account concerning this event.⁵ The Sinhalese sources too, though they do not state that Alagakkōnāra was a heretic or a tyrant, record the memories of the tradition concerning his

1. JRAS (CB)., XXIV, pp.98, 119.

2. This was officially the third expedition.

3. His wife, children and the chiefs of the state too were captured. Toung-pao, XXX, 1933, p.280; JRAS., 1951, p.19.

4. JRAS (CB)., XXIV, pp.98-99; UCHC., I, pt.II, pp.651-52.

5. Toung-pao., XVI, 1916, pp.381-83; JSEAH., V, no.2, p.31.

capture.¹ The Saddharmaratnākara, especially, tersely states that 'he was caught in a Chinese stratagem as a result of a past karma'.²

If the foregoing account of the Pien-i-tien is taken at its face value it would follow that the main cause behind the encounter between the Chinese and A-lie-kou-nai-enl was the Chinese attempt to convert the latter to Buddhism. This was necessary as A-lie-kou-nai-enl was a tyrant and heretic who did not respect the law of the Buddha and worship the Tooth Relic. However, one has to be very cautious about accepting this reason. Firstly it finds no confirmation in any of the Sinhalese works. Secondly, since the Sinhalese rulers were traditionally believed to have been the guardians of Buddhism and Vīra Alakēśvara especially is not described as a heretic in other sources, one may wonder why the Chinese should take the initiative in converting such a person to Buddhism. This raises the doubt as to whether Vīra Alakēśvara actually deserves such an accusation from the Chinese or whether it was a deliberate attempt of the Chinese to blacken his character. An analysis of the motives behind the Chinese expeditions of the period and the nature of the Sinhalese sources may help to determine whether or not the accusation found in the Chinese annals is justifiable.

-
1. Srk., p.294; Rjv., p.46; Alak.Yuddh., p.19; see also, Couto's account in JRAS (CB)., XX, p.67.
 2. Srk., p.294.

In his interesting study of the motives of Chinese voyages in the early fifteenth century, Needham draws our attention to the main considerations of the Chinese expeditions. These voyages were made in the pretext of a search for a deposed Chinese emperor but their main concern was to impress upon foreign countries the idea of China as the predominant political and cultural power. The envoys who came to the domains of the rulers of the east Asian archipelago, Malaya and Africa, gave them rich presents and induced them to acknowledge the nominal suzerainty or overlordship of the Chinese emperor. The rulers of these domains were expected to despatch missions bearing tribute to the Chinese court. By this means a great deal of state trading was carried on while at the same time the activities of private traders were fostered and rarities of all kinds were collected for the imperial coffers.¹

Although we do not possess sufficient evidence to determine the exact motives behind Cheng-Ho's activities in Ceylon, it is not unlikely that his mission too was actuated by the prevailing conditions mentioned above. Of these, the inducement of political authority and especially the re-opening of Chinese trade contacts with Ceylon must have been predominant. The latter in fact gains further strength from two other considerations.

1. Joseph Needham, Science and Civilization in China, Vol. IV, Cambridge, 1971, pp. 488-89.

One is the development of trade contacts with Majapahit Java for which king Paramēśvara and the port of Malacca were selected by the Chinese as the most promising means of accomplishing their ends.¹ This suggests that opening trade contacts was one of the considerations of Cheng-Ho's expeditions. The other is the importance of the geographical situation of Ceylon in the maritime trade between western Asia and China. Ceylon was known to the Chinese as an important commercial centre as early as the fourth century A.D. The location of Ceylon in the Indian Ocean naturally involved it in maritime trade even in later centuries. A passage appearing in the Tai-ping-yu-lan compiled in the late tenth century, states that cannabar, mercury, turmeric, storax, costus and such other commodities are the products of Ceylon (Shih-Tsu).² The importance of Ceylon doubtless would have been increased when the central Asian trade routes were closed by Timur (Tamerlane) and for that reason it is not surprising that Cheng-Ho took a keen interest in opening commercial contacts with Ceylon.³

It would thus appear that the reason given in the Pien-i-tien for the encounter between Cheng-Ho and Vira Alakēśvara does not find any corroboration from Chinese motives of the period.

-
1. E.O.Reischauer and J.K.Fairbank, East Asia; the Great Tradition, p.321.
 2. O.W.Wolters, Early Indonesian Commerce, New York, 1967, pp.80-81.
 3. Somaratna, op.cit., p.128.

Cheng-Ho probably came to establish trade contacts with Ceylon, but since he is said to have brought about 28,000 men in sixty two junks, Vīra Alakēśvara must have mistaken the Chinese mission for an invasion and taken every possible step to avoid a confrontation. The resistance of Vīra Alakēśvara is very likely to have been the reason which led Cheng-Ho to launch an attack on the Sinhalese kingdom which resulted in the capture of the former together with his family and valuables. It seems reasonable therefore to hold that Cheng-Ho attempted to enforce the Chinese authority in Ceylon as he did in Palembang in A.D.1406 and north-western Sumatra in 1413/14,¹ where he was also unable to establish friendly relations.

Some scholars, however, justify the allegations found in the Ming annals in view of the fact that 'not a single good word is said about Vīra Alakēśvara' in the literary sources of the period.² There is no record that could definitely be ascribed to the period, i.e. A.D. 1400-11, during which Vīra Alakēśvara was the prabhurāja of Ceylon. The sources which in fact make references to him belong to periods either before or after his office. Of these the main literary works which contain historical data for this period are the Nikāya Saṅgrahaya,

1. Needham, op.cit., pp.515-16.

2. UCHC., I, pt.II, p.651; Somaratna, op.cit., p.127.

Saddharmaratnākaraya, Alakēśvara Yuddhaya, Rājāvaliya and many such works as the Pārakumbā Sirita and the Sandēśa poems written during the reign of Parākramabāhu VI. The Nikāya Saṅgrahaya, which gives a glowing account of the achievements of Niśśaṅka Alakēśvara and Vīrabāhu, does not even mention Vīra Alakēśvara. The reason for the omission of his name from this work is quite obvious for it was written during the reign of Bhuvanekabāhu V while Vīrabāhu, the younger brother and rival of Vīra Alakēśvara was holding the office of prabhūrāja.¹ The Saddharmaratnākaraya, written by a pupil of the author of the Nikāya Saṅgrahaya, under the patronage of Parākramabāhu VI does mention Vīra Alakēśvara but only shows that the latter fell a victim to a Chinese stratagem.² Further, the Pārakumbā Sirita and the Sandēśas written during the reign of the same king do not make any mention of Vīra Alakēśvara. This is quite understandable for these works were panegyrics and there was therefore no motive for the authors to pay attention to anything other than the affairs of the reigning king. Besides, Parākramabāhu, the hero and patron of all these works, was a rival of Vīra Alakēśvara as the latter is said to have made every attempt to exterminate the former.³ One cannot

1. Nks., pp.1, 24-26.

2. Srk., pp.72, 294.

3. According to the Rājāvaliya Vīra Alakēśvara tried every possible means to exterminate Parākramabāhu and his brother, after the death of their father who is believed to have been

(Contd. on next page.....)

therefore expect praise to be given to Vīra Alakēśvara by poets and writers who received the patronage of his opponents. In addition, the fact that he was unable to resist the Chinese invasion must have been another factor which earned the antipathy of these authors towards Vīra Alakēśvara. The other two works, the Alakēśvara Yuddhaya and the Rājāvaliya, written at least a century after Vīra Alakēśvara, appear to have confused the events of the period. They even fail to mention him by name. That too, suggest that the authors of these works were, for some reason best known to them, were unfair to him.

On the other hand, if one accepts the identification of Vīra Alakēśvara¹ with Dēvamantrīśvara and Devhimi mentioned in the Sagama Inscription² and the Mayura Sandēśaya³ respectively, the allegation that 'not a single good word is said about him' does not hold much ground. In the Sagama inscription, Dēvamantrīśvara, together with his brother Niśśaṅka Alakēśvara, is described as a man who used his efforts to promote the cause of Buddhism.⁴ The Mayura Sandēśaya in more glowing terms

(.....contd. from previous page)

killed in battle when Vīra Alakēśvara came to Ceylon after his exile. Sunetrādēvi, Parākramabāhu's mother, took refuge in the Vīdāgama temple when Alakēśvara's soldiers were in the hunt for them. The trio however, escaped with great difficulty. Rjv., p.47; Couto in JRAS(CB)., XX, p.67; Somaratna, op.cit., pp.113, 116-17.

1. Ibid., pp.108-09.
2. JRAS(CB)., XXII, no.65, 1912, pp.364-65.
3. May.Sand., VV, 66-69.
4. JRAS(CB)., XXII, no.65, 1912, pp.364-65.

states that Devhimi-māti was someone who constantly venerated the Triple Gems (tunuruvan) of the world, a Bodhisatva and a wishing tree.¹ If these compliments are accepted at their face value, it would follow that Vīra Alakēśvara was a pious Buddhist who won the favour of the people before he attained the position of prabhurāja, as these records date from a period when his brother, Niśśaṅka Alakēśvara, was holding that office.

The only evidence which would suggest that Vīra Alakēśvara changed his attitude towards Buddhism after he became prabhurāja is the above mentioned passages of the Pien-i-tien and the Ming-Shih.² Commenting on these accusations of the Chinese works concerning the attitude of Vīra Alakēśvara, Somaratna remarks that they may well have been based on facts. He thinks it is possible that Vīra Alakēśvara, after he seized power in A.D. 1400/01, would have adopted a policy contrary to that of his rival brother, Vīrabāhu, who was a great benefactor of Buddhism.³ But a note of caution is needed in accepting this argument for it is hardly imaginable that Vīra Alakēśvara should change his attitude towards religion simply because his rival was a Buddhist. In fact, it was a well known practice in Ceylon that the ruler should always be a guardian of Buddhism.

1. May.Sand., VV, 66-69.

2. See above, pp.219-20.

3. Somaratna, op.cit., pp.126-27; Paranavitana holds a similar view. UCHC., I, pt.II, p.651.

for otherwise he could not get popular support, and for that reason it is hardly believable that Vīra Alakēśvara acted against this policy. The fact that he remained in the office of Prabhurāja for twelve years¹ without any opposition can also be taken as substantial evidence that he was not wholly deprived of popular support.

Moreover, the Chinese Annals mention that the Tooth Relic was kept in a building next to the king's palace. If Vīra Alakēśvara actually did not respect the Tooth Relic, as disclosed by the Chinese records, it is again difficult to understand why the custodians of the Tooth Relic did not remove it from the capital as they had done on previous occasions.² This too may lead one to assume that the evidence supplied by the Chinese cannot be taken as decisive in determining Vīra Alakēśvara's attitude towards Buddhism.

It should be added, however, that the above mentioned facts can be interpreted in a different manner. If we agree with Somaratna and take it for granted that Vīra Alakēśvara changed his attitude towards religion it is possible to suggest a reason for such a change. It is clear that he lived in India as an exile and launched his attack on Ceylon with the help he received from a South Indian ruler, probably Vijayanagara.³

-
1. Somaratna, op.cit., p.115.
 2. See above, pp.172, 188.
 3. Somaratna, op.cit., pp.113-14.

It is possible that he became an adherent of another religion, probably Hinduism, or had to convert himself to qualify for the aid he received from South India. In that case his change of attitude would be quite understandable.

Nevertheless it would seem unlikely that he should have possessed the Tooth Relic while being an adherent of a religion other than Buddhism. Of course, it might be suggested that Vīra Alakēśvara forcibly took possession of the Tooth Relic in order to strengthen his claims to power as this relic, since the beginning of the Polonnaruva period had been the palladium of the Sinhalese royalty. But it would seem strange that he should have managed to wield his authority for twelve years without any opposition while being a heretic and possessing through coercion the most coveted religious object of the Sinhalese.¹

Thus it would appear that there is no valid reason to suggest that Vīra Alakēśvara changed his attitude towards religion after he captured power from Tunayesa. Our conclusion, therefore, is that Vīra Alakēśvara was not a heretic or a tyrant as mentioned in the Chinese Annals but a man who bravely resisted the Chinese aggressor who tried to impose Chinese

1. One has to compare his rule with that of Māgha in order to understand the difficulty which a heretic has to face.

authority in Ceylon, and that the accusations regarding his character were meant as a justification of Cheng-Ho's activities in Ceylon.

Having captured Vira Alakēśvara, Cheng-Ho is said to have carried away the Tooth Relic together with the captives.¹ A commentary to the Si-yu-ki states that one of the objects carried away by Cheng-Ho, was the Tooth Relic of the Buddha.² However, one has to be cautious in accepting this detail for, unlike the capture of the Tooth Relic by Arya Cakravarti, none of the Ceylonese sources furnishes any corroborative evidence to this effect. This silence makes one doubt the validity of the Chinese sources regarding the capture of the Tooth Relic. In fact, the authorities of the present Tooth Relic Temple at Kandy do not accept these accounts. According to them the Tooth Relic has never been taken away since it was brought to Ceylon.³ They think that a replica of the Tooth might have been captured by the invader as the genuine Tooth Relic was never kept in the relic casket during periods of danger. In support of this view they cite the keeping of a replica of the

1. JRAS(CB)., vol.XXIV, pp.98-99.

2. J.E.Tenant, Ceylon (An account of the Island), London, 1860, I, pt.V, pp.622-24.

3. This again seems to be an exaggeration for it is evident that Arya Cakravarti captured the relic from Yāpahuva. See above, p.200.

Tooth Relic in the relic casket during the Second World War.¹
 In the circumstances it is hardly possible to arrive at a definite conclusion at our present state of knowledge, as to whether the Chinese captured the Tooth Relic or one of its replicas or if it had actually been captured when was it brought back to Ceylon. We once again hear about the relic after Parākramabāhu VI had become king of Kōṭṭē.

A large number of literary sources ascribed to the reign of Parākramabāhu VI provide valuable information on the worship accorded by this ruler to the Tooth Relic. The Saddharmaratnākaraya furnishes us with the information that Parākramabāhu built a three-storeyed pāsāda and a large pavilion (mahatvū mandapāyak) for the Relic.² This building, as the Parevi Sandēśaya puts it, was a firm, tall and splendid one.³ It had a golden tiara (rankot)⁴ and its inside was decorated with paintings.⁵ Although they make no reference to the internal decorations, the Rājaratnākaraya and the Cūlavamsa⁶ confirm the detail that the Relic temple was of three storeys.

1. Sabaragamuvē Pāraṇi Liyavili, ed. K.Nānavimāla, 1942, pp.35-36; Sorata, Dal.S., Introduction, pp.lviii-lxi. These two works record similar instances.

2. Srk., p.295.

3. Par.Sand., V, 42.

4. Srk., p.295; Gir.Sand., V, 51.

5. Srk., p.295.

6. Rrk., p.46; Cv., 91.17, see also Ktk.Sng., p.32; The Alakēśvara Yuddhaya simply mentions that the king built a relic temple (Alak.Yuddh; p.21).

The building of a new relic temple by Parākramabāhu suggests that the former temple of the Tooth at Kōṭṭē which is referred to in the Chinese annals, was not in a suitable condition during this time to house the Tooth Relic. The reasons which would have accounted for the dilapidation of the temple is not apparent but two possibilities may be suggested in this connexion. One is that the relic temple had been destroyed probably by the Chinese. Their encounter in Kōṭṭē with Vīra Alakēśvara is said to have lasted for six days¹ and it is not impossible that they laid waste the city during this period. The other is that if by any chance the Relic had been captured by the Chinese or removed to a safer place by its custodians no one would have worried about the temple as it contained no relic.² It is, however, difficult to ascertain whether one or the other or both these reasons were instrumental in causing the dilapidation of the temple.

In addition to the building of a relic temple, Parākramabāhu is credited in our sources with numerous offerings made to the Relic. The Saddharmaratnākaraya mentions that this king made many caskets of jewels and gold,³ a detail corroborated by both contemporary and later works.⁴ He also

1. JRAS(CB)., XXIV, p.99; UCHC., I, pt.II, pp.651-52.

2. For similar occasions see above, p. 139.

3. Srk., p.295.

4. Par.Sand., V.42; Cv., 91.18-19.

celebrated relic festivals in the same manner as did the former kings of Ceylon.¹

The fame of the Tooth Relic as well as the worship accorded to it by Parākramabāhu seems to have spread overseas too. Harvey draws our attention to an offering of gold and gems made to the Relic in A.D. 1456 by king Narapati of Ava.² The Kalyāṇi Inscriptions record that Parākramabāhu used to wear a replica of the Tooth Relic embellished with a topaz and a diamond.³ Whether this replica was considered an ornament or a device for protection is not certain but at the least it is clear that Parākramabāhu treated the Relic with much honour. Further the Jinakālamālī states that the Siamese monks who received higher ordination at Kālaṇiya during the reign of this king, worshipped the Relic after the ordination ceremony.⁴

After the reference to the homage paid by Parākramabāhu VI to the Tooth Relic, the Cūlavamsa provides no further information on the Relic until the end of the period under discussion. The construction of the history of the Tooth Relic during the next 37 years therefore, depends mainly on contemporary inscriptions both native and foreign and on literary sources of a much later date.

1. Ibid., 91.20-21.

2. G.E.Harvey, History of Burma, London, 1967, p.100; UCHC., I, pt.II, pp.755-56.

3. Kalyāṇi Inscriptions, Ind.Ant., XXII, 1893, p.45.

4. Jkm., p.93.

Some information on the Tooth Relic is found in the Gaḍalādeniya Slab Pillar Inscription, ascribed to the reign of Jayavīra Parākramabāhu (A.D.1467-69).¹ This epigraph, while recording an amnesty granted to a person called Mēnavara Tunayan and the people of the five countries on the subjugation of the hill country, states that the king faithfully promised in the presence of the Tooth Relic that in the future, any losses of property, limb or life should not be inflicted upon the people of that country.² This detail, as will be discussed elsewhere,³ is of fundamental importance for our study for this is the first recorded instance in which a king, in the presence of the Tooth Relic, made a solemn promise concerning a political matter. At the least it establishes that Jayavīra Parākramabāhu was in possession of the Relic and that he showed great respect towards it. This view is confirmed by the Sinhalā Daḷadā Vaṃsaya.⁴

The next reference to the Tooth Relic is found in the reign of Bhuvanekabāhu VI, the successor of Jayavīra Parākramabāhu. The Dādigama Slab Inscription of Bhuvanekabāhu records that an amnesty was granted to the people of the four

-
1. See above, pp. 77-78.
 2. Ep.Zeyl., IV, p.24.
 3. See below, p.309 ff.
 4. Sin.Dal.V., p.52.

kōrales in the name of the Tooth and the Bowl Relics.¹ As in the case of his predecessor, the utilization of the Relic by Bhuvanekabāhu for a political purpose is a clear indication of its importance in the religious as well as political sphere and the honours paid to it by the king.

The Kalyāṇi Inscriptions, while confirming the view that Bhuvanekabāhu VI was a patron of the Tooth Relic, provide further information on the homage paid to it by king Dhammaceti of Pegu, the Burmese contemporary of the Ceylonese king. According to this epigraph king Dhammaceti had doubts about the validity of the higher ordination of the bhikkhus in his own country. He wished, therefore, to introduce into southern Burma, the unbroken Mahāvihāra succession from Ceylon. In order to achieve this end, he sent two groups of monks with costly presents to the Sinhalese king and the Saṅgha as well as valuable offerings to the Tooth Relic. He also requested the Sinhalese mahātheras to make arrangements in order to grant permission to the Burmese monks to venerate and make offerings to the Tooth Relic.² In response to this request, the Sinhalese

1. Ep.Zeyl., III, pp.279-80.

2. 'Kalyāṇi Inscriptions', Ind.Ant., XXII, 1893, pp.40-41.

king is said to have caused the Relic temple to be decorated and then exhibited the Relic preserved in a golden receptacle, in the presence of the Sinhalese monks. The offerings of the Burmese king too were presented on this occasion.¹

Harvey directs our attention to another remarkable offering made by a Burmese king in the reign of Bhuvanekabāhu VI. According to him, king Tihathura of Ava (A.D. 1469-81) sent a broom to sweep the temple of the Tooth Relic at Kandy² in A.D.1474.³ This broom is said to have made of the hair of the king and the queen while its handle was studded with gems.⁴ Taken together, these pieces of evidence clearly indicate that the Burmese rulers during the period took a keen interest in the worship of the Tooth Relic.

Bhuvanekabāhu's reign came to an end in A.D.1478.⁵ After him, there were two more kings in Kōṭṭē who come within the scope of this study. The Sinhala Daladā Vamsaya states that one of them, Paṇḍita Parākramabāhu VII (A.D.1478-84) was a patron of the Tooth Relic.⁶ This work, may perhaps have recorded as it often did a tradition based on a valid foundation,

-
1. Ibid., p.43.
 2. This may perhaps be a later addition for the Tooth Relic was at Kōṭṭē during this period as revealed by other sources.
 3. Harvey, op.cit., p.101.
 4. Ibid., p.101.
 5. A.D.1477 according to Somaratna, op.cit., p.266.
 6. Sin.Dal.V., p.53.

but since finds no confirmation in other sources, its authenticity is doubtful on this occasion. This is the last reference to the Tooth Relic in the period selected for our study.

IV

Reasons for the Relic's Importance

From the eleventh century onwards, the Tooth Relic seems to have been the most prominent object of worship in Ceylonese Buddhism. Unlike the rulers of the previous period, the rulers of these five centuries took special care in the construction of relic temples, and celebration of relic festivals¹ while some of them showed their faith by the dedication to the Relic, of their children,² state dignitaries³ and even the sovereignty of the Island.⁴ On many an occasion the chronicler too gives prominence to the affairs of the Relic, sometimes to the extent that even important political events are pushed to the background.⁵ Further he devotes great attention to the Relic and spends a considerable number of verses⁶ to narrate its affairs. These indications suggest that

1. See above, pp. 164, 184-86, 191-92, etc.

2. Ep.Zeyl., II, pp.113, 173.

3. Cv., 86.55-57.

4. Ibid., 85.109-17;

5. Cv., 74.181 ff; see above, p.26.

6. Ibid., 73.124-35; 74.181-248; 81.17-39; 82.5-53; 85.1-37; 88.10-16; 89.13-46, etc.

the Tooth Relic gained a supreme position in the religious sphere during the Polonnaruva and subsequent periods. This importance is remarkable especially when compared with the position of the Relic during the Anurādhapura period. Four reasons may be suggested to explain this situation.

One is the prevalence of friendly relations among the three nikāyas or fraternities¹ of the Buddhist Order in Ceylon from the ninth century onwards. Reference has been made above² to the schisms of the Order which were instrumental in the victimization of the Tooth Relic. Such attempts were carried out by the Mahāvihāravāsins who wielded a greater influence in the religious sphere. But from the ninth century onwards, there appear signs of mutual tolerance among the three fraternities. The monks of these nikāyas were working in collaboration to mediate in political matters in the reigns of Sena II, Udaya III, Gajabāhu II, and Parākramabāhu I.³ There is evidence to show that they assembled together even for matters concerning religion from as early as the tenth century. The Cūlavamsa mentions a recitation of Paritta by monks of the three nikāyas, a ceremony arranged by Kassapa V (A.D.914-23) to ward off the danger of plague and bad harvest.⁴ Although this

-
1. The Mahāvihāra, Abhayagiri and Jētavana.
 2. See above, pp.22 ff, 159-60.
 3. Cv., 51.13-14; 53.24; 70.179-81, 328 ff.
 4. Ibid., 52.80.

should not necessarily be taken to mean that the three nikāyas assembled together for the ceremony there are clearer examples from the later history. Sena IV, (A.D.954-56) who according to the Cūlavamsa was a scholar versed in the teachings of the Buddha, used to explain the scriptures to the monks of the three nikāyas who assembled in the Lōhapāsāda.¹ The Lōhapāsāda, as we know, was a centre affiliated to the Mahāvihāra and the assembly of the monks of the other two fraternities there clearly suggests a friendly intercourse among them. Further evidence in this connexion is forthcoming from an inscription ascribed to the last quarter of the tenth century, found at the site of the Mahāpāli Alms Hall. This inscription records a decision taken by all the monks who received alms at the Mahāpāli to donate their share of rice to defray the cost of repairs at the stūpa at the Jetavana monastery.² Mahāpāli in all probability was the alms hall for the monks of every nikāya. The consent given by them to donate their shares clearly indicates that their relations have, by this time, developed to the extent that they supported each other in times of difficulty. This feeling of solidarity would have been strengthened during and after the period of

1. Ibid., 54.4.

2. Ep.Zeyl., III, p.132.

Cōla rule when Saivism gained popularity in the Island.¹
 The dedications made by rulers collectively to all nikāyas,²
 and the concerted action taken by the monks to resist the
 threats to the religion,³ together with their collective attempts
 to mediate in political matters⁴ during the Polonnaru period,
 lend further support to this view.

There is further evidence which suggests that during the
 latter half of the Anurādhapura period, the Mahāvihāra came to
 be influenced by the so called 'heretical' or unorthodox
 schools of Buddhism. The Dampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya which was
 written by 'the great king Abhā Salamevan' i.e. Kassapa V⁵
 (A.D.914-23) who is hailed in the Cūlavamsa, as an ideal follower
 of the Theravāda teachings, bears Tantric influence. The
 comments of the Cūlavamsa on Kassapa i.e. a 'pious' ruler,
 'wise as one who possesses supernatural powers', 'a preacher of
 the true doctrine', 'adroit in what is right and not right',
 'stood firm in the teachings of the leader on the path of
 deliverance and could not be shaken by all storms of other
 opinions' etc.,⁶ make it clear that his opinions were at least
 acceptable to the Mahāvihāra if they did not actually represent
 the views of the latter. Commenting on a passage from the

-
1. Gunawardhana, op.cit., p.483.
 2. Cv., 60.11-14.
 3. Ibid., 61.58-61.
 4. See above, p.238 fn.3.
 5. DAG., p.290; Ep.Zeyl., II, p.30, II, A.7-11, p.41, II, A.9-19; Gunawardhana, op.cit., p.484.
 6. Cv., 52.38-41; Gunawardhana, op.cit., pp.484-85.

Devadattathera Vatthu, the author of this work states that the Buddha possessed a vajrakāya (a diamond body) and could not therefore be harmed by enemy designs.¹ The concept of the vajrakāya found herein, according to Gunavardhana, was a Tantric concept.² Again the pillar capitals of the so called Daḷadā Māligāva (Tooth Relic Temple) are ornamented with representations of the vajra.³ Although the use of this symbol as a decorative motif need not necessarily indicate associations with Tantrism, when considered in the light of the evidence from the Dampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya, it may represent Tantric influence at the Mahāvihāra.⁴ Gunavardhana further emphasizes that the Mahāvihāra came to be influenced by the teachings of the Abhayagiri-nikāya, as can be concluded from two commentarial works written after the time of the unification of the Saṅgha.⁵

Thus taken together, all these indications point to the fact that there was a mutual understanding and a friendly relationship between the three nikāyas since the ninth century and that there were influences of the views held by the Abhayagiri-vāsins in the Mahāvihāra. These cordial relations reached a climax by the unification of the Saṅgha by Parākramabāhu I. This unification brought together the Saṅgha

-
1. DAG., pp.53-54.
 2. Gunavardhana, op.cit., pp.485-87.
 3. CJS(G)., II, pp.80-81, plates, LII, LIII; ARASC., 1895, p.3.
 4. Gunavardhana, op.cit., pp.487-88.
 5. Ibid., pp.488-90.

which had been divided for 1254 years¹ and persuaded the leading monks of the eight fraternities which by this time, had replaced the three nikāyas, to live at the same monastery and to accept a common leader (mahāsāmi).² The creation of the post of mahāsāmi is particularly noteworthy for this is the first time in the history of Ceylon that the Saṅgha was organized under a single leader which no doubt amounted to a further development of the friendly relationship that had prevailed since the tenth century.

Although the Cūlavamsa claims that Parākramabāhu's unification of the Saṅgha brought an end to the factional strife of the Order³ there is reason to believe that the unification did not last long. The Daṁbulla Cave Inscription of Nissankamalla records that the king reconciled the disputes among the monks of the three nikāyas.⁴ The Pūjāvaliya states that Vijayabāhu III established unity among the Saṅgha (bohō davasak asamaṅgavū saṅghayā samaṅga koṭa),⁵ a detail corroborated by the Cūlavamsa and the Nikāya Saṅgrahaya.⁶ A

1. Ep.Zeyl., II, p.268, II, lines 4-5, p.269, II, lines 12-13.

2. Gunavardhana, op.cit., p.500.

3. Cv., 73.20-22.

4. Ep.Zeyl., I, p.131, II, line 21; Gunavardhana, op.cit., pp.500-01.

5. Pjv., p.27.

6. Cv., 81.46-47; Nks., p.20.

similar act of reconciliation was undertaken by his son Parākramabāhu II,¹ which lasted for nearly a century. Such attempts to arrest the forces of degeneration in the sāsana were made in later times too.² However, all these reconciliations and purifications suggest that the sāsana was easily vulnerable to the forces of degeneration but the counter measures to arrest them, taken frequently by the rulers and dignitaries, saved the sāsana from further deterioration. These dissensions therefore, did not amount to villifications and victimizations in the Order such as those which happened in the Anurādhapura period.

In keeping with the development of mutual understanding the community of monks seems to have come to a compromise and started to venerate equally the objects entrusted to different fraternities in the early period. Particularly noteworthy in this connexion is the close association of the Tooth Relic and the Bowl Relic after the beginning of the Polonnaruva kingdom. In the Anurādhapura period, the Tooth Relic was under the custodianship of the Abhayagiri; but, apart from the detail that Devānampīya Tissa kept the Bowl Relic in his palace,³

-
1. Cv., 84.9-10; 87.32; Nks., pp.20-21.
 2. Nks., pp.22, 24, 26; N.Ratnapala, The Katikāvatas, München, 1971, p.226. For detailed discussions of the reforms of the Saṅgha from A.D.1200 onwards see, Y. Dhammavisuddhi, op.cit., pp.412-46; H.B.M.İlangasinha, op.cit., p.165 ff.
 3. Mv., 20.13.

nowhere is it mentioned in whose custody the latter relic was. Nevertheless, the facts that the Bowl Relic was brought to Ceylon at a time when the Mahāvihāra was the only fraternity in Ceylon and that it was used in the ceremonies which were performed during the latter half of the Anurādhapura period to bring down rain¹ give one to understand that the Mahāvihāra had some control over this relic. However, with the beginning of a Sinhalese kingdom in Polonnaruva one would notice that these two relics were kept together and worshipped together,² a situation which continued until the end of the period under survey. Their close association which began with the resurgence of the country after the Coḷa occupation, is a clear indication that the feelings of solidarity between the nikāyas had strengthened by this time and the Saṅgha had started to venerate equally the objects entrusted previously to various fraternities.

Another factor which deserves particular attention at this stage is the attitude of the chronicler towards various religious objects. As has been stated elsewhere, parts two and three of the Cūlavamsa which cover a major part of this study were written at a time when sectarianism in the Order was less pronounced.³ Unlike the author of the first part the

1. See above, pp.121-22.

2. See above, p.167 ff.

3. See above, p.25 ff.

chroniclers of these two parts, provide a well-balanced picture of the worship accorded by rulers to various religious institutions. In addition, it is noteworthy that the Tooth Relic which received less attention from the author of the first part is given a prominent place in these two parts. This kind of treatment may be explained as the result of the unbiased attitude of the chroniclers towards religious objects entrusted previously to various factions, and this in turn reflects the friendly relations of the Saṅgha. The existence of such friendly relations together with the sanctity of the Tooth Relic would no doubt, have enabled the Relic to gain a supreme position in the religious sphere.

It is also not unlikely that the Tooth Relic together with the Bowl, played an important role as a unifying factor in the renascent Sinhalese nationalism during the Coḷa occupation. As has been mentioned earlier, it is not stated where the Tooth Relic was preserved during this period¹ but with the establishment of a Sinhalese kingdom in Polonnaruva, it suddenly came into prominence, even surpassing all important objects and places of worship of the Anurādhapura period. Its sudden rise on this occasion may be explained as a result of the friendly

1. See above, pp.163-64.

relations among the Saṅgha but regrettably there is no evidence to explain the role of the Relic during the Coḷa occupation. One factor which is worthy of consideration in this connexion is the utilization of the Tooth Relic by Vijayabāhu III and Parākramabāhu II in the organization of the Sinhalese resistance to the rule of Māgha.¹ This leads one to assume that the Relic might have been used for such purposes, presumably by Vijayabāhu, during the Coḷa occupation. This view derives further strength from another consideration. The Polonnaruva period, it should be remembered, witnessed a great awakening in every aspect of the Sinhalese society. The idea of kingship evolved to the extent that the rulers openly called themselves Cakkavattis (universal monarchs).² In keeping, perhaps, with this ideal, one of them (Parākramabāhu I) attempted not only to unite the three kingdoms but also to bring foreign nations under his influence.³ There were also attempts to bring Buddhism back to its former glory.⁴ The religious edifices

1. See below, p. 283 ff.

2. Ep.Zeyl., III, p.305; JRAS(CB)., XXVI, no.71, p.57; Ep.Zeyl., II, pp.109, 114, 172; Cv., 72.329.

3. Cv., chapters 73-75; UHC., I, Pt.II, pp.447 ff; Cv., 76.10-35; Ep.Zeyl., III, pp.321-23; UHC., I, pt. II, pp.473-75; Cv., 76.76 ff; UHC., I, pt.II, pp.475-85.

4. Reforms in the Order were made by Vijayabāhu I, Parākramabāhu I and Nissāṅkamalla. Cv., 60.4 ff; 73.18 ff; Ep.Zeyl., I, p.131, II, line 21; For details, see Gunavardhana, op.cit., pp.500-01.

built during this period suggest that there may also have been a tendency to surpass similar structures of the preceding period.¹ Such activities in turn reflect the prosperity and the resurgence of the country after the Cola occupation. It is particularly noteworthy that the Tooth Relic too became the palladium of the Sinhalese kingdom during this period of prosperity. Its possession, as we shall see in the sequel,² became a determining factor of a prince's claim to the throne. This suggests that the importance of the Relic was a part of the new awakening of the Sinhalese nationalism and the importance attached to it may well have been the result of the role it played as a unifying factor during the alien rule. If such was the case, the prominent place it held in both religious and political spheres is quite understandable.

Another factor which certainly contributed towards the importance of the Tooth Relic during this period was its potentiality to produce rain. In ancient civilizations such as the Egyptian, Hebrew and Hittite, the ability to control the natural phenomena was considered a necessary attribute of kingship.³ In times of droughts, bad harvest and other natural

1. UCHC., I, pt.II, p.593 ff.

2. See below, p.264 ff.

3. Henri Frankfort, Kingship and the Gods, A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Religion as the Integration of Society and Nature, Chicago, 1948, pp.57-58, 215; Ivan Engnell, Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East, Uppsala,

(Contd. on next page...)

or seasonal disasters, the kings were held responsible, for all such disorders were regarded as the magical consequences of the rulers' failure to maintain the moral order.¹ Ancient Ceylon, where civilization flourished mainly in the dry zone, was no exception to this widespread belief. The kings not only took special care in the preservation of water² but also took measures such as the performance of especially designed ceremonies to produce rain. The practice usually followed in the Anurādhapura period was to take round the city the image of either the Buddha or Ananda while the monks chanted paritta and sprinkled water from the Buddha's Alms-Bowl.³ There were also occasions on which the rulers resorted to acts of faith in order to bring down rain⁴ but no reference is found in the chronicle or elsewhere to the Tooth Relic being used for this purpose during the Anurādhapura period.

(.....contd. from previous page)

1943, pp. 36, 68; Myth, Ritual and Kingship, Essays on the Theory and Practice of Kingship in the Ancient Near East and in Israel, ed., S.H.Hooke, Oxford, 1958, pp.27-28, 85, 139, 207-08.

1. Rājatarangani, Transl., M.A.Stein, Westminster, 1900, II, p.31; Jātaka, VI, p.252; U.N.Goshal, A History of Indian Political Ideas, Oxford, 1959, pp.486, 518.
2. Mv., 22.4, 35, 94 ff; 37.47 ff. etc.; UHC., I, pt.I, pp.219-23, 352-59, II, pp.553-58.
3. See above, pp.
4. Mv., 36.74-79.

Apart from a single reference¹ which lends some support to the present belief among the Ceylonese that it rains whenever the Relic is taken out, there is no evidence from the Polonnaruva period to suggest a change in pattern of the rain-making ceremonies of the preceding period. Nevertheless, one would notice that from the reign of Parākramabāhu II onwards, the Tooth Relic had been used in the rain magic instead of the Buddha image, Ananda image or the Bowl Relic. The Cūlavamsa records that there was a drought in Laṅkā during the reign of Parākramabāhu II. When everything was burnt up as a consequence of the drought and a famine was inevitable, the king arranged a festival of offerings for the three sacred objects (Buddha, Dhamma and Saṅgha), the cetiyas, Bō-trees and for such deities as Metteyya. He then made the Saṅgha recite paritta and bear the Tooth Relic round the town in a fitting manner and made a firm resolve that 'the heavens shall rain' which resulted in the bringing of rain.²

-
1. Cv., 74.228-40. In the course of the procession which brought the Relic to Polonnaruva after its recapture from Rohaṇa, the chronicle states that a great cloud unexpectedly gathered and was about to rain so as to disturb the festival. But owing to the power of the king, it poured down rain in the surrounding areas but rained just enough to lay the dust of the ground in the area where the procession was taking place.
 2. Cv., 87.1-10; Pjv., p.41; Rjv., p.45.

The next reference to the prevalence of this practice is forthcoming in the Daladā Sirita. In dealing with the annual celebrations of the Tooth Relic, this work prescribes the manner in which the Relic should be taken out of the relic chamber, taken in procession and exhibited to the people.¹ Then it states that the same ceremony should be performed when the rains fail.² One would notice in this account that the Relic was taken in procession while the monks chanted paritta and sprinkled paritta water in the streets. This indicates that, although differing in some details, the festival prescribed in this work is basically similar to that performed by Parākramabāhu II. No further evidence pointing to such relic festivals is found during the period under consideration, but since it is likely that the regulations of the Daladā Sirita can be dated to an earlier period³ the possibility that it was followed before the Kurunāgala period and perhaps even after that, cannot be completely ruled out.

However, these indications point to the fact that there was a deviation in the rain magic in that the Tooth Relic, during the period under consideration, took over the role of the images of the Buddha and Ananda, and the Bowl Relic. The utilization

-
1. Dal.S., pp.51-53. For details see below, p.402 ff.
 2. Dal.S., p.53, rule 30.
 3. See above, p.37 ff.

of the Relic for this purpose suggests that it was of considerable use for the rulers as a necessary attribute of kingship, i.e. to bring down rain whenever necessary. Thus, in addition to its significance as a unifying factor and the palladium of the Sinhalese kingdom, the potentiality to produce rain would certainly have earned the Relic an added importance in the political sphere.

Hand in hand with this religious and political importance go the mobility of the Tooth Relic and the change of the capitals which combined to give the Relic an added importance. As the chronicle often records, such stationary religious objects and places as the images, stūpas, vihāras and monasteries, attracted the invaders and other impious rulers who were in quest of immediate gains. Daṭhapatissa is said to have plundered the property of the three fraternities and relic temples, broke the golden images and damaged the Thūpārāma to obtain its riches.¹ Similar damage was done by Śri Māra during the reign of Sena I² and by the Coḷa army in the reign of Mahinda V. The latter especially are described in the chronicle as 'blood sucking yakkhas'.³ Vikramabāhu not only plundered the riches of the vihāras at Polonnaruva but also gave some monasteries as dwellings to his foreign soldiers.⁴ The religious

1. Cv., 44.131-34.

2. Ibid, 50.33-36.

3. Ibid., 55.20-21.

4. Ibid., 61.54-57.

institutions of the country suffered even greater hardship during the rule of Māgha.¹

In addition to the frequent destruction and plunder, the religious institutions suffered stage by stage from the negligence of the Sinhalese rulers. After Anurādhapura had been abandoned owing to the invasion of the Coḷas it never again became the capital of Ceylon. In later times, the religious institutions of this city received some attention from the Sinhalese rulers who had Polonnaruva as their capital² but when Polonnaruva too had to be abandoned as a result of the invasion of Māgha the position of Anurādhapura must have become worse. It is evident that the rulers of Daṁbadeṇiya paid some attention to Anurādhapura and Polonnaruva³ but when the capital was shifted again to Kurunāgala these places seem to have lost their significance. In later times, when the capital graduated through the central highlands towards the south-west of Ceylon the religious institutions of Rājaraṭṭha received much less attention from the rulers and devotees probably nothing more than occasional pilgrimages to these places. On the other hand, only a few rulers were powerful enough to wield any actual authority in these areas⁴ after the downfall of the Polonnaruva

1. Ibid., 80.65, 68-69; 88.92-101; Pjv., pp.25-26.

2. Cv., 60.62-63.

3. Pjv., pp.47-49; Cv., 88.80 ff.

4. Parākramabāhu II, Parākramabāhu III. See above, pp.194, 208.

kingdom. This evidently brought decay and destruction in its wake.

It is true that the riches of the Tooth Relic too, were plundered by those who were in search of wealth, and some had to be abandoned owing to the change of capitals. But unlike the stationary objects the mobile character of the Relic helped its custodians to save it, except on one occasion,¹ from all dangers which threatened its existence. Again, since it still remained in the possession of the rulers as in the early centuries, it was always brought to new capitals whenever there was a change of the royal residence. Wherever it was taken, a new relic temple was built and the highest honours were paid because of its religious sanctity and political significance. Thus while many other religious institutions which had been prominent in the early centuries sank into oblivion, the Tooth Relic became, during the period under discussion, the centre of worship for the Sinhalese.

1. See above, p.200.

Chapter V

The Political Significance of the

Tooth Relic, c. A.D. 300-1500

At the end of the rebellion of 1818 when the Sinhalese showed their first resentment to the British rule, the Tooth Relic which had been in the possession of the rebels was captured by the British and was brought to be enshrined again in the relic temple at Kandy. Davy remarks the effects of the capture of the Relic on the inhabitants of the Island in the following words.

'Now (the people said) the English are indeed masters of the country; for they who possess the relic have a right to govern four kingdoms: this, for 2000 years, is the first time the relic was ever taken from us'. According to the first Adikār (prime minister) 'whatever the English might think of the consequences of having taken Kappetiipola, Pilime Talawe and Maḍugalle, in his opinion, and in the opinion of the people in general, the taking of the relic was of infinitely more moment'.¹

This account, it would seem, underlines two important factors. One is that the capture of the Relic placed the English on a firm footing to rule the country. The other is that the loss of the Relic was instrumental in the failure of

1. John Davy, An Account of the Interior of Ceylon and of its Inhabitants with Travels in that Island, CHJ, XVI, Dehiwala, 1969, p.275.

the rebellion. These factors indicate the political significance of the Tooth Relic which is evident even at the present time when it plays no active role in politics. This is not a later development but a continuation of a system which prevailed in earlier times. The present chapter is devoted to this aspect of the Tooth Relic during the first eleven centuries since its arrival in the Island. The history of the Relic during this period is discussed in the preceding chapters.

It seems relevant to draw attention, at the outset, to the connexion between the Order and the state in ancient Ceylon. Since the introduction of Buddhism in the third century B.C., the ruler of the Island was required to perform the dual roles of statesman and patron of the śāsana. The role of the guardian of religion was a necessary attribute of rulership for on the one hand the śāsana always depended on the generosity of the rulers and on the other it granted a certain amount of sanctity to the royal office. The rulers seem to have been well aware of the advantages of the latter aspect. When the boundaries of the Mahāvihāra were to be established in order to make the śāsana take root in the Island, Devānaṃpiya Tissa included his palace within the boundaries 'so that he may live under the command of the Buddha'.¹ On a later occasion he bestowed kingship on the Bō

1. Mv., 15, 180-83.

Tree,¹ the most sacred object of the day, probably to show that he ruled the country in the name of the Tree. Numerous such offerings made to the Order by subsequent rulers² no doubt reflect the idea that they ruled the country in the name of the sāsana, but not on their own. The evolution of this phenomenon is evident in later centuries when it was believed that a king of Ceylon ascended the throne in order to protect the Bowl and the robes of the Master³ and that none but a Bodhisatva was eligible for the throne.⁴ Such expressions together with patronage to religious institutions and participation in religious activities, would no doubt have become means by which the rulers could win the allegiance of the Saṅgha and the people, which was absolutely necessary for the smooth running of the government. One has to examine the political significance of the Tooth Relic with this interdependence of the State and the Order in mind.

Throughout the first seven centuries after the arrival of the Relic in Ceylon there is only a single reference which points to its political significance. The Cūlavamsa records that when

-
1. Ibid., 19.30-31.
 2. Ibid., 31.89-92, 111.; 32.36.; 34.86.; Cv., 39.31; 48.135-38.; See above, pp.152-53; T.Hettiaratchi, The History of Kingship in Ceylon up to the Fourth Century A.D., Colombo 1972, p.129 ff.
 3. Ep.Zeyl., I, p.237 II lines 53-54; Pjv., Ch.XXXIII, p.49.
 4. Ep.Zeyl., I, p.237 II lines 51-53.

the Tooth Relic was brought to Anurādhapura Siri Meghavanna welcomed it with the highest honours and later placed it in the building called the Dhammacakkageha (House of the Wheel of the Law).¹ This building, we are told, was built by Devānaṃpiya Tissa in the royal courtyard.² Apart from a few occasions³ the usual practice in Ceylon was to worship relics by enshrining them in stūpas or in vihāras. The selection of a building in the royal courtyard to house the Tooth Relic therefore seems strange and suggests that it was regarded as something special and perhaps more important than the other relics. This special treatment underlines the sanctity of the Tooth Relic as a religious object,⁴ but it is not unlikely that there was a political motive as well which was more important than the religious one. This political motive may be understood by an examination of the political significance attached to the Bowl Relic in the early centuries and the symbolism of the Dhammacakkageha where the Tooth Relic was enshrined.

The Mahāvamsa states that Devānaṃpiya Tissa enshrined Buddha relics in stūpas like the Thūpārāma but kept the Bowl Relic in his palace.⁵ This suggests that the Bowl Relic, though it was not a sāririka dhātu (corporeal relic), was treated then as an

-
1. Cv., 37.94-96.
 2. Ibid., 37.95
 3. The Bowl Relic and Hair Relics too were not enshrined in stūpas for a long time since their arrival in Ceylon.
 4. See above p.151,157 ff.
 5. Mv., 20.13.

object of special importance. The reason for such special treatment of the Relic is not known. It may be speculated that the Relic was considered to have been endowed with miraculous powers. From the Mahāvamsa we learn that this idea was current in the first century A.D.¹ This may perhaps be explained as a later development but one cannot rule out the possibility that such ideas were prevalent in the third century B.C. Further it is not unlikely that the possession of the Bowl Relic was considered a demonstration of the ruler's adherence to Buddhism and that he ruled the country in the name of the Buddha as was also the case in later times. This would strengthen his authority by winning him the allegiance of the Saṅgha and the laity.² Above all, it is evident from the Mahāvamsa that some political importance was attached to the Bowl Relic during the early centuries. In dealing with the Tamil invasion during the reign of Vaṭṭagāmanī Abhaya, this work states that the king could not take the Bowl Relic with him in his flight to a hideout.³ The particular attention paid by the chronicler to record the failure of the king to take the Relic give one to understand that he considered that the Bowl Relic was

1. Ibid., 33.55.

2. See below, p. 287 ff.

3. Mv., 33.48.

something very special to the king which he should not fail to carry with him. Another passage of the same work states that one of the six Tamil invaders captured the Bowl Relic and hastened with it to the mainland.¹ This suggests that the invader was convinced that the capture of the Relic was a sufficient reward for his labours of the invasion. The capture of the Relic may not have been symbolic of the capture of the throne, as in later times, but the interest taken by these invaders to capture it and by the Sinhalese rulers to recover it,² certainly seem to indicate that it served a political end rather than or in addition to a religious one. In this case the special treatment of the Relic is quite understandable.

The Dhammacakkageha seems to have served another symbolic purpose in the political sphere. The Dhammacakka, in Buddhist literature, symbolizes the Buddha's universal overlordship of the saddhamma or true doctrine. The earliest Buddhist monuments that have the Dhammacakka symbol are the Aśokan pillars, the most famous of which is the Sārnāth pillar. This is now in a fragmentary form but a bas relief from Sanchi shows its original shape. The wheel is mounted on a seat of three adorsed lions which in turn stand on a circular plinth adorned with four

1. Ibid., 33.55.

2. Gajabāhu I (A.D.114-36) is credited in later Sinhalese works with the recovery of the Bowl Relic. (Rjv., p.34.)

animals i.e. the lion, elephant, bull and horse. Between the animals four smaller wheels are depicted. The plinth is mounted on a lotiform bell. This elaborate capital is placed on a tall, slightly tapering pillar.¹

Commenting on the symbolism of the Dhammacakka of this pillar, Benjamin Rowland writes that it is not only a glorification of the Buddha's preaching and the universal extension of the power of the Buddhist law but also an emblem of the universal extension of Maurya imperialism through the Dhamma.² This interpretation, apart from the particular association of Maurya imperialism, seems applicable to all the Dhammacakkas. It is therefore understandable why Devānampiya Tissa should have had a Dhammacakkageha in the royal courtyard. Such a construction would have enabled the king to demonstrate the universality of Buddhism, the newly-introduced religion in Ceylon, as well as his desire to be called a Cakkavatti, a universal king, even though his own authority was limited. The prevalence of such a building in later times, until the reign of Meghavanna, suggests that the Dhammacakka concept remained important in the eyes of Devānampiya Tissa's successors.

-
1. The wheel, Buddhist Publication Society, Kandy, 1969, Nos.137-38.
 2. B.Rowland, The Art and Architecture of India (Buddhist-Hindu-Jain), Penguin Book, 1953, p.46.

A radical change seems to have taken place in this symbolism when the Tooth Relic was enshrined in the Dhammacakkageha. After this the building was known as the Dhāṭṭhādhātughara (the House of the Tooth Relic) but not as the Dhammacakkageha.¹ The change of the name by no means signify that the Dhammacakka concept, which was something fundamental to Buddhism, became extinct after the arrival of the Tooth Relic. The importance of this concept, it should be noted, does not necessarily entail the presence of a special building. In fact, the Sinhalese rulers of later times were expected to be Bodhisatvas and the upholders of the Dhamma, as is evident from an inscription of the tenth century.² This shows that the Dhammacakka ideals such as the expansion of the Dhamma and the rule of righteousness in the manner of a Cakkavatti were observed by later rulers too. Hence the only possible explanation which could be given to the change of the name of the Dhammacakkageha is that the Dhammacakka symbolism has receded to the background with the introduction of the Tooth Relic.

It is also worthy of note that from this time until the twelfth century, the Bowl Relic, apart from its association in the rain-making ceremonies, was not used for political purposes.

1. Cv., 37.94-96.

2. Ep.Zeyl., I, p.237 II lines 51-53.

This indicates that the Tooth Relic superceded both the Bowl Relic and the Dhammacakka as symbols of political significance. These two symbols were no longer necessary for the Tooth Relic was the symbol of both the Buddha and the Dhamma. Hence the possession of it was regarded as the clearest expression of a ruler's adherence to Buddhism, emphasizing his determination to wield his authority in the name of the Buddha and the Dhamma. The references in the chronicle to its close association with the Sinhalese rulers indicate that this situation prevailed until the downfall of the Anurādhapura kingdom, even though the chronicle does not emphasize this aspect of the Tooth Relic.

In the five centuries which begin with the establishment of a Sinhalese kingdom in A.D.1070 at Polonnaruva, the Tooth Relic gained a supreme position politically. As has already been mentioned,¹ the extraordinary interest taken by the rulers in the construction of relic temples as well as the celebration of festivals and the making of endowments on a lavish scale, make one understand its predominant position in the religious sphere; but the motive behind these activities was not purely religious. Commenting on the importance of the Tooth Relic during this period, Geiger remarked that its possession by this time became a sine qua non to justify the claims of the Sinhalese kings to

1. See above, p.164 ff.

the throne of Ceylon.¹ This remark finds justification from the evidence available to us.

Before attempting further discussion it should be emphasized that when we consider the political significance of the Tooth Relic during this period, that of the Bowl Relic too has to be taken into account; for from the Polonnaruva period onwards these two relics appear to have shared the same veneration. Although the two relics were kept together, prominence had always been given to the Tooth Relic. The Vēlaikkāra Inscription which records a promise of the Vēlaikkāra mercenaries to protect the Tooth and the Bowl Relics together with their belongings, names the sanctuary where the relics were kept as the 'temple of the Tooth Relic'.² The Cūlavamsa very often mentions the bringing of the two relics to safety, their recovery³ and other such details but whenever a festival is celebrated in their honour it is termed 'festival of the Tooth Relic'.⁴ Such a treatment in the chronicle is a clear indication that, although the Bowl Relic was associated with the Tooth Relic its significance was always secondary to that of the latter, probably because the Tooth Relic was a corporeal relic (sārīrikadhātu) and therefore more venerable than the Bowl.

1. Cult.Ceyl.Med.Times., pp.213-14.

2. Ep.Zeyl., II, p.254; Cv., 60.16. This was the case on other occasions too. See Cv., 74.198, 78.41, 80.19; Pjv., pp.27, 29, 37.

3. See above, pp.26, 172, 188, 192.

4. Cv., 90.57, 77-79; Pjv., pp.48-49.

The importance of the possession of the Tooth Relic in order for a prince to be consecrated as a legitimate ruler, is clearly illustrated from the history of the Polonnaruva and subsequent periods. There is a slab inscription found in Kahambiliyāva which embodies an edict of Vikramabāhu II conferring immunities to a land brought under cultivation by a person named Kandavan Pilantavan Vallan,¹ and which is dated in the month of Āsala of the twenty third year.² It is not clear from the epigraph whose regnal years are referred to but since the record was issued on the order of Vikramabāhu,³ it naturally implies the twenty third year of that king.⁴ It is particularly noteworthy however, that apart from the high sounding Sanskrit epithets extolling his virtues and valour,⁵ Vikramabāhu was not given in the epigraph either of the throne names, Siri Saṅgabō

1. Ep.Zeyl., V, pp.404-408.

2. Ibid., p.407 II lines 31-33.

3. Ibid., p.407 II lines 21-23.

4. The Cūlavamsa gives him only 21 years (Cv., 63.18) while the Pūjāvaliya states that he reigned for 28 years. (Pjv., p.23). As it is evident from the epigraph that the king issued an order in his twenty third year, the chronicle seems to be wrong in this detail. However, it is possible to reconcile the Cūlavamsa with the inscription if one assumes that the former has recorded the number of years which elapsed from the date of his assumption of kingship at Polonnaruva after the defeat of the faction who plotted against him, while the latter has adhered to the official calculation of his reign from the date of Vijayabāhu's death. For details see, Ep.Zeyl., V, p.405 ff.

5. Ibid., pp.406-07 II lines 1-20.

and Abhā Salamevan, borne by the consecrated rulers of the period. This leaves one in doubt both whether Vikramabāhu was consecrated and whether it is truly his regnal years to which the inscription refers. From the Cūlavamsa we learn that Vikramabāhu ruled without being consecrated,¹ a detail which justifies the absence of either throne name in the inscription. Further, the Diṃbulāgala Māravīdiyē Rock Inscription of his queen, Sundarī Mahā Dēvī is dated in the regnal years of a deceased king Jayabāhu,² instead of those of Vikramabāhu. Another epigraph issued by his son, Gajabāhu, in the fifteenth year of his (Gajabāhu's) reign, is ascribed to the 38th regnal year of Jayabāhu.³ The Mankānai Tamil Inscription of the same ruler is ascribed to the 43rd regnal year of Jayabāhu who is referred to as 'Śri Apaiya Calāmekā panmarana cakkaravartikal,'⁴ (Abhaya Salāmegha - Abhā Salamevan and Cakravarti). One noteworthy aspect of the epigraph is that Gajabāhu who issued the inscription and Mānābharāṇa (the ruler of Rohaṇa)⁵ who inscribed it on stone are simply mentioned as Gajabāhu-tēvar (Dēva) and

-
1. Cv., 63,18;61.28-30,47.
 2. Ep.Zeyl., II, pp.188-89, 195.
 3. ARASC., 1909, pp.26-27.
 4. UCR., XX, no.1, p.13, Ins., I, II lines 7, 1-6.
 5. Kanapati Pillai assumed that Mānābharāṇa referred to in the epigraph is Parākramabāhu's father. (UCR., XX, no.I, p.13). Paranavitana quite convincingly points out that he cannot be the father of Parākramabāhu but was the ruler of Rohaṇa who fought with him for the throne of Rājaratṭha. (Ep.Zeyl., V, pp.405-06.)

Mānābharāṇa-tēvar without any royal epithets.¹ The Cūlavamsa states that Gajabāhu reigned for twenty two years,² but makes no reference to his consecration. It was the usual practice of the chronicler to mention a ruler's consecration immediately after his accession to the throne or some time later,³ and the absence of such a reference in the case of Gajabāhu leaves little doubt that he was not a consecrated king. This bears out the evidence of the above mentioned inscription in which Gajabāhu was not given royal epithets. This argument would also explain why Vikramabāhu was not given throne names in the Kahaṃbīliyāva Inscription suggesting, in view of the evidence of the Cūlavamsa, that he was not a consecrated ruler. Thus it is very likely that the twenty third year mentioned in the inscription refers to the regnal years of Jayabāhu as all other inscriptions of the period. Thus it would seem that there was a practice of recording events by the regnal years of a deceased king which was observed in these cases.

One wonders however, whether there was anything which prevented the consecration of these two rulers. Vikramabāhu,

-
1. UCR., XX, no.I, pp.13-14, inscription no.I, lines 11-12, no.II, lines 3-4, 5-6.
 2. Cv., 71.5.
 3. Ibid., 59.8; 71.29; 72.311-29.

as is well known, was the son of Vijayabāhu and, had he not been deprived of his legitimate position, he should have been appointed as the successor of Jayabāhu who ascended the throne after Vijayabāhu I. A plot against Vikramabāhu, designed by the Pāṇḍya faction of the royal family¹ changed this law of succession. As a result Vikramabāhu rose against Jayabāhu, defeated him together with his allies, and became king in Polonnaruva.² His position on the throne was thus sufficiently justified by his conquest and by his direct descent from the royal family of Polonnaruva. It seems strange, therefore, that he and his son, Gajabāhu II, should not have been consecrated.

The only factor which barred their consecration seems to have been that they were not in possession of the Tooth Relic. It is evident from the Cūlavamsa that Vikramabāhu felt some antipathy towards the Saṅgha, possibly because they appear to have taken part in the conspiracy against him.³ His animosity was clearly reflected in the evil acts he committed against the Order.⁴ His disrespect towards Buddhism led the custodians of the Tooth Relic

-
1. The plot was designed by Mittā, the younger sister of Vijayabāhu, who was given in marriage to a Pāṇḍya prince, and by her three sons. Cv., 59.41-42; 61.1 ff.
 2. Ibid., 61.1 ff.
 3. Ibid., 61.1; The epithet that he is a 'great bull of a hero to whom benediction has been granted by the husband of Pārvatī', found in the Kahāmbiliyāva Slab Inscription discloses that he had a leaning towards Saivism. (Ep.Zeyl., V, p.407, II. 17-19, Transl., p.408.)
 4. Cv., 61.54-57.

to deliver it to Rohaṇa.¹ As has been seen earlier,² the Relic remained in the possession of the rulers of that province until it was captured in the fourth regnal year of Parākramābāhu I. It has also been remarked that the Relic together with the Bowl would possibly have become a unifying factor of the Sinhalese resistance against the Coḷas in the preceding period.³ It is very likely therefore that, by this time, they had become a kind of regalia without which the princes were not considered to have a right to the throne. This view gains strength from subsequent events.

In the tripartite war of Parākramābāhu, Gajabāhu and Mānābharāṇa for the throne of Rājaraṭṭha, the people of Rājaraṭṭha, as has been mentioned,⁴ requested Mānābharāṇa of Rohaṇa to come to their rescue. The latter attempted to establish himself on the throne⁵ and the first thing he did after capturing power was to bring the Tooth and the Bowl Relics from Rohaṇa to Polonnaruva.⁶ Subsequently, when he was no longer able to hold Polonnaruva, he retreated with the two relics, his mother and his wives.⁷ The great interest taken by Mānābharāṇa on these

-
1. Ibid., 61.61.
 2. See above, p. 176 ff.
 3. See above, pp. 245-47.
 4. See above, p. 173.
 5. See above, pp. 173-74.
 6. Cv., 70.266.
 7. Ibid., 70.309-10.

occasions to fetch and secure the relics, and the importance attached to such acts by the chronicler, suggest that the possession of the relics was advantageous to Mānābharana and had a direct bearing on his accession to the throne at Polonnaruva. The chronicle seems to justify this interpretation.

Towards the end of the tripartite war Parākramabāhu defeated Gajabāhu who forged an alliance with him through the mediation of the San̄gha.¹ According to the Cūlavamsa, Gajabāhu nominated Parākramabāhu as his successor to the throne of Rājaraṭṭha.² Thus his right to Rājaraṭṭha was established by both conquest and nomination in addition to the fact that he was a scion of the royal family of Polonnaruva; and yet the ministers of Rājaraṭṭha wanted Mānābharana of Rohana to take up the throne.³ The reason for such strange behaviour is unknown, but it would seem possible that it was because Mānābharana possessed the two relics. If so, it would follow that the possession of the relics was regarded as the principal factor deciding succession. It can therefore be suggested that the main reason why Vikramabāhu and Gajabāhu were not consecrated may well have been that they were not in possession of the relics.

1. Cv., 70.327-36.

2. Ibid., 71.3-4; Ep.Zeyl., IV, pp.7-8.

3. Cv., 71.6-7.

This supposition raises the question as to how Parākramabāhu I could be consecrated at a time when he was not in possession of the relics. The Cūlavamsa refers to two consecrations of this ruler. One was performed immediately after the death of Gajabāhu and at the time when Mānābharana of Rohana had come within very close proximity of Polonnaruwa to contest the throne of Rājaratṭha.¹ The attitude of the chronicler as regards this consecration is noteworthy. He pays more attention to the request of ministers to celebrate the consecration² than to the ceremony which is described in four verses.³ This attitude especially when compared with the place given by the chronicler to the ceremony in the other consecration⁴ suggests that the first was by no means a traditional consecration but a mere act of assuming the kingship.

The second consecration, in the second regnal year,⁵ appears to have been the true consecration ceremony of Parākramabāhu. The relics, according to the Daḷadā Pūjāvaliya, were not captured until two years later;⁶ but the description of this

1. Cv., 71.29.

2. Ibid., 71.19-26.

3. Ibid., 71.28-32.

4. See below, pp.271-72.

5. Cv., 72.311-28; 72.329.

6. Dal.Pjv., p.48. Some manuscripts of the work mention the seventh year as the date of the capture of relics. (Ep.Zeyl., V, pt.I, pp.15-16; CALR., IX, p.184.

ceremony in the Cūlavamsa implies that Parākramabāhu assumed and claimed to be the overlord of Rohaṇa and the possessor of the Tooth Relic. This merits further discussion.

At his death, Mānābharana is said to have repented for all the evil that he had committed and advised his son, Kittisirimegha, to submit to the authority of Parākramabāhu.¹ The chronicle then mentions the submission of Kittisirimegha, followed immediately by the account of the second consecration.² The manner in which these two events are related raises the doubt as to whether Parākramabāhu considered the submission of Kittisirimegha to be symbolic of the submission of Rohaṇas and also the surrender of the relics which were in their possession and whether it was on this basis that he had himself consecrated even though he was not in possession of the relics. This is very likely, for the Cūlavamsa subsequently refers to a rebellion of Rohaṇa against Parākramabāhu, presumably on the assumption that Rohaṇa was under the hegemony of Rājaraṭṭha. This assumption, as will be discussed in the sequel, was made merely for the advantage of the king, for there is no reason to suggest that Rohaṇa came under his power. Thus the fact that Parākramabāhu's second consecration was performed without the relics does not destroy the probability that possession of the

1. Cv., 72.304-05.

2. Ibid., 72.310.

relics was necessary for a ruler to validate his authority. The subsequent attempts of Parākramabāhu to capture the relics illustrate how important they were to him.

Some time after the above-mentioned consecration of Parākramabāhu there began another conflict between Rājarat̥ṭha and Rohaṇa. This conflict, in the eyes of the chronicler, was the result of the measures taken by Parākramabāhu to quell a rebellion of Rohaṇa. The chronicler states that the chieftains of Rohaṇa after the death of Mānābharana had deviated from the right path, and would not submit to the authority of Parākramabāhu. With (it is said) the boast that they would not let the enemy enter their country, they brought all the inhabitants of the province under their influence and also won the support of Sugalā, the mother of the late king. They erected fortifications at difficult spots right up to the frontier, dug trenches everywhere, placed barricades and made roads impassable with felled and fallen trees. Thereupon, the chronicle continues, 'they gathered in strongholds well armed with offensive and defensive weapons and rebelled full of violence'.¹

Thus it would seem that the non-submission of Rohaṇa and the improvement of its defenses were regarded by the chronicler or

1. Ibid., 74.22-35; S.Wickramasinghe, op.cit., p.169 ff.; G.S.Ranawella, op.cit., pp.281-336.

by the king himself as 'acts of violence'. This view however, finds no justification in the political conditions of the period. Parākramabāhu, as has been suggested earlier, appears to have assumed the overlordship of Rohaṇa on the strength of the submission of Kittisirimegha. But the latter evidently had no authority to confer any rights on Parākramabāhu concerning the province. According to the Gūlavamsa, he was a son of Mānābharana by his second queen.¹ But there was another son who, as the son of the principal queen² (like Moggallāna, son of the chief queen of Dhātusena in the fifth century),³ was more eligible than Kittisirimegha, according to the Sinhalese law of succession. Kittisirimegha could ascend the throne only after his death; but he was still alive⁴ and thus Kittisirimegha had no right to the throne nor any authority to confer territorial rights on Parākramabāhu. The only means by which he could forestall his brother was to enter into an alliance with Parākramabāhu and rule Rohaṇa under the hegemony of Rājaratṭha. Parākramabāhu was ready to offer his support in order to serve his own ends as he did on previous occasions to win the allegiance of Rājaratṭha.⁵ Thus Kittisirimegha's betrayal of Rohaṇa to

1. Cv., 64.24.

2. Ibid., 64.19. He was taken prisoner (Cv., 72.299) but later he escaped and sought refuge with the Colas. (Ep.Ind., XXII, no.14, p.86 ff.; S.Wickramasinghe, op.cit., p.171 ff.)

3. Cv., 38.80.

4. S.Wickramasinghe, op.cit., p.171 ff.

5. Cv., 66.35 ff., 130 ff., 147 ff.

Parākramabāhu and the latter's strategy to win that province by diplomatic means were conceived of as a means of serving their own purposes. But there is no evidence to suggest that Parākramabāhu gained effective control over Rohaṇa as a result of this alliance. In this case what the people of Rohaṇa did when they improved the defences of the province, was not to commit any act of violence, but to prepare themselves for a probable invasion from the north.

Thus the real nature of this conflict appears to have been somewhat different from what the chronicler would have us believe. It was an attempt by Parākramabāhu to validate the assumption of his overlordship which he could not achieve by diplomatic means, and a struggle by the people of Rohaṇa to maintain their independence. It would also appear that the possession of the relics was the determining factor in this conflict. The chronicle provides ample evidence in support of this view.

Let us first examine the point of view of the people of Rohaṇa as regards this conflict. The majority of the inhabitants of Rohaṇa appear to have taken part in this so called rebellion. The Cūlavamsa, as has already been cited, states that the chieftains who organized the defences, brought all the inhabitants of the province under their influence.¹ On two more occasions,

1. Ibid., 74.28.

the chronicle states that 'all dwellers of Rohaṇa turned rebels'¹ and 'all the many rebels each in his division roused the whole population of the country down to the very boys in open revolt'.² Thus, the participation of the majority of the population suggests that it was based upon some high ideal which was widely held and cherished by the whole community on the basis of which the people could unite.

This high ideal of the Rohaṇas was the securing of the relics on which depended their independence. It is quite clear from the words attributed to the chieftains of Rohaṇa that they thought it would be better for them to live independently even for a single day in their own province where they were born and bred.³ Hence they were determined not to permit a hostile army even to set their eyes on the country nor to let them cross the borders as long as they were alive.⁴ This determination went hand in hand with the securing of the relics. When Rakkha and Bhūta, the generals of Parākramabāhu, advanced with their forces to the interior of Rohaṇa resulting in the loss of many battles to Rohaṇa, the chronicler suddenly changes the course of the war and states that 'they (the Rohaṇas), made a firm resolve

-
1. Ibid., 74.34.
 2. Ibid., 74.133-34.
 3. Ibid., 74.26.
 4. Ibid., 74.27 ff.

that they shall not permit to seize the sacred Tooth Relic and the precious Alms-Bowl Relic'.¹ Immediately after this resolve the invading army reached Uddhanadvāra (Udundora) and captured that stronghold. Then the Cūlavamsa continues the story and states the queen Sugalā fled to Uruvelā with the relics.²

The advance of the invading army towards Uddhanadvāra, the resolve of the Rohaṇa army, and the flight of Sugalā seem to have been directly connected with each other. The troops of Rājaraṭṭha, according to the chronicle, advanced directly towards Uddhanadvāra.³ This stronghold, as has been mentioned earlier,⁴ was the place where the relics were preserved for some time after they were delivered to Rohaṇa. Although there is reason to believe that they were later taken to Mahānāgahula,⁵ it is likely that queen Sugalā and the troops of Rohaṇa brought them again to Uddhanadvāra when they were organising resistance against the invader. Then the advance of the troops of Rājaraṭṭha towards this spot together with the resolve made by the army of Rohaṇa just before the former reached it, give one to understand that the invasion was undertaken with the intention of capturing the relics, and that the invaders demanded the

1. Ibid., 74.84.

2. Ibid., 74.88.

3. Ibid., 74.51 ff; UHC., I, pt.II, p.466.

4. See above, pp. 175-77.

5. See above, pp. 177-79.

surrender of the relics after having inflicted heavy losses on the troops of Rohaṇa. It is owing to their pressure that Sugala fled to Uruvelā with the relics probably with a view to secure them which, in fact, is quite in keeping with the resolution of the Rohaṇa army. However, after a few more encounters¹ Parākramabāhu's forces were able to capture the Relics.

After this it appears that the conflict took a different form. So far the troops of Rohaṇa had made every attempt to save the relics from falling into the hands of the invaders, but now the roles were reversed. Parākramabāhu's army found themselves in the defensive. The army of Rohaṇa united to recover the relics, under a chieftain called Sūkharabhātudeva who escaped from a prison in Rajaraṭṭha.² Heavy losses were again inflicted on them but their determination to regain the relics was not given up. The following passage of the chronicle describes it thus:

'Now the many rebels, each in his division roused the whole population of the country down to the very boys (in open revolt) with the firm resolve, "even at the sacrifice of our lives we shall not give up the two relics".'³

1. Cv., 74.89 ff.

2. Ibid., 74.153.

3. Ibid., 74.133-34.

If this passage is taken at its face value it would follow that the whole population of the province then joined the struggle in order to recover the relics before they were taken out of Rohaṇa. This may perhaps appear as an exaggeration of the chronicler but the severe attacks made by the Rohaṇa army on the retreating forces of Rājarat̥ṭha, at Hintālanaganāma, Khīragāma, Tanagaluka, Sukhagirīgāma, Kaṭadorāvāda, Ambagalla and Taṇḍulapatta¹ indicate that they were stronger than ever before, that they were faithful to their resolve, and that they made every attempt to regain the relics.

On the other hand it appears that the capture of the relics was the chief motive behind the Rohaṇa campaign of Parākramabāhu. The manner in which the invasion was carried out, the extraordinary interest taken by the king, as reflected in the words attributed to him in the chronicle, and the manner in which the campaign ended provide valuable information in support of this view.

It has been mentioned in the foregoing discussion² that the invasion was directly aimed at the spot where the relics were preserved probably with a view to capture them. The invaders however, were unsuccessful in their attempt for queen Sugalā

1. Ibid., 74.162-65.

2. See above, p.276.

fled to Uruvelā with the relics.¹ Parākramabāhu then received the news that queen Sugalā intended crossing the seas taking the relics with her. He immediately sent the following message to his generals who were stationed at Dīghavāpi.

'Shattered in combat the foe is in flight. They have seized the splendid sacred relics of the Alms Bowl and the Tooth and are fain, through fear, to cross the sea. So have I heard. If this is so, then the Island of Laṅkā will be desolate. For though here on the Sīhala island various jewels and pearls and the like and costly kinds of precious stones are found, yet of quite incomparable costliness are the two sacred relics of the Lord of the Truth, the Tooth and the Alms-bowl. At the cost of much valuable property and by the constant amassing of well-armed warriors I have freed this superb island of Laṅkā from every oppression but all my pains would be fruitless. My head adorned with a costly diadem sparkling with the splendour of various precious stones, would only be consecrated by the longed-for contact with the two sacred relics of the great master, the Tooth and the Alms-bowl. Therefore must ye all, with the same end in view, with army and train and without departing from the orders I give, conquer the hostile army and speedily send me the splendid Tooth Relic and the sacred Alms-bowl.'²

Although it contains some poetical embellishments of the author, this passage is of considerable importance for it provides for the first time, a detailed description of the exact significance of the relics. Above all it reflects the real motive behind the Rohaṇa campaign of Parākramabāhu. He

1. See above, p. 276.

2. Cv., 74.100-109.

considered that all his labours for the supremacy of the Island would be fruitless if he were unable to possess the Tooth and the Bowl relics. It was for this reason that he gave direct orders to his forces to conquer the Rohaṇa army and send the relics immediately to him.

Soon after the message of the king, the troops of Rājaraṭṭha who were stationed in Dīghavāpi, advanced towards Uruvelā where Sugalā had retreated with the relics. First they advanced to Uddhanadvāra where another coloumn of forces was stationed,¹ and from there marched on to Uruvelā passing Maharīvara, Voyalaggama, Sumanagalla and Badagūṇa.²

Subsequently they were able to capture the relics after another encounter at Uruvelā.³ Thus the movements of the troops of Rājaraṭṭha clearly establish that they pursued the forces of Rohaṇa until they captured the relics.

As has already been stated, the forces of Parākramabāhu, once they had captured the relics, were subjected to repeated and severe attacks from the Rohaṇa army.⁴ They were gradually retreating towards Dhanumaṇḍala which presumably was a frontier of Rājaraṭṭha and where a general named Mañju was stationed.⁵

1. Ibid., 74. 113.

2. Ibid., 74.121 ff.

3. Ibid., 74. 125-26.

4. See above, p.278 ; Cv., 74.162 ff.

5. Ibid., 74.166-67.

During the course of this retreat, Parākramabāhu sent the following message to his generals.

'That ye fight as chance wills it while dragging the relics about from village to village pleaseth me not. Send ye both relics at once to me'.¹

This passage too is a clear indication of Parākramabāhu's eagerness as regards the possession of the relics. No doubt, he was in constant fear of loosing the relics, as the pressure of the Rohaṇa army was so great as the chronicle give us to understand.² The relief and satisfaction he had, after the relics were brought to safety and were gradually approaching Polonnaruva, could be seen from the following words attributed to him in the chronicle.

'In truth a great gain for me! Blessed is my life, the finest fruit of my labours for the peace of the realm is mine now that I may beheld and reverence these two relics of the monarch of the sages'.³

After the safe despatch of the relics the chronicler attributes the following words to a general of Parākramabāhu.

'Our foes know their own country. When we come near them they disperse on every side, penetrate again into the territory that we have brought into our power, in order to conquer it and vex the people'.⁴

This passage apparently sums up the tactics so far employed by

-
1. Ibid., 74.159-60.
 2. See above. pp.278,280.
 3. Cv., 74.183-85.
 4. Ibid., 74.170-71.

the Rohaṇa army which led the general to the suggestion that they should place officers and armies in areas which they had already subdued.¹ From the following chapter of the Cūlavamsa² we learn that they again fought battles at places which they had captured before. This, together with the above mentioned passage, shows that apart from the seizure of the relics, the invading army gained nothing as a result of the battles fought so far.³ This appears to have been a fundamental weakness in the military operations of the generals of Parākramabāhu, but it points to the fact that the main cause behind the campaign was not the subjugation of the province but the seizure of the relics. Only after the seizure of the relics could they concentrate on the subjugation of the province. Although the people of Rohaṇa, still under the leadership of Sugalā, showed some resistance, their moral courage appears to have been lost by this time. The loss of the relics on this occasion recalls to mind the case of the rebellion of 1818.⁴ No doubt it was a major factor in breaking the morale of the defending troops. The conflict finally came to an end with the capture of Sugalā.

This evidence establishes that during the Polonnaruva period the possession of the relics was of fundamental importance to a ruler in order to consecrate himself and validate his authority.

-
1. Ibid. 74-75; UHC., I, pt. II, pp. 468-69.
 2. Cv., ch. 75; UHC., I, pt. II, pp. 469 ff.
 3. S. Wickramasinghe, op. cit., pp. 179-80.
 4. See above, pp. 254-55.

This explains why Vikramabāhu II and Gajabāhu II were not consecrated and why Mānābharana displayed such keenness to secure the relics. The importance of the relics was the determining factor of the subsequent conflict between Rājarat̥ṭha and Rohana.

The significance of this new role of the Tooth Relic is attested by the fact that it became the palladium of the Sinhalese royalty during the Polonnaruva and subsequent periods. Polonnaruva, as is well known, ceased to be a capital of the Sinhalese in 1215 chiefly as a result of the disastrous invasion of Māgha, a ruler of Kāliṅga origin. The Sinhalese were dispersed into the jungle tracts called 'Vanni', lying between the Rājarat̥ṭha and Māyārat̥ṭha, and into the regions of Māyārat̥ṭha, the western part of Ceylon. The Cūlavamsa refers to many chieftains of this period who resisted the oppression of Māgha,¹ but the strongest resistance to his rule came from Daṁbadeṇiya,² situated 18 miles to the south-west of Kurunāgala. The initiative of this resistance was taken by Vijāyabāhu, the third of that name, and the resistance was brought to a successful end by his son Parākramabāhu II. The reigns of these rulers provide further evidence of the political significance of the Tooth

1. Cv., 81.1 ff.

2. Ibid., 81.10 ff.

Relic, that is to say, the extent to which the possession of that relic validated their position on the throne and provided an ideological basis for the Sinhalese resistance to Māgha.

It seems appropriate at this stage to outline the background of Vijayabāhu, the first ruler of Daṁbadeṇiya, for the better understanding of this aspect of the Tooth Relic. According to the various traditions contained in the literary and epigraphical sources of this period, Vijayabāhu seems to have had no direct kinship with the royal families of the preceding period.

According to the Cūlavamsa Vijayabāhu was of the lineage of Siri Saṅghabodhi,¹ a king who reigned in Anurādhapura in the third century. The Pūjāvaliya states that he was a descendant of the Saṅghabodhi family which brought the Bō Tree to Ceylon.² In an

elaborated version of this tradition found in the Pali

Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa, and its Sinhalese paraphrase, Elu Attanagalu Vamsaya, Vijayabāhu's father, Vijayamalla, was given the epithets of narādhipa, rājottama, and narasvara,³ probably

with a view to describing the former as the son of a person who wielded royal authority. The Daṁbadeṇi Katikāvata, the

Daladā Pūjāvaliya and the Vīdāgama version of the Elu Attanagalu Vamsaya give him the title vathimi and vathimi maharaja.⁴ The

1. Ibid., 81.10.

2. Pjv., p.26.

3. Hvv., p.30; Elu.Av.

4. Ktk.Sng., p.8; Dal.Pjv., p.50; Elu.Av., (Vidagama), p.68.

Daṁbadeṇi Asna and the Rājaratnākaraya call him Kāliṅga Vijayabāhu¹ thus connecting him with the Kāliṅga dynasty. The Kavsiḷumina, which is generally accepted as a work of Parākramabāhu II, Vijayabāhu's son, claims that its author was descended from Paṇḍu,² the mythical founder of the Pāṇḍya royal family. The Deṽundara Inscription of Parākramabāhu II, seems to have a similar motive of establishing a connexion with the Pāṇḍyas, when it states that Parākramabāhu was a descendant of Somarāja of Nāmbara,³ for the Pāṇḍyas were of the lunar race and 'soma' means moon. However, the lack of unanimity of these traditions was, as Parnavitana suggested, 'either a result of the attempts made by their panegyrists to find for their patrons a respectable pedigree which they lacked or of the marriage alliances which their ancestors might have contracted with those royal families'.⁴ Liyanagamage thinks that the former is more likely to have been the case with the Daṁbadeṇi rulers.⁵ However, taking the available evidence, and the lack of any apparent link between these rulers and those of the preceding period into consideration, it may be reasonable to hold that they had no direct connexion with the royal families of the preceding period, or that if there were a link, it was a remote one.

1. Dmb.A., p.30; Rrk., p.37.

2. Ed., Valiviliye Sonta Thera, Colombo, 1946, p.294, V.2.

3. MASC., VI, p.68, lines 16-18.

4. UHC., I, pt.II, p.615.

5. Liyanagamage, op.cit., p.84.

Although he had no direct claim to the sovereignty of the country and to the allegiance of its inhabitants, Vijayabāhu seems to have had other claims to kingship. He was apparently a born leader who started as a 'Vanni' - chieftain of a forest tract and, owing probably to his ability to protect the Sinhalese against the onslaught of Māgha, gradually rose to prominence by enlisting other chieftains of similar status under his banner both by means of diplomacy and of force. Ultimately he succeeded in freeing the entire Māyāraṭṭha and set himself up as its ruler, with Daṃbadeṇiya as his centre of authority.¹

The rulership which Vijayabāhu acquired through his valour and steadfastness appears to have been strengthened and validated or legitimized by his possession of the Tooth Relic. From the Cūlavamsa and other literary sources as well as the popular traditions, we learn that during the rule of Māgha the Tooth and the Bowl Relics were delivered to Kotmalē,² a mountainous area in the central highlands, and there secured in a hideout. Immediately after he had established his power in Māyāraṭṭha Vijayabāhu is said to have enquired about the hiding place of the relics.³ When he was informed about it, his body is said to

1. Cv., 81.10 ff; UCHC., I, pt.II, p.615 ff.

2. See above, pp. 188-90.

3. See above, p.190.

have been filled with the 'fivefold joy'.¹ His joy and satisfaction after the recovery of the relics is further illustrated from the following words attributed to him.

'With a heart as full of joy as if he had found a jewel like the wheel and the rest (cakkādiratanam) or a great treasure, or as if he had attained nirvāna, the sovereign took unto himself the two relics and blessed like Mandhātara, he bore them with great celebrations from village to village...'²

This passage evidently contains some poetical embellishments but after making allowances one notes that its basic idea is that the relics were of vital importance to Vijayabāhu.³ His selection of an almost inaccessible site for the Tooth Relic temple and the institution there of a strong military guard for its protection, as was the case for the royal palace,⁴ give further support to this view.

In this connexion it is necessary to analyse the reasons which led Vijayabāhu to take such an interest in the recovery and the protection of the Tooth Relic. The most obvious reason is as a demonstration of his piety towards Buddhism. From the time of Devānampiya Tissa, the rulers of Ceylon were the supreme custodians of Buddhism. This concept became predominant especially during the latter half of the Anurādhapura period when

1. Cv., 81.24.

2. Ibid., 81.27 ff.

3. See above, p.283; Paranavitana thinks that Vijayabāhu counted his regnal years from the date on which he gained the possession of the relics; UHC., I, pt.II, p.616.

4. Pjv., p.27.

it was believed that a king of Ceylon ascended the throne primarily to protect the Sacred Alms-Bowl and robes of the Buddha.¹ This was observed by most Sinhalese rulers but was completely disregarded during the oppressive rule of Māgha who caused great hardship to the religion in particular and society in general. For this reason the Sinhalese no doubt longed for a ruler who could restore Buddhism to its former glory. But to achieve this end it was necessary, in the first place, to free the country from foreign domination. It is generally true that no struggle is likely to succeed unless based upon a high ideal that was widely held by the whole community. Duṭṭhagāmaṇī's war cry was that his labours were 'not for the joy of sovereignty', but for the betterment of the Buddhist Order.² A similar device had to be used on this occasion in order to organize the Sinhalese against the foreigners. Vijayabāhu like the first ruler of his namesake seems to have understood that the relics could become the symbol of freedom of which Buddhism was one manifestation. Besides, as we saw in the foregoing discussion,³ the relics validated a ruler's authority. Hence their possession would have granted Vijayabāhu a legal

-
1. Ep.Zeyl., II, p.237; The Pūjāvaliya too stresses the view that the rulers of Ceylon should be Buddhist. Pjv., Ch.XXXIII, p.49.
 2. Mv., 25.17.
 3. See above, p.264 ff.

basis for his authority, justified his position on the throne, and made him acceptable to the people as their king. This would have been a further advantage especially as Vijayabāhu appears to have had no direct link with the royal families of the preceding period. In these circumstances it is understandable why Vijayabāhu should take such an interest, as had Parākramabāhu and Mānābharana before him,¹ in the recovery and protection of the relics.

Although Vijayabāhu had utilized these means to organize a strong Sinhalese resistance to Māgha as well as to validate his own position, he could not enjoy the fruits of his labours as he had a short reign of four years. When his reign was drawing to a close, Vijayabāhu is said to have entrusted his eldest son, Parākramabāhu, with the custody of the two relics together with the Saṅgha and the people, a convention symbolic of the latter being accepted as the legitimate heir to the throne. A classic instance of the exploitation of the Tooth Relic for political ends is connected with his reign.

The Cūlavamsa states that Parākramabāhu thought of destroying the alien foes and making 'the maiden of Laṅkā' his

1. See above, p. 268 ff.

own.¹ The chronicle then continues that he considered it desirable to perform a festival for the Tooth Relic before going to war with the Damiḷas, and accordingly brought the relics from Beligāla to Dambadeniya, and enshrined them in a temple near the royal palace.² Since it is stated that he built a temple near the palace in order to worship the Tooth Relic whenever he wished,³ the chronicle gives one to understand that the interest taken by the king to celebrate a festival before taking any measures against Māgha was motivated by his religious devotion. There is, however, reason to believe that this festival was expected to serve a political end rather than a religious one.

Parākramabāhu, after celebrating a splendid festival in the city in honour of the Tooth Relic, is said to have taken the Relic on the palm of his hand and resorted to an act of faith (satyakriyā) in the presence of the members of the community who had assembled there for the occasion. The Island of Laṅkā, it is said, was sanctified by the three visits of the Buddha, and it was possible only for kings of 'true faith' to hold sway there.⁴ Every time, since the reign of Asela, when foreign

1. Cv., 82.5.

2. Ibid., 82.6-9.

3. Ibid., 82.8-9; see above, p.192.

4. Ibid., 82.17-19.

invaders captured the Island, they were defeated by successive Sinhalese rulers who protected and sheltered the laity and the Order. Parākramabāhu too, we are told, wished to vanquish the Damilas who had destroyed the Order of the Buddha and who were still in occupation of the Paṭṭharattha.¹ He claimed also that if he had been chosen by the Lord (Buddha) to be included among the great rulers of antiquity and if he was destined to destroy the foreign foes, establish order in Laṅkā, and promote the welfare of the world and the sāsana (religion), then the Tooth Relic would perform a miracle to demonstrate the truth of his claims.² At that instance, the Tooth Relic is said to have risen into the sky like the crescent moon and appeared in the life-like form of the Buddha, radiating the six-coloured effulgence which illumined the whole city. Having thus satisfied the king's wish, it descended and rested on the palm of his hand.³

Commenting on this passage, Liyanagamage states that one can see little more than the attempts of the authors to highlight the merits and piety of the king.⁴ It is true that miracles bear little importance in the eyes of a modern scholar, but viewed in the light of the after-effects of the festival, the miracle seems

1. Ibid., 82.20-27.

2. Ibid., 82.28-40.

3. Ibid., 82.41-43; Pjv., pp.29-30; Hvv., pp.31-32.

4. Liyanagamage, op.cit., p.105.

to reflect the importance attached to the Tooth Relic and the festival celebrated in its honour. This is evident from two passages which immediately follow the above-mentioned passage of the chronicle.

In one of them the chronicler attributes the following words to Parākramabāhu to show his joy after the miracle.

'This day I have gained life, this day my life has become of worth; this day hurrah! my life has become perfectly fruitful. Having by the power of my merit beheld today such a miracle and having also seen the blessing of merit richly earned by the people, I have now been enrolled among those earlier rulers of men, famed for the fulness of their virtues in this Order of the Sage'.¹

These words not only indicate the happiness of the king but also emphasize the importance of the incident. The reason for his joy, according to the passage, was the belief that he was regarded as a ruler equal to those famous ones of antiquity. This suggests that the king was considered a legitimate ruler of the country but it leaves one in doubt as to whether this was the only reason which made the king feel so happy. Another passage of the Cūlavamsa provides a further reason for the king's joy. It runs thus:

'Since all the inhabitants of Laṅkā had seen the effects of the merits of the king, they lived from that time onwards filled with still greater reverence towards him,

1. Cv., 82.46-48.

in fear, in joy and in love, never were they capable of transgressing his commands. All the sovereigns of divers countries sent the king gifts since their hearts were inclined to admiration of his majesty'.¹

Examined in relation to the political conditions and the needs of the period these two passages reveal the exact significance of the Tooth Relic festival referred to above. The period under discussion, as has already been remarked, demanded an organized resistance against the foreigners who had occupied a major part of Lañkā. Vijayabāhu undertook this task but could not accomplish it as he had only a short reign of four years.² Hence this duty now fell on Parākramabāhu. On the other hand, the Tooth Relic had become a symbol of freedom, a unifying factor of the resistance to Māgha.³ In these circumstances a festival in honour of the Relic was of extreme importance for the new ruler to demonstrate his religious faith and the validity of his kingship in order to win the allegiance of the Saṅgha and the laity; in other words, to organize the Sinhalese resistance under his banner. He seems to have achieved all these objectives for, as the above

1. Ibid., 83.1-3; Pjv., p.31.

2. See above, p. 289.

3. See above. p.283 ff.

mentioned passages clearly indicate, Parākramabāhu was considered a legitimate ruler full of virtue which in turn resulted in the people becoming loyal to him. The friendly gifts which are said to have been sent by rulers of other countries (nānādesanarādhipā) may perhaps have been a reference to the winning of the allegiance of those petty chieftains like the Vannis and the aids given by the Pāṇḍyas.¹ However, the winning of the allegiance of the inhabitants and other rulers is remarkable for it ultimately resulted in the liberation of the country from the foreigners. Having this ultimate result in mind, one may reasonably agree with the view expressed in the foregoing passage of the Cūlavamsa² that Parākramabāhu considered that his life had become fruitful after the festival of the Tooth Relic.

The view that the Tooth Relic was utilised by Parākramabāhu to validate his authority is further illustrated by another act of the king. After his victory over the foreigners Parākramabāhu held a second consecration ceremony in the old capital, Polonnaruva³ - an act which certainly was symbolic of

1. Cv., 83.8-10; Pjv., p.31; Liyanagamage, op.cit., pp.128-29, 147.

2. Cv., 82.46-48; see above, p.292.

3. The arrangements for this ceremony was made by Vijayabāhu, Parākramabāhu's son, who was then in charge of the administration. For details see Cv., 89.10; Pjv., p.48, Liyanagamage, op.cit., p.164.

recognition of his victory over the Damilas, who had occupied Rājaraṭṭha for nearly half a century and ruled the country from that city.¹ The literary works dealing with the period then refer to a festival celebrated for three months in Polonnaruva in honour of the Tooth and the Bowl Relics.²

The interest taken by the king to bring the Relics to Polonnaruva and celebrate a festival there may appear as a demonstration of his veneration towards them and his desire to place the Tooth Relic in its old sanctuary to enable the people of Rājaraṭṭha to venerate it. Nevertheless, there is reason to believe that this act has a symbolic importance as had his second consecration in Polonnaruva, which is more important than the demonstration of his religious devotion. The expulsion of foreigners no doubt granted Parākramabāhu a right to be considered the ruler of both the Rājaraṭṭha and Māyāraṭṭha. His second consecration, as Liyanagamage rightly remarked, earned him the recognition of the people of Rājaraṭṭha, as the hero who had liberated the country from the foreigners. The exhibition of the Tooth and Bowl Relics and a celebration of a festival in their honour, immediately after this second

1. Ibid., pp.162-63.

2. Cv., 89.12-46; Pjv., pp.48-49.

consecration, make one believe that Parākramabāhu considered this the opportune moment to show the people of Rājaraṭṭha that he was in possession of the relics and for that reason had a stronger claim to the Rājaraṭṭha, the throne of which he gained by right of war. This is very likely for such a demonstration is quite in keeping with the practice of the previous rulers of Polonnaruva.¹ Besides, the political motive of this festival is quite understandable if it is viewed in the light of the first festival which Parākramabāhu celebrated soon after his accession to the throne of Māyāraṭṭha.² If the latter festival was meant to earn the goodwill of the Saṅgha and the people of Māyāraṭṭha, it is reasonable to hold that the festival in Polonnaruva too was celebrated to serve the same purpose. Thus it would follow that the political significance of the Tooth Relic was successfully utilized by Parākramabāhu to organize the Sinhalese resistance against the rule of Māgha and to legitimize his position on the throne.

Further evidence to the political significance is forthcoming in the foreign invasions especially the Jāvaka and Pāṇḍya invasions of the latter half of the thirteenth century. Two Jāvaka invasions are recorded to have taken place during this

1. See above, p. 268 ff.

2. See above. p. 290 ff.

period. One, according to the Cūlavamsa and the Pūjāvaliya, took place in the eleventh year of Parākramabāhu II,¹ i.e. 1247, and the other somewhere between 1258-1262, probably in 1261.² Both these invasions were led by a king named Candrabhānu of Tāmraliṅga, the region of Ligor in the Malay Peninsula. Coëdes identified this ruler with Candrabhānu who is described in a Sanskrit inscription from Vat Hva Viah in Jaiya, as Tāmbraliṅgeśvara, belonging to the Padmavamsa or Kamalakula and also as the lord of the Pancāṇḍavamsa.³ A detailed discussion of the controversies concerning the motives and exact dates of his invasions, their after-effects and so on, is beyond the scope of this study. Suffice it to say that the first invasion ended in defeat, but Candrabhānu succeeded somehow in establishing his rule over a part of northern Ceylon. From there he led the second⁴ invasion which too was repelled by the Sinhalese helped by the Pāṇḍyas.⁵

The Cūlavamsa contains the following account concerning Candrabhānu's second invasion:

-
1. Cv., 83.36-39; Pjv., p.32; Liyanagamage, op.cit., pp.136, 144.
 2. Cv., 88.62-66; Pjv., p.46; Hvv., p.32; Liyanagamage, op.cit., pp.151-52.
 3. Coëdes, 'Le royaume de Crīvijaya', BEFEO., XVIII, no.6, 1918, pp.1-36, Text and Transl., pp.32-33; Recueil des Inscriptions du Siam, II, p.26, Transl. p.27.
 4. Liyanagamage, op.cit., pp. 151 ff; Indrapala, op.cit., p.458.
 5. Liyanagamage, op.cit., pp.133-59.

'After that time the Lord of men Candrabhānu, formerly beaten after hard fighting, having collected from the countries of the Paṇḍus and the Coḷas and elsewhere many Damiḷa soldiers, representing a great force, landed with his Jāvaka army in Mahātitttha. After the king had brought over to his side the Sīhalas dwelling in Padī, Kurundi and other districts he marched to Subhagiri. He set up there an armed camp and sent forth messengers with the message, "I shall take Tisīhala. I shall not leave it to thee. Yield upto me therefore together with the Tooth Relic of the Sage, the Bowl Relic and the royal dominion. If thou wilt not, then fight"'.¹

The Pūjāvaliya too contains an identical Sinhalese version of this passage.²

To a considerable extent this account reveals the nature and the motives of Candrabhānu's invasions. It appears that, apart from the foreign soldiers, a considerable number of Sinhalese from Padī and Kurundi constituted his forces. The Pūjāvaliya adds to the list of areas brought under his influence, Mānāmatu, Gōṇa, and Debara paṭan, which were located in the North-Western and North-Eastern coastal regions of Ceylon.³

The Pali Hatthavanagallavīhāravamsa and its Sinhalese version, the Elu Attanagalu Vamsaya state in this connexion that he had 'deluded the whole world by a show of service to the world and the śāsana'⁴ (Order). This indicates the reluctance of the

1. Cv., 88.62-66.

2. Pjv., p.46.

3. Ibid., p.46.

4. Hvv., p.32; Elu.Av., p.71, 'lōkaśāsana saṅgrahakirīm vaśayen vañcā karanalada Siyaḷu lōkayā āti'.

authors of these works to grant that Candrabhānu was a Buddhist, but it is established beyond doubt that he was so. This factor must have helped him even though he was an invader to bring to his side the people of these regions, who had undoubtedly suffered heavily under Māgha's rule of persecution and oppression. Thus he seems to have extended his influence into regions which were formerly occupied by Māgha and at the time of his second invasion, was in a stronger position.

No reason is given in the Cūlavamsa for Candrabhānu's first invasion. But the accounts referred to above give one to understand that the desire for the possession of the Tooth and the Bowl Relics was an important consideration, apart from his territorial ambitions. In the light of these apparent motives and the fact that Candrabhānu was a Buddhist as revealed by the Jaiya Inscription, Liyanagamage thinks that the first invasion too was at least partly motivated by religious considerations.¹ He further points to the possibility that Candrabhānu had heard of Ceylon especially of the time of Parākramabāhu I who was famous for his association with the relics, and made an unsuccessful attempt to obtain them by negotiations. When he heard of the difficulties in Ceylon owing to the rule of Māgha, he ventured

1. Liyanagamage, op.cit., p.138.

on this expedition thinking that the opportune moment had come to fulfil his ambition.¹ Liyanagamage cites as a parallel to Candrabhānu's venture, an inscription from Siam which mentions the story of a Siamese prince who visited Kāliṅga, Pāṭaliputra, Colamāṇḍala, the kingdom of the Mallas, and the Island of Laṅkā in a search of relics;² and he states that it is not impossible that Candrabhānu, being a Buddhist himself, had similar ideas of possessing the Tooth and the Bowl Relics now in the possession of Parākramabāhu. He concludes: 'It appears that religious motives were at least partly responsible for this venture whatever course it may have taken later'.³

From what he has to say in this connexion, Liyanagamage seems to suggest that Candrabhānu's demand for the surrender of the relics was motivated rather by religious devotion than territorial ambitions. But when the importance of the Tooth and the Bowl Relic in the political sphere is taken into account, it would appear that the political motive was uppermost.

Candrabhānu's message, 'I shall take Tisīhala. I shall not leave it to thee. Yield up to me therefore together with the Tooth Relic of the Sage, the Bowl Relic and the royal dominion. If thou wilt not, then fight', recalls to one's mind the manner

1. Ibid., p.138.

2. Ibid., p.138; Recueil des Inscriptions du Siam, I, pp.145-49.

3. Liyanagamage, op.cit., p.138.

in which the surrender of kingship was demanded in earlier times. The Udeni Vastuva of the Saddharmaratnāvaliya refers to a prince who demanded the kingdom with the message, 'either make war with me or surrender the kingdom'.¹ The Mahājanaka Jātaka mentions, 'give the royal umbrella up to me or give battle', a demand made by one of the sons of Mahājanaka of Mithilā in Videha.² An identical demand made by the Brahman Tissa and the seven Damiḷas (Tamils), concerning the handing over of the parasol finds mention in the Mahāvamsa, in its narrative of the reign of Vaṭṭagāmani.³ The last two references make it clear that the surrender of the parasol was symbolic of the surrender of kingship. The Cūlavamsa contains a classic example to demonstrate the effects of the loss of the umbrella. When Saṅgatiṣṣa II (A.D. 614) went to war with Moggallāna III (A.D. 614-19) his elephant sought the shade of a tree whereupon the umbrella fell down, for it knocked against a branch of the tree. The rebel army saw that, took possession of it and handed it over to their commander. He raised the umbrella standing on the summit of the mountain. Thereupon the king's troops, thinking he was now king, came and surrounded him.⁴

-
1. Sdr., p.202.
 2. Jataka, Vol.VI, p.31.
 3. Mv., 33.39-40.
 4. Cv., 44.18-20.

As a parallel to the possession of the umbrella, the possession of the Tooth and the Bowl Relics was a determining factor, perhaps the most important in a prince's claim to the throne during this period. Reference had already been made to the importance of the political role played by the relics during the reigns of Vikramabāhu, Parākramabāhu I, Vijayabāhu III, and Parākramabāhu II.¹ It may also be recalled that Vijayabāhu III, when his reign was drawing to a close, handed over the custody of the Tooth Relic to Parākramabāhu, a convention symbolic of the latter being nominated as his successor. Parākramabāhu observed the same practice when he handed rule over to his son, Vijayabāhu IV.² Parākramabāhu III personally visited the court of the Pāṇḍyas in order to recover the relics which were captured by Ārya Cakravarti, for he thought it worthless ruling the country without the possession of the relics.³ Had he done so, he might have been regarded as an unlawful king. Thus taken together, all this evidence clearly establishes that during this period, the sovereignty of the Island depended largely on the possession of the Tooth and the Bowl Relics.

1. See above, p.264 ff.

2. See above. p.289.

3. Cv., 90.51-55.

Now, Candrabhānu appears to have been the ruler of the northern Ceylon when he made the second attack on the Sinhalese kingdom.¹ Hence it is very likely that he was well aware of the role played by the relics for the validation of a prince's claim to the throne. If such was the case, it is quite likely that his demand to surrender the relics was made less because of his religious devotion than because of the political significance of the two relics, the surrender of which meant the surrender of the kingdom.

The political importance attached to the relics was to bring unfortunate consequences within the next twenty-five years although they had been saved from falling into the hands of Candrabhānu. In A.D. 1284, after the death of Bhuvanekabāhu of Yāpahuva, a general named Arya Cakravarti sent to Ceylon by the Pāṇḍya ruler, laid waste the kingdom and seized the Tooth Relic and all other costly treasures. He returned to the Pāṇḍya kingdom and made over the booty to king Kulasekhara who, according to the Cūlavamsa was 'the sun for the lotus blossom of the stem of the great kings of the Pāṇḍus'.² The Daḷadā Sirita, the Sinhala Daḷadā Vamsaya and foreign records confirm

1. See above, p.297.
2. Cv., 90.47.

the testimony of the Cūlavamsa.¹

About the same time Marco Polo and the Chinese annals mention an attempt made by the Chinese to obtain the relics by peaceful means. An embassy sent to Ceylon in A.D. 1284 by Kublai Khan for the purpose of obtaining relics, finds mention in the records of Marco Polo, who visited Ceylon in A.D. 1292. According to him, this mission was successful in obtaining the Alms Bowl, two of the grinder teeth and some hair belonging to Adam.² The Chinese records, on the other hand, mention an emissary, Uigur-i-hei-mi-shih, who was sent to Seng-kia-li (Ceylon) in A.D. 1282 in order to obtain the Buddha's Alms-Bowl and body relics (Sarira) and who was unsuccessful.³ In 1287 the same envoy was sent to Ma'bar to get the relics but the mission again failed.⁴ Thus it would appear that although there is a similarity regarding the purpose of the mission, there is a contradiction between the two records as regards the outcome of it and also a difference of two years in the date.

The reason for the failure of the Chinese mission seems to have been the invasion of Arya Cakravarti. The Chinese embassy which was sent in A.D. 1282 would have taken at least three months for their voyage, for from the Yuan Shih we learn

1. See above.p.200.

2. Foreign Notices of South India, p.161.

3. Ibid., p.153.

4. Ibid., p.153; Dhammavisuddhi, op.cit., p.323 ff; UHC., I, pt.II, p.631 ff.

that the envoys sent from China who embarked in the first month of the eighteenth year (about February 1281), arrived in Ceylon after three moons, i.e. three months.¹ Thus if there was no undue delay, they could have arrived in Ceylon in the same year or in 1283, depending on which part of the year they embarked. Thus if the Chinese records are accurate as regards the date of this mission and the Cūlavamsa narrative records the events in a chronological order, the Chinese mission would have come to Ceylon earlier than the invasion of Arya Cakravartī. If such was the case, we are left in doubt as to why they could not obtain the relics from the Sinhalese ruler. A reason which may be advanced in this connexion is that the Sinhalese ruler was not willing to part with the relics, even to please the mighty emperor of China, probably because of their political significance. But the fact that there were no hostile feelings of the Chinese towards Ceylon because of the latter's refusal to hand over the relics, together with the fact that the Ceylonese sources make no mention of the Chinese mission, leaves room for doubt as regards the accuracy of the Chinese account. Two alternative explanations which may be suggested are that the Pāṇḍya invasion came earlier than we are given to understand

1. Foreign Notices of South India, p.151.

or that the Chinese mission was sent later than has been recorded. The latter view in fact finds corroboration in the records of Marco Polo.

However, the Chinese mission sent in 1287 to Ma'bar to procure the Bowl Relic reveals an interesting point which is not specified in the Ceylonese sources. Although the Cūlavamsa makes mention of the capture of the Tooth Relic and sabbaṃ sāradhanam (all costly treasures),¹ it says nothing about the capture of the Bowl Relic, nor does it make mention of it even in the recovery of the Tooth Relic by Parākramabāhu III.² But the Chinese records referred to above make it clear that the Bowl Relic too was captured by Arya Cakravarti. This is quite possible for if it were not the case, the Chinese mission, even if it arrived in Ceylon later than Arya Cakravarti's invasion, would have obtained the Bowl Relic from the Sinhalese ruler; and there would have been no reason to send a mission to Ma'bar to procure the relic. From what happened, one gets the impression that the actual purpose of the mission was not the procurement of the Bowl Relic and other relics but the procurement of the Tooth Relic. The Chinese, like the Jāvakas and Pāṇḍyas, may well have been aware of the importance of the Tooth Relic, and for that reason they would not have been

1. Cv., 90.46.

2. Ibid., 90.51-55.

content with anything other than that. The fact that a mission was sent to Ma'bar thus suggests that its purpose was to obtain the Tooth Relic together with the Bowl even though no reference to the former is made in Chinese records.

What was then the reason which motivated these foreign powers to take such an interest to obtain the Tooth Relic and the Bowl Relic? Parnavitana observes that the Pāṇḍya ruler must certainly have used the Tooth Relic as a lever to gain political influence over the Island.¹ This view gains strength from the preceding events.² But how far this reason can be applied to China's attempts to obtain the relics is not certain. There seems to have been a tendency by this time in the Chinese court to establish friendly relations with the barbarians outside the sea of China probably as a means of enforcing Chinese authority. The missions headed by Yang-Ting-Pi resulted in the acceptance of Chinese authority by the rulers of Kulam, Su-mu-ta (Mangalore or a place not far from it)³ Na-wang (not identified), and Su-mu-tu-la (Sumatra) who sent annual tributes to the Chinese court.⁴ It is not impossible therefore that

1. UCHC., I, pt.II., p.758.

2. See above, p.264 ff; UCHC., I, pt.II, p.633.

3. Foreign Notices of South India, pp.152-54.

4. Ibid., pp.152-54.

the Chinese wanted to establish a similar relationship with Ceylon and, for this reason, attempted to obtain the relics as the most effective means of enforcing their authority.

The political significance of the Tooth Relic is further illustrated in epigraphs of the fifteenth century. Six inscriptions which were ascribed to this period refer to the Tooth Relic as being used in such political matters as taking oaths, concluding alliances, enforcing royal decrees, and pledging allegiance. The use of a relic in such affairs is a practice unprecedented and therefore merits further discussion.

The mediation of the monks seems to have been the most popular and perhaps effective way of settling political disputes in ancient Ceylon. Kākavanna Tissa is said to have made his ten warriors take an oath in the presence of the Saṅgha that they would not go to the battlefield of his two sons in case a dispute should arise between the latter. The warriors were faithful to this vow and did not take part in the war that subsequently ensued between Duṭṭhagāmaṇī and Saddhātissa.¹ At a later stage a reconciliation between the two princes was effected through the mediation of Elder Godhagatta Tissa.² When seven ministers had left Vaṭṭagāmaṇi,

1. Mv., 24.10-11.

2. Ibid., 24.49-58.

the two theras, Tissa and Mahatissa, took them to the king and made an end to the quarrel.¹ The participation of the monks in such affairs is evident in later times. Reconciliations of Sena II with his yuvarāja Mahinda and of Kassapa IV with prince Mahinda were brought about through the mediation of the bhikkhus.² Similarly when Gajabāhu II was in an imminent danger of falling into the hands of Parākramabāhu, the monks of the three fraternities succeeded in concluding an alliance between the two.³

A deviation from this popular practice could be seen in the Gaḍalādeniya Slab Inscription of Jayavīra Parākramabāhu which grants an amnesty to Mēnavara Tunayan, and the people of the five countries.⁴ Among the details found in the epigraph, of particular importance for our study is the detail that the king promised in the presence of the Tooth Relic, to abide by the conditions of the amnesty laid down in the inscription.⁵

'Such is the command', it is said, 'of the Three Gems, the Tooth and the Bowl Relics, of Śakra, Brahma, Viṣṇu, Mahēśvara and the rest of the gods'.⁶ With a similar oath the dignitary and the

1. Ibid., 33.70-77.

2. Cv., 51.13-14; 52.9.

3. Ibid., 70.327-36; Ep.Zeyl., IV, p.7 II lines 12-14.

4. See above, p.234.

5. Ep.Zeyl., IV, p.24 I B lines 34-36.

6. Ibid., p.24 I B lines 29-34.

people promised to obey the king.¹

These details are of particular importance for they point to another development of the function of the Tooth Relic in the political sphere. Since the Relic was always under the custody of the Sangha they would no doubt have participated as arbitrators on this occasion as in the preceding period. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that they were not mentioned here while the Tooth Relic was given the place of the mediator as the two parties, the king and the dignitaries, took the oath in its presence. Further, the passage 'this is the command of the Tooth and the Bowl Relics...'² suggests that the settlement was brought into effect in the name of the two relics which in turn indicates that they, among other sacred objects and deities, were considered means by which the two parties involved were obliged to observe the conditions of the settlement. This too is different from the practice followed in earlier times concerning such affairs.

A large number of inscriptions dated from the ninth century onwards give one to understand the manner in which royal decrees were issued. One popular method was to issue orders in the name of the reigning king.³ A slight variation of this

1. Ibid., p.25. II A. lines 40-43, B. lines 1-10.

2. See above, p. 309.

3. Ep.Zeyl, I, pp.25,46-49; V, pp.323,398-99,406-07.

practice was the issuing of royal decrees by state dignitaries but that too, was done by acknowledging the authority of the ruler.¹ The other method widely used during this period was to use an imprecation to insure that future rulers abode by the rules laid down in epigraphs. One such imprecation was that those who transgressed the decrees laid down in royal edicts would, in a future existence be born as people of low castes,² crows or dogs.³ The latter imprecation is sometimes conveyed by the two symbols of crow and dog.⁴ Other imprecations very often found in inscriptions are that those who infringe any command would take upon themselves the sins committed by a killer of cows at Mahavoṭi⁵ (Mahātitttha), or the sins committed by all inhabitants of the land;⁶ that they would suffer the consequences of the sin of having slain cows and Brahmans on the banks of the Ganges;⁷ that they would enter the same hell into which entered Devadatta;⁸ and that they would not be able to raise their hands (in adoration) even if

-
1. Ibid., I, pp.168-69,174; III, pp.74-78; V, pp.339-40; MASC., VI, pp.67-69. B. lines 20-26; JRAS(CB)., XXII, no.65, 1912, pp.362-63.
 2. Ep.Zeyl., II, no.36, p.226, II B. lines, 29-30; V, p.206 II B. lines 17-22.
 3. Ibid., I, p.205 II D. lines 18-22; V. p.206 II B. lines 17-22; p.295 II. D, lines 2-8; p.352 II D. lines 5-11; p.376 II D. lines 6-9.
 4. Ibid., V. pp.361,370,377,389.
 5. Ibid., III, p.223, II. C. lines 17-21; p.225 fn.9; p.132; II, p.233 II. C. lines 11-12.
 6. Ibid., III, p.132, lines 6-9.
 7. MASC., VI, pp.73-74.
 8. Ep.Zeyl., V, p.169, lines 15-16.

the perfect Buddha, Metteyya, were to pass by their doors.¹
 In addition the enforcement of royal charters in the name of
 the Three Gems is also evident from epigraphical sources.²

It is however, interesting to note that a command such as
 the one found in the Gaḍalādeniya Inscription³ is not found
 elsewhere until the latter half of the fifteenth century.
 Within the last four decades of this century, five more
 inscriptions testify to the fact that the Tooth Relic was being
 used to validate some important political issue of the day.
 The Gaḍalādeniya Inscription of Senāsammata Vikramabāhu records
 an amnesty granted by the king to the people of certain
 provinces in the Kandyan kingdom and provides that the heriot
 (malāraya or marāla) of those who have fallen in the elephant
 hunt shall, in the absence of an heir, be devoted to the
 restoration of vihāras in disrepair. It concludes in the
 following manner:

'This is the command of the Three Gems; this is the
 command of the Tooth and Bowl Relics; this is the
 command of Śakra, Brahma...'.⁴

Similarly two slab inscriptions from Alutnuvara record another
 amnesty granted by the same ruler to the people of Satara-Kōralē

-
1. Ibid., III, p.258 II B. lines 7-13.
 2. Ibid., IV, p.7 II. lines, 13-14.
 3. See above, p. 309.
 4. Ep.Zeyl., IV, pp.8-15, lines 9-12.

and the pledge of allegiance by the latter to the kingdom of the highlands (kanda uda kaṭṭuva) and contain an invocation of the people which runs thus:

'To the effect that having invoked the Tooth Relic and the Three Gems, having invoked the four guardian deities such as Dhṛatarāṣṭra (and also) having invoked Utpalavarna and other deities who are the lords of Laikā....'.¹

In his turn, the king, too, promised not to violate the amnesty after having invoked the Tooth Relic, the Three Gems, Śakra, Brahma and other gods.² Further evidence of this practice is found in the Dādigama Slab Inscription of Bhuvanekabāhu VI,³ the object of which was to proclaim a grant of amnesty by the king to the inhabitants of the four-kōralēs.

It would appear from the foregoing evidence that the Tooth Relic received a prominent position on occasions when sacred objects and deities held in highest veneration, were invoked for the enactment of an amnesty or to take an oath. The Tooth Relic was given the first place on one occasion⁴ and on other occasions was second only to the Three Gems. Later all the deities were mentioned.⁵ Another particularly noteworthy aspect is that the Gaḍalādeniya and Alutnuvara inscriptions of

-
1. Ibid., IV, pp. 261-70, Inscription no. I, lines 7-16, no. 2, lines 11-14.
 2. Ibid., IV, pp. 261-70.
 3. Ibid., III, pp. 278-86, lines 12-16.
 4. Ep. Zeyl., IV, pp. 261-70.
 5. Ibid., IV, pp. 8-15, 261-70.

Senāsammata Vikramabāhu suggest that even the rulers who were not in possession of the Relic regarded it with high esteem to the extent that its name was used to settle important political matters. This is a clear indication of the important position held by the Relic in the religious sphere during this period but it suggests also that the Tooth Relic was still a dominating factor in the political affairs of the country.

Chapter VI

The Property and Resources of the
Tooth Relic

During the period under discussion the Tooth Relic temple, like other religious centres in ancient Ceylon, seems to have become a property holding institution. Its wealth, as revealed by our sources, ranged from property such as villages (Pali. gāma, Sinhalese gam), forests or parks (P. ārāma, Sin. aram), homesteads (P. vatthu, Sin. vat, vatu), land (Sin. bim), fields (P. Khetta, Sin. ket), precious articles and money to servants, slaves, and animals such as cattle, buffaloes and elephants. The nature and extent of the resources which earned the Tooth Relic such wealth are the main points dealt with in this chapter.

The resources of the Tooth Relic can broadly be divided into two categories, viz. I. Donations by kings, members of the royal family, high dignitaries and others; II. Contributions from state officials, customs duty, tolls and isran, masran and davasran.

I

Donations by kings, members of the royal family
high dignitaries and others.

Donations by rulers were by far the major source of income of the Tooth Relic. This is quite natural for like any other

religious centre in Ancient Ceylon - or even more than any other - the prosperity of the Tooth Relic depended on the generosity of the rulers. Of the various offerings made by them during this period, the dedication of landed property deserves particular attention, for it greatly contributed to the growth of wealth of the temple.

Apart from a single reference in the Daladā Sirita¹ our sources make no mention of the dedication of land to the Tooth Relic before the end of ^{the} Anurādhapura period. This seems strange but it would not necessarily follow that such dedications were not made to the Relic during the Anurādhapura period. The famous Vēlaikkāra Inscription of the eleventh century records a promise given by the Vēlaikkāra mercenaries to protect the belongings, i.e. the villages, property and the retainers of the Tooth Relic temple.² This piece of evidence is of extreme importance for it is a clear indication that by this time, the ownership of a considerable amount of land was vested in the Tooth Relic. The same source further records that one soldier from each regiment of the Vēlaikkāra army was assigned for the protection of the temple and that he was given one vēli of land for his services.³

-
1. Dal.S., p.41. This work states that Siri Meghavanna's donations to the Relic included villages, lands, slaves and cattle, but it finds no corroboration elsewhere.
 2. Ep.Zeyl., II, p.253, lines 35-36; transl., p.255.
 3. Ibid., II, p.253, lines 33-34; transl., p.255.

This passage, it would seem, lacks precision for although it records that a vēli was given to one soldier of each regiment it is not specified whose land it was. The number the regiments in the Vēlaikkāra army is also not mentioned. As to the first, it may be suggested that land distributed was from that belonging to the Vēlaikkāras, to the king or to the Tooth Relic temple. The last alternative seems more likely to have been the case.

The Vēlaikkāra mercenaries, as could have been expected were naturally more concerned with their personal gain than with the welfare of Ceylon or its religion. As has been discussed elsewhere,¹ this view derives strength from their attitude on many occasions. It is not unlikely that some of them were Buddhists and contributed some of their wealth to Buddhist institutions. But, nevertheless, their attitude concerning personal gains as evident from the incidents cited above make it hardly conceivable that they allotted their own property for the protection of a Buddhist temple. It is also difficult to suggest that the king remunerated these mercenaries for their services in the temple, for the inscription makes no mention of the king's intervening in the entrustment of the temple to Vēlaikkāras. Hence it is probable that the vēli of land given to a soldier of each regiment of the Vēlaikkāras was from the landed property belonging to the Tooth Relic.

1. See above, pp.169-72.

On the basis of this assumption it is now possible to make a rough assessment of the extent of land allotted to these soldiers. This assessment depends on the understanding of the term vēli and the number of regiments in the Vēlaikkāra army. Vēli in Tamil has several meanings such as 'hedge', 'fence', 'wall', 'custody', 'watch', 'guard', 'land', 'field', 'land measure of 6.74 acres', 'cowshed', 'village', 'see', 'red-flowered silk cotton tree', 'sound', and 'wind'.¹ The Vēlaikkāra Inscription refers to one vēli of land, and thus no doubt, the term was used in this context to denote a measure of land. The Madras Tamil Lexicon attempts to give an approximate measure of 6.74 acres, but there seem to have been variations. As a unit of surface measure, the vēli of Tanjore, and in general, the vēli of South India, corresponded to 6.6 acres, although there were exceptions to this general rule. Some inscriptions point to vēli being 6376 kūlis i.e. about nineteen acres, but such cases are very rare.² D.C.Sirkar takes vēli as an equivalent of vāṭikā or nilam. Vāṭikā is defined in the Mayamata as 5120 square dandas and since the length of a danda being four cubits, he holds that vāṭikā (vēli) denotes a land measure of 4.48 acres.³ Thus, although there is no certainty about the exact measure of a vēli, it would seem that we may safely assume that it denotes a land

1. Tamil Lexicon, VI, pp.3838-3839.

2. A.Appadorai, Economic Conditions in Southern India (1000-1500 A.D.), Vol.I, University of Madras, 1936, pp.262, 406, 408, 410.

3. D.C.Sirkar, Indian Epigraphical Glossary, Delhi, 1966, pp.368-69.

measure of between c. 4.48 and 6.74 acres.

The Vēlaikkāra Inscription does not provide the exact number of the Vēlaikkāra regiments. But, in the concluding part of the inscription, there is a list of those who attested its contents. They were Valan kai (the right hand), Idan kai (left hand), Siru tānam (minor class), Pillai-kāl-tānam (Vellalar class), Vaḍukar (the Telugus), Malaiyālar (the Malayālis), Parivāra-k-kontam (the retinue of spear men) and Palakalanai (the army of Kalanai men?),¹ and, as Wickramasinghe suggested,² these may well have been the regiments for, if there were any others they, too, would have been mentioned in the inscription. Thus the total number of regiments of the Vēlaikkāras at this time seems to have been eight. Hence if one soldier of each of the eight regiments was given a land measuring about 6.74 acres (maximum) or 4.48 acres (minimum), the total extent of land allotted to them would have been something between 36-54 acres approximately. As has been seen above, the inscription refers to villages belonging to the Tooth Relic of which, no doubt, those allotted to the Vēlaikkāras could have been only a small portion. This indicates that there were land holdings belonging to the Tooth Relic, although no reference to them is made in our sources.

1. Ep.Zeyl., II, p.253 II lines 41-43; transl., p.255.
 2. Ibid., II, p.251.

Evidence pertaining to the donation of villages and land becomes numerous from the reign of Nissankamalla onwards. The Hāṭadāgē Portico Slab Inscription records that Nissankamalla offered his son Vīrabāhu and his daughter Sarvāṅga Sundarī to the Tooth Relic while the Prītidānaka Maṇḍapa Rock Inscription refers to what was probably another instance in which only Vīrabāhu was offered.¹ Both these inscriptions are unanimous in stating that the king dedicated many villages and lands (gambim) in addition to the treasures he offered to the Relic for the purpose of redeeming his son and daughter.² The nature and extent of these lands are, however, not known since no corroborative evidence of these donations is found elsewhere.

These references which bear evidence to the existence of villages belonging to the Tooth Relic are of particular importance for the understanding of another passage found in the Cūlavamsa which runs as follows:

'He (Parākramabāhu II) caused to be determined which villages, parks and the like were the property of the Buddha and the Doctrine, which (were) assigned maintenance villages (for ordinary needs) which the villages belonging to the chapters, which the villages which were personal possessions, which (were) the villages of the eight sanctuaries (atthāyatanagāmake) and the villages of the parivepas and had them given back'.³

-
1. Ibid., II, p.89 II lines 17-18; p.173, II lines 20-21.
 2. Ibid., II, p.89 II lines 18-21; p.173, II line 23.
 3. Cv., 84.3-4.

This passage is found in a context which describes the events after the defeat of foreign foes i.e. the troops of Māgha and those of Candrabhānu. Māgha according to the Cūlavamsa made over the vihāras, pariveṇas, and many sanctuaries to his warriors as dwellings and seized the treasures which belonged to the Buddha and the holy Order.¹ Hence the passage cited above no doubt refers to the restitution of property which formerly belonged to the Buddha, the doctrine, chapters, aṭṭhāyatanas, pariveṇas, and individual monks, and had been expropriated during Māgha's rule.

It seems strange that the Cūlavamsa, which records the removal of the Tooth Relic to Kotmalē during Māgha's rule, nowhere mentions what happened to its property. It is quite possible, however, that, at this time, when the property of all other religious establishments were subjected to seizure and expropriation as the Cūlavamsa would have us believe, those of the Tooth Relic were no exception and received the same treatment. In fact, this seems implied in the Cūlavamsa when it mentions the expropriation by Māgha of the treasures belonging to the Buddha and their subsequent restitution by Parākramabāhu. For the Tooth Relic, as any other relic, was the representation of the Buddha and for this reason, its property may well have been implied

1. Ibid.., 80.77-78.

in the term 'property of the Buddha'. Hence it is reasonable to hold that the property, including land holdings belonging to the Tooth Relic, were expropriated during the rule of Māgha and were later restituted by Parākramabāhu II.

References to the dedication of villages and lands are again found in our sources concerning the reign of Parākramabāhu IV of Kurunāgala. The Cūlavamsa gives priority to the donation of villages in a long list of this ruler's offerings to the Tooth Relic.¹ The Daladā Sirita, a contemporary work, informs us that the king decreed that a pamupu, a permanent land grant, should be given to the Tooth Relic on two occasions, on the king's birthday (niriṅḍun bihivū maṅgulhi) and on the day of another festival termed vanuvak maṅgula.² The derivation of the term vanuvak cannot be traced etymologically. Therefore it is impossible to ascertain what it stands for in this context. Rajasekara, in his edition of the Daladā Sirita, takes vanuvak to mean an 'anniversary' (saṃvatsarotsavaya).³ This interpretation is rather vague for 'anniversary', unless specified, may mean any celebration which is held annually. Parānavitana proposes to

1. Ibid., 90.76.

2. Dal.S., p.53, vanuvak maṅgula does not appear in the Br.Mus.Ms., Or.6606(31) folio khah while niriṅḍun bihivū maṅgulhi does not appear in Br.Mus.Ms., Or.6606(29) folio khām.

3. Dal.S., ed. E.S.Rajasekhara, Kandy, 1920, p.59.

take vanuvak as denoting a new-year festival,¹ which seems to be an interpretation based on that of Rājasekara.

In his edition of the Daladā Sirita Sorata states that Rajasekara's interpretation does not suit the context in which vanuvak appears in the said work. He seems to have mistaken Rajasekara's sanvatsarotsavaya (anniversary) as meaning new-year festival.² As we have seen Rajasekara's interpretation does not necessarily imply a new year festival but rather any festival held annually - it may perhaps be taken as implying a Tooth Relic festival which, too, is held annually - and in fact it was Paranavitana who proposed 'new year festival' as the interpretation of vanuvak maṅgula .

The term vanuvak appears also in the last stanza of verse sixteen of the Pārakumbā Sirita.³ In this context it has been interpreted as 'from then until the present time' (evak paṭan metuvak kal)⁴ and also as 'a great line of kings' (mahat raja vanuvek).⁵ Sorata examines the first interpretation but rejects it as unsuitable for the context in which vanuvak appears

1. MASC., IV, p.37.

2. Dal.S., p.120.

3. 'gosin valavan niriṇḍu diṭṭi eda asā ohugen raṭa pavat
tosin siya sira ohuṭa danduni ehisa deskī giya tānat
risin budubava labanu budukuru daham sapayana ebōsat
yasin sirisaṅgabō namin dān liyati vanuvak rajamahat

4. Pārakumbā Sirita, ed. D.G.Abhayagunaratna, Colombo, 1922, p.25.

5. Pārakumbā Sirit Peheliya, ed. A.Gunavardhana, Colombo, B.E.2497, p.86.

in the Daladā Sirita. In order to suit both contexts he chooses 'consecration ceremony' as the most appropriate interpretation of "vanuvak Maṅgula". He strengthens his case by assuming that the consecration ceremony was commemorated annually by the rulers of the past.¹ Dhammavisuddhi preferred this interpretation.²

It would appear that Sorata's interpretation was based only on the context but not on etymological grounds. This interpretation, however, seems convincing, and that for two reasons. First it is in agreement with a practice followed in ancient times. It is recorded in the chronicle that Sena II received his consecration at the Mahāthūpa and decreed that this event should be celebrated annually.³ This suggests that some rulers, if not all, commemorated their consecration ceremony. Secondly, it is historically possible to interpret vanuvak raja in the Pārakumbā Sirita as 'consecrated kings'. It is well known that the rulers of the latter half of the Anurādhapura period assumed a throne name either Sirisaṅgabō or Abhā Salamevan, on the day of their consecration. This practice has been followed also by later rulers.⁴ It is not impossible therefore

1. Dal.S., p.120. He does not comment on the second.

2. Dhammavisuddhi, op.cit., p.159.

3. Cv., 51.82.

4. UCHC., I, pt.I, pp.364-65; pt.II, p.529.

that the author of the Pārakumbā Sirita had this practice in mind when he wrote vanuvak raja mahat which can be interpreted as 'great consecrated kings'. It is noteworthy that only consecrated kings assumed this title and hence the above interpretation fits well in this context. Thus it seems reasonable to accept 'consecration ceremony' as a tentative translation of vanuvak Maṅgula until further evidence in this connexion is brought to light.

The above cited regulation of the Daḷadā Sirita suggests that there was a practice of granting two pamuṅus a year. What the extent of these pamuṅus was or should be is not mentioned in this work but it may range from a small piece of land to that of a large area or perhaps a village or many villages of several hundred acres. In fact the Cūlavamsa specifically mentions that villages were among the donations of Parākramabāhu IV.¹ Hence the possibility of denoting a whole village by this term cannot be completely ruled out. Nevertheless, it is not known whether the practice which Parākramabāhu caused to be recorded, i.e. of donating two pamuṅus a year, was already in vogue, or whether it was one which he initiated, either at the commencement of his reign or some time later. None of these is impossible. Therefore no definite conclusion can be arrived at in the present state of our knowledge.

1. See above, p.322.

The Cūlavamsa further states that fields were also among this ruler's donations to the Tooth Relic.¹ This appears to be the first reference to such a donation in the case of the Tooth Relic. But dedication of fields to religious institutions for the supplying of the necessities was not unknown in ancient Ceylon and this may perhaps have been the case with the Tooth Relic too, although it is not mentioned elsewhere. The Hapugastāna Inscription records another dedication of a tract of fields in the fifteenth regnal year of Parākramabāhu V. In this inscription we read that the watercourse and the dams of the tract of fields Kirallamoṭṭā had been out of order for three or four hundred years (tunsārasiyayak)² and that it had been repaired; the fields had been fully improved (samurdhakaravā) and had been dedicated to the Tooth Relic by a certain dignitary named Sivalkolu Lakdivu Adhikāra.³ A similar dedication made by the same dignitary together with four of his colleagues is mentioned in the Vīgulavatta Inscription of the fourth regnal year (A.D.1260) of Vikramabāhu III.⁴ The motive of the donations, we are told, was the accumulation of merit for the benefit of the donors, the king and all the creatures,⁵ which is the normal

1. Cv., 90.76.

2. This may perhaps be taken as 'four hundred and three years', as well.

3. JRAS(CB)., XXII, no.65, 1912, pp.362-63; N.Mudiyanse, op.cit., pp.168-69.

4. RKD., pp.78-79; JRAS(CB)., XXII, no.65, 1912, p.363; Br.Mus.Ms., Or.6606(165) folio, kū; N.Mudiyanse, op.cit., pp.186-87.

5. JBAS(CB)., XXII, no.65, 1912, p.362, line 11; p.363 lines 16-17.

purpose of religious donations. The Hapugastāna Inscription adds another detail by stating that the donation was made in order to supply the four priestly requisites (satarakaṭu - satarapasa - sivpasa).¹ This is important, for it suggests a particular motive of the donation of these fields.

Two relevant problems which merit discussion at this stage are the manner in which the proprietary rights were transferred to the Relic in the case of a donation and the income derived by the Relic as a result of such donations. As has been seen above, the sources often mention land grants but nowhere is it mentioned how and what proprietary rights were transferred to the Tooth Relic. The numerous inscriptions of the Anurādhapura period which record grants made to religious institutions suggest that these inscriptions were meant as title deeds to enable the donee to enjoy the donation without interruption. The discs of the sun and the moon appearing in these inscriptions² clearly indicate that the grants were intended to last as long as the sun and the moon. The Hapugastāna Inscription of Parākramabāhu V and the Vīgulavatta Inscription of Vikramabāhu III, which record the

-
1. Ibid., p.362 line 12. Four priestly requisites are cīvara (robes), piṇḍapāta (food received in the alms-bowl), senāsana (dwelling) and gilānapacca (medical requisites).
 2. Ep.Zeyl., II, plates 7, 9, opposite pp.36, 47. The Diṃbulāgala Mārāvīdiyē Rock Inscription categorically states that the donation is to last as long as the world endures (lov pavatnā tāk). Ibid., II, p.195 II line 7.

donation of some fields,¹ suggest that the same privileges might have accorded in the case of the donations made to the Tooth Relic. In his inscriptions, Nissankamalla records that he issued copper-plate charters since those written in olas are perishable and impermanent like lines drawn on water.²

These charters, so far as the evidence at our disposal suggests, were given only to the laity but it is not impossible that they were issued in the case of religious donations too. In the Lankātilaka Inscription of Bhuvanekabāhu IV, which records the construction of the Lankātilaka vihāra and the allocation of certain villages and lands for its maintenance, we read:

'in order that this act of merit may be maintained in the future, this edict has been granted and recorded on copper plates and in this stone inscription'.³ Thus it is evident that copper-plate charters were issued even in the fourteenth century to emphasize the perpetuity of donations.

The Arankālē Sannasa of Bhuvanekabāhu VI refers to another kind of register called danpat which served the purpose of a charter. This sannasa records two such danpatas, one given to Vidāgama Maitrī and the other to his senior pupil, Niyāṇḍavanē

1. RKD., pp.78-79; JRAS(CB)., XXII, no.65, 1912, pp.362-63.

2. Ep.Zeyl., II, p.132 II line 4.

3. UCR., XVIII, nos. 182, 1960, p.15.

Phussadeva Sumaṅgala.¹ These danpatas were meant as title deeds in order to enable the recipients to bequeath their property to their heirs in the line of pupillary monastic succession.² Regrettably, apart from the two inscriptional passages mentioned above neither copper plates nor danpatas accorded to the Tooth Relic as title deeds find mention in our sources. There is therefore no proof for the assumption that a similar method might have been followed in issuing land grants to the Tooth Relic temple, guaranteeing proprietary rights over the land.

The income derived from these lands seems to have depended on the nature of proprietary rights vested in the Tooth Relic by the donor. The dedication of a piece of land, a village or fields could have implied the transfer of the complete proprietary rights as well as the transfer of taxes, all or in part. The transfer to the temple of the right to utilize services from tenants, in addition to or in lieu of the share due from them, could also have been implied by these donations. The following discussion seeks to examine how far these criteria are applicable to land grants made to the Tooth Relic.

1. Sin.Sa.Lipi., pp.139-40.

2. Ibid., p.139.

It has been mentioned in the foregoing discussion that one type of land grant, called pamunu, was among the donations of landed property, made by Parākramabāhu IV.¹ The king also stipulated that two pamunus a year should be given to the Tooth Relic on certain specified occasions.² Pamunu according to L.S.Perera, 'confers to the grantee the most complete ownership possible within the tenure system'³ and as the word itself suggests pamunus were intended to be enjoyed in perpetuity. On this basis it may be suggested that the Tooth Relic held full proprietary rights over the lands donated to it as pamunu. A detailed discussion of rights and privileges of landlords, especially monks holding full proprietary rights, need not concern us here for they have sufficiently been discussed by previous writers.⁴ Suffice it to say that monks could exchange their properties; could withhold the water supply to fields and force the tenants to quit the land if they did not fulfil their obligations.⁵ It is therefore reasonable to hold that similar

1. See above, p.322.

2. Dal.S., p.53 regulation 32.

3. L.S.Perera, Institutions of Ceylon from Inscriptions, unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Ceylon, 1949, p.1261.

4. Gunawardana, op.cit., p.71 ff; Dhammavisuddhi, op.cit., p.205 ff.

5. Samantapāsādikā, (PTS), pp.679, 682, 1238; Pmvv., p.57.

On the evidence of the Mahāvamsa that Gajabāhu's mother bought a plot of land from the Mahāvihāra to build a residence for monks (Mv., 35.121) and the Mihintale Tablets which prohibit the sale or mortgage of monastic property (Ep.Zeyl., I, p.92 II A.lines 29-30; p.97 II B. lines 56-58),

(Contd. on next page....)

powers were vested in the Tooth Relic temple in the case of such lands donated to the Relic.

Thus, if complete proprietary rights were vested in the Tooth Relic, the Tooth Relic temple would also have enjoyed landlord's share as well as that charged by the state, the latter in accordance with the precise conditions laid down in the grant. In ancient Ceylon, as in India, there does not seem to have been any precise rate concerning taxation and landlord's share. In India, the tax charged on land was usually a sixth of the produce but there were variations such as a half, a third, a fourth, an eighth and sometimes a twelfth, depending on the nature of the land, water supply, and such other considerations.¹ These rules, it would appear, were followed also in Ceylon throughout the period under discussion. The Perumiyamkulam Inscription includes among other items of income on a tank sakoṭasahi ekakoṭasa pati, (the right to one share of every six shares).² From the

(.....contd. from previous page)

Gunawardhana concludes that the monks could even sell the property over which they held full proprietary rights (op.cit., p.71 ff). Viewed in the light of the present practice the ability to sell the land may seem a right but this may not have been the case in ancient times because it made the monastery subject to political and economic pressures. Pamupu lands as the word itself and the discs of sun and moon suggest, were inalienable.

1. The Kautilya Arthasāstra, II, ed. R.P.Kangle, Bombay, 1963, p.343; Manusmṛti, (SBE)., XXV, Oxford, 1886, p.237.
2. JRAS(CB)., NS., V, pp.129-36.

Vessantara Jātaka in the Butsarana, a twelfth century work, we learn that king Vessantara was given a share of a sixth from the wealth of the people.¹ The fact that this detail does not appear in the Vessantara Jātaka neither in the Pali Jātakatṭhakathā nor in the Sinhalese Jātaka Pota suggests that the author of the Butsarana recorded a practice prevalent during his time.

Nissāṅkamalla, as revealed by his inscriptions, introduced a system of taxation which depended on the productive capacity of the land. The share of the state from one amuna of land of the highest productivity was one amuna, three pālas of grain and a cash payment of six maḍaran coins. From land of the middle quality the share of the state was one amuna, two pālas of paddy and four maḍaran coins while one amuna, one pāla of paddy and three maḍaran coins was the share from the land of the lowest productivity.² It is not known to what percentage these figures amount but it seems to be quite different from the methods stated above.

The landlord's share too, seems to have depended on various circumstances. I-Tsing, who visited India in the seventh century, testifies to the practice of giving the share of one sixth to the monks but adds that, although this was the usual practice, it was

1. Butsarana, ed. W.Sorata, Colombo, 1953, p.299.

2. Ep.Zeyl., II, p.110 II A. lines 16-17; UCHC., I, pt.II, p.548.

modified according to the season.¹ He also records that giving a third of the vegetables from the taxable lands of the Saṅgha is the practice prevalent in Tāmralipti.²

There is evidence to the latter method being practised in Ceylon. The Mihintale Tablets regulate that a third of the produce of land should be taken to the monastery.³ It is uncertain whether this regulation specifies the dues which the monastery received from its tenants, but, more positive evidence of this practice is forthcoming in the Pūjāvaliya. According to this work, a farmer had to allocate a half or a third of the produce of his fields to the landlord in accordance with the terms of his tenure.⁴ This even leads us to the assumption that the Mihintale Tablets are referring to a similar instance.

The Anurādhapura Slab Inscription of Mahinda IV contains a detail which may perhaps imply an exception to this practice. This inscription stipulates that one fruit out of ten from trees and shrubs that may exist in the future in Tamil villages and the lands situated in the four quarters should be payable⁵ but, owing

-
1. I-Tsing, A Record of the Buddhist Religion, transl., J.Takakusu, Oxford, 1896, p.61; one sixth of the produce, as we see from other sources, was usually the share due to the state. It is not known whether I-Tsing confused the dues of the state with that of the landlord.
 2. Ibid., p.62.
 3. Ep.Zeyl., I, p.93, II A. line 38.
 4. Pjv., ed. A.V.Suravira, Colombo, 1961, p.347; UCHC., I, pt.II, pp.721-22.
 5. Ep.Zeyl., I, p.118 II lines 41-48.

to the fragmentary nature of this inscription, it is impossible to ascertain by whom this share was exacted. Three possibilities may be suggested. One is that it refers to a tax due to the state. The other is that this refers to a share appropriated by the Tooth Relic temple, for in another context the same inscription records that a certain share of these lands should be kept apart for the upkeep of the Tooth Relic temple.¹ The third is that it mentions a share due from farmers to the landlords of Tamil villages and other lands of the four quarters.

The Vimativinodanī, the subcommentary on the Vinayaṭṭhakathā written in the twelfth century by Coliya Kassapa, provides substantial evidence which makes the latter two alternatives more plausible. Referring to the plantation agriculture in the lands owned by monasteries, this work stipulates that, if the cultivator plants trees and looks after them from the very beginning, he should return only one tenth of the produce to the monastery and enjoy the rest.² From the inscription cited above we learn that a share of a tenth was to be appropriated from the trees and shrubs which may exist in the future, evidently meaning those which the cultivator planted and looked after from the very beginning. There is, therefore, no doubt that both the

1. Ibid., I, p.118. II lines 44-45.

2. Vimativinodanī, ed. B.Dhammadharatissa, Colombo, 1935, p.513.

inscription and the Vimativinodanī attest to the practice of paying the share of only a tenth from the produce of trees and shrubs to be planted later. This even leads one to suggest that dasamabhāgaṃ (a tenth part) found in the Samantapāsādikā¹ and the regulation that 'a tenth part of the revenue should be given to the Abhayagiri-vihāra'² of the Slab Inscription of Kassapa V are referring to similar instances. The fact that this is an exception is quite evident from the Anurādhapura Slab Inscription which provides that the method which should be followed in the case of trees and shrubs that are already in existence at the time of the inscription, is to appropriate the produce according to the former custom (peresirit).³ This peresirit may have been somewhat different from the realization of a tenth, probably the usual share of a third from the produce.

It would thus appear that there was no precise rule regarding the taxation from plantation crops and the share due to the landlord. Although the tax depended on various considerations, the most common practice, at least theoretically, would have been the realization of a share of a sixth of the produce. This share due to the state would have been transferred

-
1. Smp., (PTS)., p.1103.
 2. Ep.Zeyl., I, p.49 II lines 46-47.
 3. Ibid., I, p.118 II lines 46-47.

to the Tooth Relic temple whenever a grant of landed property was made with the right to royal dues. In such cases the Tooth Relic temple received an income in addition to the landlord's share. In other cases, its income would have been either a half or a third or else a tenth depending on the nature of the cultivation.

This leads us to the question as to whether the realizing of a share of the produce is in keeping with the vinaya rules. According to the Samantapāsādikā, the vihāras are allowed to receive only suitable articles (kappiyabhaṇḍa) but not a stipulated share of the harvest.¹ These suitable articles were rice and aparanna. Aparanna is described in the Sikhavalaṇḍa Vinisa as uṇḍu (peas), muṇ (green gram, phaseolus mungo), tala (sesamum), kollu (glycine villosa), komaḍu (melon), pusul (pumpkin) and the like.² Thus it is evident that at least in theory, the vihāras were expected to receive only food stuffs which were necessary for the survival of the monks.

There are indications in the Samantapāsādikā that monks, in actual practice, received a share from paddy fields. This work prohibits the monks from claiming more than that is allocated to them³ or from claiming kahāpaṇas in lieu of their

1. Smp., (SHB)., II, p.490; Pmvv., pp.56-57.

2. Sikhavalaṇḍa Vinisa, ed. D.B.Jayatilaka, Colombo, 1934, p.71.

3. Smp., (SHB)., II, p.490 ff; Pmvv., p.58.

share, even before it is allocated. Moreover, when the farmers inform them of the extent of land cultivated and the share allocated to them, the monks should not measure the land in order to ascertain whether the share given to them is appropriate. It is also improper for them to stay and watch in the threshing floor, take a share from it and store it in the granary.¹ As these regulations, coupled with the reference to the granary, concern possibilities for certain abuses by the monasteries, they may indirectly strengthen the view that, provided these excesses did not occur, the monasteries exacted a share from the land. This may well have been the case with the Tooth Relic temple too.

The Daladā Sirita sheds some light on another kind of income from landed property. This work stipulates that paṅḍuru should be given by those who hold pamuṅu; wicks and oil (vāṭi tel) from those holding divelgam and isran masran and davasran from others (sessangen).² This regulation lacks precision and therefore, may convey two meanings. Pamuṅu and divelgam in this regulation could denote either those lands belonging to the Tooth Relic temple or else those assigned by the state to

1. Ibid., p.58.

2. 'Lakdiva pamuṅu ātiyavungen paṅḍuru hā divelgamin vāṭi tel hā sessangen isran masran davasran hā denuva isā', Dal.S., p.54 regulation 38. Isran, masran and davasran will be dealt with elsewhere. See below, p.365 ff.

private individuals as pamuṇu and divel¹ land with the understanding that a certain portion of the income was due to the Tooth Relic temple. The latter seems more likely in this context.

This view gains support from the inscriptions of the ninth and tenth centuries. The Gonnāva Dēvālē Inscription records that a piece of land called Mahalābim, has been granted to Agbō Mugayin Varadanā. The land was to be held on pamuṇu tenure and the donee was expected to give a share (bā) of one amuna of paddy for each kiri of field at each harvest to the inner monastery of the Mahāvihāra.² Another inscription from Nāgama, dated the seventh year of a king identified as Kassapa IV, records the grant of a village Koḷayunu in the district of Tanabim to a certain mahayā Kitambavā. This village too was to be held on pamuṇu tenure and a badu (rent or tax) was to be paid to the Abhayagiri monastery.³ A similar grant is mentioned in the Rambāva Inscription of Mahinda IV, where we read that a person called Kaliṅgurad Pirivat Hambuvan was given some property on the condition that he should supply oil for two months each year at

1. Divel is equal to Skt., jīvita and Pali jīvana which means life, existence, subsistence and livelihood. Land held on divel tenure therefore, would have been given for subsistence for the period of service. For details see W.I.Siriweera, op.cit., p.68.

2. Ep.Zeyl., IV, p.189 II A lines 6-17.

3. Ibid., II, pp.17-18.

the rate of one lāha a week for the maintenance of lamps at the shrine of the Bō Tree at the Mahāvihāra.¹ In all these three instances, the donee, not the religious institution, was the owner of the land. He was also exempted from royal dues; but a part of his income had to be transferred to the monastery. This portion must have been either the equivalent of the royal dues or, more probably, considerably less than that. It is very likely that pamuṇu and divelgam mentioned in the Daladā Sirita were settled on a similar basis. In that case, it may be suggested that the Tooth Relic temple received an income from the lands which were settled on the condition that the donee should pay paṇḍuru² or supply wicks and oil to the said temple.

Apart from this practice of assigning a share of the produce to the temple there seems to have been another practice followed in the case of the landed property of the Tooth Relic Temple. A brief discussion of the administration of lands belonging to the present Tooth Relic temple at Kandy may be helpful in understanding it. The lands belonging to the Tooth Relic temple are divided into four categories.

1. Ibid., II, pp.67-68 II lines 19-29.

2. The term paṇḍuru is used at present to mean coins or currency offered to Buddhist temples or to shrines of gods. It seems to be a derivation of Pali pannakāra which according to Mv., 11.24, denotes any kind of presents. (Dhammavisuddhi, op.cit., pp.160-61). But according to the contexts in which paṇḍuru appears in this regulation as well as in regulations no. 27 and 33 (Dal.S., pp.53-54), it denotes a kind of revenue assigned to the Tooth Relic temple.

- A. Muttettu¹ Lands: As the word muttettu itself suggests lands dedicated primarily for the supply of food to the Tooth Relic, belong to this category. In many cases these lands are paddy fields.
- B. Bandāra Lands: Those given to the Diyavaḍana Nilamē for his maintenance and that of the Tooth Relic temple. Both fields and arable lands belong to this category.
- C. Paravēni Lands: Similar to those mentioned as pamuḡu in our sources. They are given to officials such as the drummers, whistle blowers, those who carry banners during annual processions, and others who attend to various duties in the temple. The lands of this category are to be enjoyed in hereditary succession but are subject to rājakāriya (compulsory service). It is a strict rule that the donee should either perform his rājakāriya or pay an amount in cash in accordance with the extent of land he enjoys. If he fails to fulfil this obligation he can be evicted from the land by legal proceedings.

1. Paranavitana states that it is a corruption of Tamil murrūṭṭu which means 'complete' (murru) and 'eating' (ūṭṭu). The term, according to him, is akin in meaning to Sinhalese batgama a term applied to estates of which the produce was reserved for the king. (UCHC., I, pt.II, pp.741-42). See also, W.I.Siriweera, op.cit., p.52.

D. Paṭṭumāru or Māruvana lands: (changing lands) Lands subject to rājakāriya, over which, however, the tenant does not have permanent ownership. The allocation of these lands is entirely at the discretion of the Diyavaḍana Nilamē. Failure to fulfil the requirements would result in the eviction of the tenant, after which the land would be given to another.¹

It would appear that lands belonging to categories B, C, and D are primarily meant for the utilization of labour (rājakāriya) on behalf of the Tooth Relic temple. This indicates that, although the Rājakāriya system (compulsory labour) in Ceylon was abolished in 1832 by the British, it still plays a dominant role in the Tooth Relic temple. This seems strange but may perhaps be explained as a result of two vital factors; viz. the necessity firstly to utilize a large number of servants who are needed in temple rituals and especially in annual celebrations, and secondly of making the best use of landed property spread almost everywhere in Ceylon, the effective administration of which would otherwise be impossible. The need for such a system must have been felt even in earlier times, too.

1. This information was obtained from Mr.H.B.Uduravana, the present Diyavaḍana nilamē at the Tooth Relic temple.

Hence it is not unlikely that, in addition to, or perhaps, in some cases, in lieu of, the usual practice of taking a share from the produce of land, a servile tenure system was in operation in the case of the landed property of the Tooth Relic. This system, in fact, was not unknown in ancient Ceylon. The Mihintale Tablets provide that the lands belonging to the Cetiyagiri monastery should be settled as kāra tenure but not as pāṭṭa.¹ The kāra tenure which finds mention in the inscription has been explained differently. Wickramasinghe sought its derivation from Sanskrit kārika and took it to mean a payment on a fixed rate.² Codrington explained it as temporary allotments.³ Parnavitana compared it with Sanskrit kārya and suggested that it refers to a servile tenure system.⁴

-
1. Ep.Zeyl., I, p.93 II A lines 43-44. Wickramasinghe interprets the term pāṭṭa as 'absolute transfers', the deed of which is inscribed on copper plates or on stone. He also points to the possibility that the term in Indian usage (cf. Paṭṭādār) denotes 'a deed of lease' (Ibid., I, p.105, fn.2). Parnavitana agrees with the latter alternative and adds that it indicates a revenue farming system (Ibid., V, pt.I, pp.127-28).
 2. Ep.Zeyl., I, p.103, fn.2.
 3. H.W.Codrington, Ancient Land Tenure and Revenue in Ceylon, Colombo, 1938, pp.14-16.
 4. Ep.Zeyl., III, p.191, fn.3.

Perera agreed with this suggestion.¹ Parnavitana later changed his view and interpreted it as dues, tax or revenue.² After making allowances for different contexts in which this words appears, Gunawardana takes kāra to mean a tenure on which the land was given to peasants for cultivation and, in a secondary sense, the share due to the state or to the land owner from the tenant cultivators. He further points out the possibility that the tenants in addition to the share they paid, had to serve at the monastery as Parnavitana and Perera surmised.³

It is thus evident that whichever view one accepts, a servile tenure system was in operation, at least partly, in monasteries like the Cetiyaigiri. This may well have been the case with the Tooth Relic temple as it is today but regrettably we are not in a position to ascertain the origins of this practice. However, if it can be dated back to an earlier period it may be suggested that the servile tenure system played a dominant role in the lands belonging to the Tooth Relic temple.

Another kind of donation consisted of different kinds of precious objects, such as jewels, pearls, gold, silver and the like. Reference is often made in the chronicle to the

-
1. L.S.Perera, op.cit., p.1274.
 2. Ep.Zeyl., V, pt.I, pp.128-29.
 3. Gunawardhana, op.cit., pp.98-100.

offerings of relic caskets of gold and silver¹ which were sometimes ornamented with precious stones.² An idea of the splendour and beauty of such a casket offered by Parākramabāhu VI can be obtained from a passage of the Cūlavamsa which runs as follows:

'He fashioned a golden casket fair beautifully set with nine precious stones³ and another casket in the form of a shell gleaming in manifold splendour and set with the most exquisite jewels in which held the first casket; and yet another golden casket into which he also put the second. Finally the king who strove after salvation in the present as in future existences made a (fourth) large incomparably magnificent casket which he covered with gold of the finest lustre and in these superb caskets he placed the Tooth'⁴

It would appear, even after making allowances for possible exaggerations of the chronicler, that the caskets mentioned in this passage were of a considerable value. The exact value of these caskets is seldom mentioned. According to the Daladā Sirita of the three caskets which Parākramabāhu II had made for the Tooth Relic, one was worth 5,000 pieces of gold coins (pandahasak ratraṇin) while another was worth 30,000 pieces of silver coins.⁵ The Daladā Pūjāvaliya states that

1. Ep.Zeyl., II, p.89 II lines 18-19; p.113 II B line 24; p.173 II lines 21-22; Cv., 91.12.
2. Ibid., 54.5; 82.11-14; 91.18-19; Ep.Zeyl., I, p.219.
3. Ruby, pearl, agate, diamond, lapis lazuli, coral, sapphire, topaz and emerald (C.Carter, A Sinhalese-English Dictionary, Colombo, 1924, p.317).
4. Cv., 91.18-19.
5. Dal.S., p.44; the Daladā Pūjāvaliya states that the king made a casket worth 40,000 silver coins (Dal.Pjv., p.50).

Parākramabāhu IV made a casket worth 7,000 pieces of silver coins.¹ Bhuvanekabāhu V too is said to have spent 7,000 pieces of silver coins on a casket for the Relic.² It is clear that the authors of these sources have expressed the amount in the currency that was in circulation during their times but since the weight and value of the currency involved is uncertain, an assessment of their exact value is impossible.³

Apart from these caskets, various other kinds of precious objects were offered to the Tooth Relic. Parākramabāhu I, according to the Cūlavamsa, offered precious stones, pearls, costly jewels and the like⁴ while the offerings of Parākramabāhu II consisted of seven kinds of precious objects.⁵ On another occasion the same ruler is said to have offered flags of gold, flags of silver, golden and silver vessels, golden and silver fly

-
1. Ibid., p.51.
 2. Cv., 91.12; The Rājaratnākaraya credits Bhuvanekabāhu VI with the making of a casket worth 7,000 massa (Rrk., p.47). This seems to be the result of a confusion in recording the events, as is evident from the fact that Virabāhu is mentioned after Parākramabāhu VI. It is very likely therefore, that the Rājaratnākaraya also is referring to the donation of Bhuvanekabāhu V.
 3. For different values and weights of currency of Ceylon in the Mediaeval period see H.W.Codrington, Ceylon Coins and Currency Memoirs of the Colombo Museum, Series 'A', no.3, Colombo, 1924, p.50 ff.
 4. Cv., 74.188-90.
 5. Ibid., 82.53; the seven kinds of precious objects are suvanna (gold), rajata (silver), mutta (pearls), mani (precious stones like sapphire and ruby), veluriya (semi precious stone like cat's eye), vajira (diamond) and pavala (coral). Childers, A Dictionary of the Pali Language, p.402, s.v. ratanam.

whisks, gold and silver chests, golden and silver fans, golden and silver bowls with lotus flowers and punnakalasā (filled jars) which were fashioned of gold and silver.¹

Parākramabāhu VI, according to the Saddharmaratnākaraya, donated vessels of solid gold and numerous other precious objects.²

There may be a certain amount of exaggeration in these accounts but again they indicate that a considerable amount of gold, silver and other precious objects had been dedicated to and came into the possession of the Tooth Relic during the period under consideration.

There are, in the chronicle, a number of references to such votive offerings as flowers, incense, oil, fruits, boiled rice and drinks made in honour of the Tooth Relic.³ Most of these offerings, it would appear, are of a perishable nature and for this reason, apart from earning merit to the donor, do not seem to provide any material benefit to the relic temple. On the other hand, a regulation in the Daḷadā Sirita suggests that this was not the case. It prescribes that sacrificial rice (pavaḍā bat) should be distributed among the retinue and musicians of the Tooth

1. Cv., 85.26-29.

2. Srk., p.295; see above, pp. 62, 232.

3. Cv., 74.188-90, 85.31-36, 89.42-45, 90.73-75.

Relic temple.¹ To determine the meaning of this regulation it may be useful to compare the practices in South Indian temples.

In South Indian temples sacrificial rice served an economic purpose. It was sometimes sold to the devotees to provide for an additional income for the temple,² while on other occasions - especially in times of distress - it was given to the employees as remuneration.³ The sale of rice to devotees was unknown in Ceylon but there is evidence to the prevalence of the distribution of rice to temple employees as a part of their remuneration. The Mihintale Tablets state that certain employees of the Cetiyagiri monastery received a portion of boiled rice as a part of their remuneration. Some of these employees were the cooks, those who procured firewood, the thatchers, the potters, the official who takes care of the relic house, the punākāmiyā (meaning obscure),⁴ the kamassam (one who appropriates work), the kamtān (the overseer of workers), and the kābali laddā (recipient of allotments).⁵ These employees were those who attend to day-to-day duties in the monastery and for this reason they could well belong to the same category as retinue (parivāraya)

1. Dal.S., p.50 regulation 8, pāvada bat parivārayaṭa hā viddatūnaṭa bedādenu koṭa isā.

2. B.Stein, 'Economic Function of a South Indian Temple', JAS., XIX, no.2, February, 1960, pp.172-73.

3. A.Appadorai, op.cit., I, pp.279-80.

4. Ep.Zeyl., II, p.9 II. line 41, p.111, fn.7; Gunawardhana, op.cit., p.163.

5. Ep.Zeyl., pp.109-10, 111.

mentioned in the Daḷadā Sirita. From the introductory section of the same epigraph we learn that the rules laid down in it were selected from those in force at the Abhayagiri-Vihāra and those formerly instituted at the Cetiyagiri.¹ This points to the possibility that some of the retinue of the Abhayagiri - vihāra were also paid in the same manner. It is not at all clear whether the rice thus distributed was taken from the offerings or from that cooked daily in the monastery for the resident monks but the latter seems to be more probable in the case of monasteries like the Cetiyagiri or the Abhayagiri, where hundreds of monks lived. But the rice distributed among the retinue of the Tooth Relic temple could have been either part of the offerings or that which was cooked in the temple or perhaps both. Whichever it was, since it is clear that distribution of rice was considered both in South India and Ceylon as a part of the remuneration of the temple employees, it may be suggested that it served the same purpose in the Tooth Relic temple.

Among the animate offerings to the Tooth Relic the dedication of the members of the royal family and state functionaries deserves particular attention.. It has been mentioned earlier that Nissāṅkamalla offered his son and daughter to the Relic and subsequently redeemed them by making valuable

1. Ibid., I, p.91 II A lines 6-7.

offerings.¹ A donation of a similar kind finds mention in the Cūlavamsa in its narrative of the reign of Parākramabāhu II of Dambadeniya. This ruler is said to have entrusted a certain dignitary named Deva Patirāja with the reconstruction of some of the religious places in Māyāraṭṭha. After the successful completion of the tasks entrusted to him Devapatirāja reported his work to the king who became quite pleased with him. Parākramabāhu also considered Deva Patirāja as a faithful servant of the state and the Triple Gem (Buddha, Dhamma and Saṅgha), and in order to venerate the Tooth Relic with an object dear to him, he dedicated the dignitary, with his wife and children, to the Relic.²

It is interesting to note that the Cūlavamsa makes no further reference to what happened afterwards, whether or not Devapatirāja and his family were redeemed by the ruler. Dedication of persons to a sacred object or to the Order and their subsequent redemption by the payment of a sum of money or valuables, as in the case of Virabāhu, was a usual practice in Ceylon.³ In the light of these previous experiences it is reasonable to hold that Deva Patirāja and his family would have been redeemed either with money or with valuables.

-
1. See above, p.320.
 2. Cv., 86.57.
 3. See above, p.153.

These donations apparently served a dual purpose. One is that they were a symbolical gesture testifying to complete devotion of the donor as well as the donated person to the Tooth Relic. The other is that they were an indirect method to make costly donations to the Tooth Relic. It is tempting to suggest that, in at least some cases, if not all, seeking protection from the Tooth Relic was another purpose which these offerings were expected to serve. The tradition recorded in the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa about the childhood of Saṅghabodhi is a classic example to substantiate this view. Young Saṅghabodhi, it is said, was brought to the Mahiyaṅgana - vihāra and was offered to the bhikkhu community by his father Selābhaya, seeking the protection of the Saṅgha and the Bodhi tree. It was for this reason that the young prince was named Saṅghabodhi. We are also given to understand that this was done as a means of providing asylum to the young prince whose life was in danger.¹ This recalls to one's mind a practice followed in Ceylon even at the present day. When one's life is in danger owing to a serious sickness or some other evil which is believed to be due to planetary movements, people usually seek the protection of the Buddha or of a deity. The ritual followed on such an occasion is to offer the endangered person either to the

1. Hvv., p.2.

Bodhi Tree or to the Tooth Relic or to any other sacred place and to redeem him usually by paying a sum of money.¹ By doing this, it is believed that the endangered person may receive the protection of the Buddha and overcome all the evils which threaten his person. It is not possible to ascertain the origin of these rituals but the evidence scattered throughout the history of Ceylon may perhaps suggest that it was a usual practice even in earlier times. Hence, if the above mentioned offerings of Nissankamalla and Parākramabāhu II can be understood in this perspective, it would follow that such donations, in addition to showing the devotion of these kings and making offerings to the said relic, were motivated by their desire to protect those dearest to them from all kinds of danger.

The donation of servitors and slaves was a remarkable feature of the animate offerings made to the Tooth Relic. From the Daladā Sirita we learn that vahal (slaves) were among Kittisiri Meghavanna's offerings to the Tooth Relic.² The retinue of the Tooth Relic Temple, which was probably made up of slaves and other officials, are mentioned among other property which the

-
1. MASC., IV, p.24. Hocart records such an instance which he witnessed at the Tooth Relic temple. Mothers, according to him, offer their babies to the Relic and redeem them by giving money, the sum of which varied according to their means. This was done as a protection against disease.
 2. Dal.S., p.41.

Vēlaikkāras promised to protect as long as their lineage would last.¹ Parākramabāhu IV, according to the Cūlavamsa,

dedicated both male and female slaves to the Tooth Relic.²

A similar donation, but by a different term, is mentioned in the inscriptions of Nissankamalla. The Hāṭṭadāge Portico Slab

Inscription records that this ruler offered veravāssan, while the

Prītidānaka Maṇḍapa Rock Inscription records the donation of

veheravāssan to the Tooth Relic.³ Wickramasinghe interprets

veravāssan as serfs and veheravāssan as monastic staff.⁴ But

it would appear that 'monastic staff' is the appropriate

interpretation of both these words, for veravāssan in the first

inscription seems to be a variant reading of veheravāssan in

the second.

It is laid down in the Vinaya rules that servants could be accepted by monks only if they were donated as Kappiyakārakas,

Veyyāvaccakas and Arāmikas.⁵ Officials and servants of these

categories can easily be termed as veheravāssan. Inscriptions

belonging to the Pagan Period of Burma (A.D. 1044-1287) record

that musicians, drummers, singers, violinists, dancers, turners,

1. Ep.Zeyl., II, pp.252-53 II lines 30-38, transl., p.255.

2. Cv., 90.76.

3. Ep.Zeyl., II, p.89 II lines 20-21; p.173 II line 23.

4. Ibid., II, p.90, 176.

5. Smp., (SHB), p.493; Pmvv., p.60.

sculptors, masons, painters, secretaries, cowherds, goldsmiths, gardeners, launderers, palanquin bearers, umbrella bearers, weavers, barbers and persons to serve betel were donated to Buddhist temples as slaves.¹ This elaborate list gives an idea of what constituted veheravāssan. Nissāṅkamalla's veheravāssan may also have included some, if not all, of these diverse employees. It may therefore be concluded that both veravāssan and veheravāssan were used to denote the same employees, viz. monastic staff, and that these terms were used as synonyms of the ārāmikas, kappiyakārakas or veyyāvaccakas of the Vinaya rules.

It would appear, however, that we have only few references to the donation of slaves and servants to the Tooth Relic throughout the eleven centuries under discussion. This seems rather surprising, for the donation of slaves to religious institutions was a widespread practice in Ceylon. If Paranavitana's interpretation of the term vaharala, found in the Brahmi inscriptions of Ceylon, is accepted, the practice of donating slaves dates back to a very early period i.e. just after the introduction of Buddhism.² The Galapāta Vihāra Rock Inscription

-
1. Than Tun, The Buddhist Church in Burma during the Pagan Period, Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, 1955, pp.159-60.
 2. Ep.Zeyl., V, pt.I, pp.35-65.

of the reign of Parākramabāhu II, records three categories of slaves, i.e. anvayāgata vahalin (those belonged hereditarily to a family), ran vahalin (either purchased slaves or those who were forced to slavery by debt), and munḍukaraṇḍuyen randīlāgat vahalin (those acquired by the payment of gold from the funds of the vihāra), who were donated to the Galapāta-vihāra by a dignitary called Demela Adhikāra and his family.¹ The Laṅkātilaka Inscription mentions that two hundred slaves, both male and female, were donated to the Laṅkātilaka-vihāra by Sēna Laṅkādhikāra.² Similarly the Pāpiliyāna Document of Parākramabāhu VI states that twenty male and female slaves were among the ruler's donations to the Pāpiliyāna-vihāra.³ These references are clear indications that religious institutions of less significance than the Tooth Relic temple still received donations of slaves on a lavish scale. It is noteworthy that all these references belong to a period when the Tooth Relic was regarded as the palladium of the Sinhalese kingdom. It is quite possible therefore that the Relic received such donations more often than the few times mentioned in our sources.

Donations of animals too, find mention in our sources. The Daladā Sirita mentions that Kittī Siri Meghavanna donated sarak

-
1. Ibid., IV, p.206, II line 13; Dhammavisuddhi, op.cit., p.154.
 2. UCR., XVIII, pp.8, 12 and 42, II line 19.
 3. Vidyodaya, II, pt.I, pp.11-12.

to the Tooth Relic.¹ In the Cūlavagga we read that Parākramabāhu IV dedicated elephants, cattle and buffaloes.² Dealing with the benefactions of the same ruler, the Daladā Sirita mentions the dedication of sarak³ which may perhaps have been taken as a general term to mean both cattle and buffaloes. Benefactions of this nature in the case of the Saṅgha and other institutions seem to have been a widespread practice. The Samantapāsādikā permits the monks to accept cattle for the use of fivefold produce.⁴ This would indicate that the acceptance of such animals was a practice prevalent in the fifth century, if not earlier, when the commentary was written. The above mentioned proviso of the Samantapāsādikā might therefore, have been thought of as providing a legal sanction for the monks to accept animals as offerings, a practice which was already in vogue and continued in later times. The Kaludiyapokuna Inscription and the Āṭavīragollāva Inscription, which record the immunities granted to the villages, estates and lands of some monasteries, lays down that oxen, buffaloes and milk cows shall not be appropriated by royal officers and others.⁵ These two references, in an indirect way, indicate that these animals were

1. Dal.S., p.41.

2. Cv., 90.76.

3. Dal.S., p.49.

4. Smp., (SHB), II, pp.493, 494; Pmvv., p.60.

5. Ep.Zeyl., III, p.265 II lines 40-41; Ibid., II, p.48 II C. lines 18-21.

among the property of the monasteries mentioned in these records. The dedication of a dairy farm named Moratoṭa-paṭṭiya is mentioned among other donations of Parākramabāhu VI made to the Pāpiliyāna-vihāra. These donations were made, it is said, for the purpose of providing food (mehe vādīmata) to the Buddha statue of the Pāpiliyāna-vihāra.¹ Similarly, elephants, horses, cattle and buffaloes were dedicated by the same ruler to Mahasaman-dēvālaya at Ratnapura and the Munnésvaram-dēvālē at Chilaw.²

Thus it would seem that the dedication of animals to religious institutions was a well established practice in Ceylon. Hence it is not at all surprising that the Tooth Relic received such donations as are mentioned above. These animals, apart from the supply of five-fold produce, as noted in the Samantapāsādikā, would have served another purpose. Reference has been made in the foregoing discussion to the fact that the Tooth Relic temple was in possession of extensive landholdings, both fields and arable land.³ There must have been a great need for oxen to transport produce from these lands and buffaloes to plough the fields and thresh the paddy. Hence, the donation of such animals, it may be suggested, would have been meant to serve these purposes too.

-
1. Vidyodaya, II, pt.I, pp.11-12.
 2. K.Nanavimala, Sabaragamuvē Pāraṇi Liyavili, pp.42-43; Vidyodaya, III, pp.269-70.
 3. See above, p.316 ff.

Although the dedication of cattle and buffaloes was in keeping with this general practice, the donation of an elephant to the Tooth Relic seems to have been an exception. Although elephants and horses were dedicated to the shrines of deities in later times,¹ this is the first recorded instance of such a donation being made to the Tooth Relic or any other Buddhist institution. Special importance can be attached to this particular donation.

The donation of an elephant appears to have been made mainly for the annual celebrations of the Tooth Relic temple. It is laid down in the Daladā Sirita that an elephant with auspicious marks (suba lakunen yut manā āteku) should be used to pull the carriage on which the relic casket is kept during the annual processions.² An elephant belonging to the Tooth Relic temple is used even at present time to carry the relic casket in annual processions of the Relic. Thus the need for an elephant for the purpose of drawing the carriage or to bear the casket must have been the obvious reason for the donation of such an animal to the Tooth Relic. Whether this was a practice followed in earlier times is difficult to ascertain. But if one believes that the rules laid down in the Daladā Sirita date back to an earlier period it would be fair to assume that the donation

1. See below, p.403.

2. Dal.S., p.51 regulation 17.

of elephants to the Tooth Relic had its origin at some time earlier than the reign of Parākramabāhu IV. However, if Parākramabāhu's offering of an elephant may be understood in the above perspective it would also explain the motive of a similar donation of elephants and horses made by the sixth ruler of the same name, to two dēvālēs¹ where annual celebrations in honour of deities are held even at present time.

A relevant problem which merits discussion at this stage is whether the acceptance of the above mentioned donations made in the name of the Buddha is in conformity with Buddhist teachings. In the Brahmajāla Sutta of the Dīgha Nikāya, the Buddha describes himself as one who abstained from the possession of currency and silver (jātarūpa-rajata), raw, uncooked grain (āmaka-dhañña), female and male servants (dāsī-dāsa), goats and sheep (aj-ēlaka), poultry and pigs (kukkuṭa-sūkara), elephants, cattle and steed (Haṭṭhi-gavāssa-valavā), fields and home-steads (khetta-vatthu) and such other wealth.² The Cullahatthipadopama Sutta and the Karandaka Sutta of the Majjhima Nikāya prohibit the monks from accepting or using fields, lands, male and female slaves, animals and the like.³ Thus it is quite obvious that the Buddha himself abstained from material wealth and directed his

1. See above, p.356.

2. Dīgha Nikāya (PTS), I, 1967, p.5.

3. Majjhimanikāya, I, ed. V.Trenckner, London, 1888, pp.180, 345.

disciples to refrain from it too. These rules of discipline found in the Vinaya Piṭaka had, however, to be modified in course of time in accordance with the requirements of the Saṅgha. The vinaya rules and their modifications which are applicable to the saṅgha apply also in the case of the Buddha without any exception. Hence the rules of discipline pertaining to the acceptance and enjoyment of material wealth by the monks are discussed in the following pages, in order to determine how far the donations made to the Tooth Relic in the name of the Buddha were in accordance with the Vinaya.

Although the Suttantas preclude the acceptance or enjoyment of material wealth the commentators take a liberal and compromising view of this problem and make provisions to enable the monks to acquire property. A reason for this modification is found in the Vinayāḷankāra. It states that although the Buddha prohibited the acceptance of fields and land he did not stipulate that the acceptance of such goods would result in the violation of rules and that therefore the Saṅgītikārakas, who were aware of this intention of the Buddha, permitted the acceptance of such goods under certain conditions.¹ The Samantapāsādikā permits the acceptance of fields, lands and the like, provided they were donated either for the use of the four

1. Vinayāḷankāra, I, ed. P.Nānavimala, Colombo, BE 2443, p.87.

requisites of the Saṅgha or in the name of the vihāra.¹

This provision, it would seem, may well be applicable to the donations of this kind made to the Tooth Relic. They would have been thought of as a means of providing substantial income for the maintenance of the Tooth Relic temple, its servants, the regular performance of its ritual on the one hand and the supply of the four requisites on the other. The latter view, in fact, is clearly expressed in the Hapugastāna Inscription.²

Moreover, Buddhist monks are prohibited from accepting precious articles like pearls and jewels which are known as dukkaṭavattu, nor are they allowed to accept nissaggiyavattu i.e. gold, silver or currency made of such precious metals. The acceptance of these prohibited articles, it is said, would result in the committing of the offences of dukkaṭa and pācittiya respectively.³ But in the Vinaya itself, there are provisions which enable the monks to accept these articles. Although gold, silver and the like cannot be accepted in the name of the community, groups or individual monks (saṅgha, gana and puggala), they can be accepted by kappiyakārakas and utilized for the expenses of the monastery. Moreover, other alternatives are that the donor could give gold or silver and currency either to

1. Smp., (SHB), II, p.489 ff; Pmvv., pp.55-56.

2. See above, p.327.

3. Smp., (SHB), II, p.490 ff; Sikhavalāṇḍa, ed. M.Vimalakitti Colombo, 1955, p.46; Pmvv., p.55.

artisans of the monastery, probably as remuneration, or donate them to the cetiya or to the vihāra, emphasizing sometimes, that the donation is made to carry out repairs in these places.¹

It is very likely that such a method was also followed if gold or silver was donated to the Tooth Relic.

The Samantapāsādikā explains that servants can be accepted by monks provided their dedication is made with the donor's declaration 'I shall give a kappiyakāraka, a veyyāvaccaka or an ārāmika'.² Elucidating this point, the Vinayāṅkāra states that servants can be accepted in the manner in which thera Pilindavacca had acted.³ This thera, according to the Mahāvagga, accepted five-hundred people as ārāmikas, a donation made by Bimbisāra for the purpose of establishing a cave residence.⁴ A donation of a similar nature, as described earlier, finds mention in the inscriptions of Nissankamalla.⁵ Hence we have at least one occasion on which servants were dedicated to the Tooth Relic in accordance with the rules laid down in the aṭṭhakathās. A similar procedure, it may be assumed, would have been used on other occasions as well, although no details are

1. Sikhavalāṇḍa, p.46; Pmvv., pp.54-55.

2. Smp., (SHB), II, p.493; Pmvv., p.60.

3. Vinayāṅkāra, p.87; Vimativinodanī, p.274.

4. Mahāvaggā, VI, ed. H.Oldenbergh, London and Edinburgh, 1879, pp.207-09.

5. See above, pp.352-53.

given in our sources. Similarly the dedication of cattle and buffaloes would have been made to the Tooth Relic for the use of five-fold produce as provided by the Samantapāsādikā.¹ The dedication of an elephant was an exception to this general rule.

II

Contributions from state officials, customs duty, isran, masran and davasran.

Customary contributions from state officials, customs duty and some payments termed as isran, masran and davasran - terms of uncertain meaning - constituted the second source of income of the Tooth Relic. As regards the contributions from state officials the Daḷadā Sirita states 'avuruddē kāttiyē rajadaruvaṇaṭa paṇḍuru pānā noyek dhurayen palamuva daḷadā paṇḍuru pā pasuva rajadaruvaṇaṭa paṇḍuru pānāva isā'² which can literally be translated as 'the different office bearers who offer paṇḍuru to the king at the new year and kārttika shall first offer paṇḍuru to the Tooth Relic and then to the king'. The term paṇḍuru, it would seem, is used in this context to denote contributions to both the king and the Tooth Relic. Hence it is certain that

-
1. Smp., (SHB)., II, pp.493, 494; Pmvv., p.60.
 2. Daḷ.S., p.53 regulation 33.

it is not a mere religious offering. But the regulation is of no help in understanding what exactly was meant by noyek dhurayen and also whether the contribution of officials was a definite share of their income or another kind of a levy. None of our sources sheds any light on these problems. It is necessary therefore to look beyond the period under consideration.

A practice followed in Kandyan times may be of some help to understand these problems. In his Historical Relation of Ceylon, Knox refers to the new year festival and the Cawtha Poujah (Kārttika) (the feast of the favourite hour or the festival of lamps). The former was celebrated in March (27th, 28th or 29th) while the latter was in November, on the day of the full moon.¹ When the king takes the auspicious bath on an auspicious day after the new year, the nobles and governors of the country bring presents to him. These presents consist of gold, jewels, plates, arms, knives, cloths and sometimes a precious stone or a rarity, and they vary according to the status of the official and the country under his jurisdiction.² These presents were not a definite share of the income of officials but were meant as a homage to the king on which depended their positions, land holdings

-
1. The Saddharmaratnāvaliya, I, (ed. D.B.Jayatilaka, p.818) attests that the kārttika festival was celebrated on the full moon day of 11 i.e. November.
 2. Robert Knox, An Historical Relation of Ceylon, in CHJ., VI, 1956-57, pp.74-76, 128.

and other privileges. Knox does not specify who these nobles and governors were but the implication is that all high dignitaries and other officials of the state made these contributions to the king. Kārttika festival, on the other hand, appears to have been a religious ceremony but on this occasion too, the officials seem to have made contributions to the king. Thus, if the above cited regulation of the Daḷadā Sirita can be understood in the perspective of the new year and the kārttika festivals described by Knox, it follows that the state officials were expected to pay homage twice a year to the king and to the Tooth Relic. Their donations may well have depended on their positions as well as other circumstances.

There is little evidence concerning the customs duties and tolls assigned to the Tooth Relic. The Daḷadā Pūjāvaliya records that Parākramabāhu IV allocated to the Tooth Relic the duty of a quarter per cent¹ twice a year i.e. at the new year and kārttika, to be taxed by the nine seaports (navatoḷin)² of

-
1. It is not stated of what this duty was charged but presumably of the goods bought and sold at the ports.
 2. The seaports meant by navatoḷin in this context cannot be explained with any degree of precision. But, it may not be unlikely that Galle, Dondra, Colombo, Beruwala, Bentota, Wattala, Chilaw, Negambo, Puttlam, and Panadura which were among the leading seaports of the day were some of them. For details of seaports of fourteenth and fifteenth centuries see W.I.Siriweera, op.cit., p.233 ff.

Ceylon.¹ The reference to the transfer of customs duty to the temple on the new year and in the month of kārttika is particularly noteworthy in this context, for, as we saw elsewhere,² they were the occasions on which the royal officials brought presents to the king and the Tooth Relic. This suggests that the presentation of the share from customs duty might have been carried out by the officials who were in charge of customs houses. Another assignment to the Tooth Relic of taxes (ayabadu) and tolls (toṭabadu) made by Parākramabāhu VI is mentioned in the Rājaratnākaraya.³ But it is impossible to ascertain the share allocated to the Relic as no further details are given.

The terms isran, masran and davasran which occur in the regulation 38 of the Daḷadā Sirita are difficult to explain. According to the context in which these terms are found, it appears that they denote three types of taxes⁵ rather than three denominations of currency.⁶ Of these isran seems to correspond to sīsakahāpana mentioned in the Jātakatṭhakathā. Commenting on the sīsakahāpanādivā of the Nidhānakathā of this work, the Jātaka Aṭṭvā Gāṭapadaya explains it as hisakaṭṭha massak

-
1. Dal.Pjv., p.51.
 2. See above, p.362.
 3. Rrk., p.46.
 4. Dal.S., p.54 regulation 38.
 5. Ibid., pp.120-21.
 6. Dhammavisuddhi, op.cit., p.160, fn.

dunamānavayi nohot hisakaṭa metek ran duna mānavayi kiyā mesē minisun atin gannā hisran¹ ('hisran is (a tax of) a massa or a certain amount of gold charged upon each head or individual'). According to the Pūjāvaliya one of the eight pleasures enjoyed by recluses is freedom from interference by the royal officials who exact daḍamuḍa (echo compound meaning fines), isran and masran.² In the Cullapanthakathā Vatthu of the Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā we read about a king of Benares who tried to ascertain the feelings of his subjects about his administration. If his rule was unjust, he thought, the people would say, 'this wicked ruler suppresses us by exacting fines and taxes (dandabaliādī)'.³ The Dampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya explains dandabali in the Pali work as balidaḍa karauvara āyin (bali, fines and taxes) and adds that ādīhi (and the like) denotes those such as sīsakahāpana.⁴ Thus from the contexts in which the term isran and its Pali equivalent sīsakahāpana are found, it would appear that they denote a kind of tax exacted by the state in addition to fines and other royal dues.

It is evident from the above cited passage of the Jātaka Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya that isran was levied upon each individual and the amount of this tax was either a massa or a certain amount

1. Jataka., I, p. 7 ; JAG., p.12.

2. Pjv., ed. D.E.Hettiaratchi and D.C.Disanayaka, Colombo, 1936, pp.19-20.

3. papenādhammikaraṇṇā dandabaliādīhi hat'amhāti vakkanti, Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā, (PTS)., ed. H.C.Norman, London, 1909, p.251.

4. DAG., p.85.

of gold.¹ Its frequent occurrence in Ceylonese sources suggests that it was a well known practice in Ceylon. Moreover, it reminds us of the poll tax (āṅgabadda) of the Portuguese period and later. This āṅgabadda, according to Codrington, was similar to isran in ancient times.² This equation is very plausible, for the term isran, like āṅgabadda, suggests a tax charged on the per capita basis. It should be emphasized, however, that it is by no means possible to ascertain whether the whole or a part of the income due to the state from this source was assigned to the Tooth Relic temple.

Masran and davasran cannot be explained with any degree of precision. The two words can literally be translated as 'monthly gold (taxes)' and 'daily gold (taxes)'.³ As recorded in works on polity, artisans and craftsmen in ancient India had to pay their contributions to the state either in cash or by service. Vasīṣṭha testifies to the prevalence of the first method, i.e. a tax which was paid monthly by artisans,⁴ while Gautama,

1. See above, pp. 365-66.

2. H.W.Codrington, Ancient Land Tenure and Revenue in Ceylon, Colombo, 1938, p.47.

3. Codrington translates the terms as 'month money' and 'day money' (Ibid., p.37). Vimalakitti equates masran with Pali mansabhāga and takes it to mean a share of meat (Sinhala Anḍuva, Colombo, B.E. 2499, pp.257-58).

4. Vasīṣṭha Dharmaśāstra (SBE)., XIV, Oxford, 1882, p.99.

Manu and Viṣṇu record the prevalence of the second method. According to them, artisans, manual labourers and Sūdras had to work one day a month for the king.¹ Taking this Indian practice into consideration, Siriweera suggests that masran in Ceylon may have been a monthly payment made by artisans and craftsmen. He also assumes that davasran may have been the taxes exacted daily in the form of tolls, customs dues and similar levies.²

However, it is not impossible that both masran and davasran in the Daladā Sirita denote a tax exacted from shops, stalls and markets. Our sources often refer to special areas for trade in ancient Ceylon. A market village named Hōpiṭigamu is mentioned in an inscription of the tenth century.³ The Tamil inscriptions of the eleventh and twelfth centuries point to the importance of a commercial centre in Padaviya where there were South Indian traders, especially the Vīravalanjiyārs.⁴ There were certain streets in Polonnaruva which were reserved for shops where all kinds of goods were kept for sale.⁵ The Kununāgala Vistaraya refers to shops and merchant streets (kaḍapil and velaṅdavīdi).⁶

1. Gautama Dharmasāstra, (SBE)., II, Oxford, 1879, p.228; Manu-Smṛiti, (SBE), XXV, Oxford, 1886, p.238; Viṣṇu Smṛiti, (SBE)., VII, Oxford, 1880, p.17.
2. W.I.Siriweera, op.cit., pp.268-69.
3. Ep.Zeyl., V, pt.II, p.185 II A lines 15-17.
4. K.Indrapala, op.cit., p.106.
5. Cv., 73.149.
6. Br.Mus.Ms., Or.5042, folio 3b.

There is reason to believe that a tax was exacted from these shops and market places. Commenting on the term cāṭikahāpana found in the Kulāvaka Jātaka,¹ the Jātaka Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya explains it as 'rā sālakaṭa kahavanuyekāi kiṃā mesē sālakaṭa massak bāgin gannā sālakahavanu' meaning 'sālakahavanu, charged at the rate of one massa or kahavanu per toddy pot'.² The Sinhala Jātaka Pota gives the same explanation for this particular passage of the Kulāvaka Jātaka.³ There is no means of ascertaining whether this was a daily or monthly tax but it is quite clear from this evidence that a levy of a massa was charged from each toddy pot of toddy stalls.

Such taxation was not limited to toddy stalls. The Badulla Inscription stipulates that a trader who kept his shop open on a poya day should pay a pādda of oil for the maintenance of lamps at the Mahiyāngana-vihāra. A fine was imposed on him in the event of his failure to fulfil this obligation.⁴ Siriweera draws two inferences from this passage: first, all shops were expected to be closed on pōya days and the traders who kept them open had to make a special payment to the vihāra; and second, those who opened stalls on monastic land on pōya days had to pay a fixed

1. Jātaka., I, London, 1877, p.199.

2. JAG., p.67.

3. Pansiya Panas Jātaka Pota, I, ed. Naulle Dhammananda, Colombo, 1955, p.80.

4. Ep.Zeyl., V, pt.II, p.186 II B. lines 26-36.

levy.¹ He further states that the first seems more plausible than the second since the regulations in the inscription seem to apply to the traders in the market place. Whatever the actual case might have been, it is noteworthy that the passage cited above suggests that the tax charged on a pōya day was exceptional or at least additional to the usual tax charged on the stalls. This normal tax would have been charged monthly from permanent shops and for this reason was called masran (monthly tax).

A tentative explanation of davasran may also be given in the light of the foregoing discussion. Davasran may either have been charged as a special tax on shops which were kept open on pōya days or from those opened on monastic land on pōya days. The latter interpretation seems quite unlikely in the case of the Tooth Relic temple, for it was always located in the royal courtyard where no trader would dare to open a stall. However, it is not impossible that peddlers² and street hawkers who occasionally visited market towns opened temporary stalls and paid a tax for the day they used the market site, as is the case with the present village fares (pola) in Ceylon. If such was the case the tax they paid might well have been called davasran. It should be

1. W.I.Siriweera, op.cit., pp.172-73.

2. The Cūlavamsa refers to an instance in which Parākramabāhu I sent spies to Rājaratṭhain the guise of peddlers. (Cv., 66.134).

emphasized, however, that even if such were the case with masran and davasran, it is by no means possible to determine what percentage of these sources of income was assigned to the Tooth Relic temple.

It would appear from the foregoing discussion that the Tooth Relic temple was immensely wealthy during the period under survey. As has occasionally been mentioned, its wealth was often threatened by destruction, plunder or expropriations.¹ In addition, it may have lost much landed property owing to the change of capitals. These reasons, no doubt, hindered the gradual increase of its wealth but, after making allowances for all kinds of losses, it seems reasonable to hold that the Tooth Relic temple was one of the richest Buddhist institutions of the period.

1. See above, pp. 141, 144-45, 171, 320 ff.

Chapter VII

The Ritual of the Tooth Relic

The importance of the Tooth Relic as a religious symbol gave rise to an elaborate system of ritual. The significance of this ritual is manifested by the writing of a text (Daḷadā Sirita) to promulgate the manner in which it should be performed. These regulations are taken in this chapter as the basis of discussion of the ritual and those who participated in it, in the fourteenth century. An attempt is also made to compare the ritual with those of the earlier and the present times.

The ritual of the Tooth Relic can be discussed in three sections viz. I. Ritual performed daily and weekly, II. Annual celebrations and, III. Rituals carried out on special occasions.

I

Ritual performed daily and weekly

The most interesting features of this category of ritual are the offering of victuals made by rulers, state dignitaries and others and the ceremony of purification. Three regulations of the Daḷadā Sirita prescribe the manner in which the victuals should be brought and offered to the Tooth Relic. The food

(mē),¹ it is said, should be brought in baskets (pratāpapayi),² with a canopy held over them, to the accompaniment of music such as sak, pañca vaddāru,³ dalahan (a kind of trumpet made of

1. Mē is used in the Kaṇḍavuru Sirita too, to denote food. Sin.Sa.Lipi., pp.64-65. In the Pāpiliyāna Sannasa, B.2 mehe is used to denote food. Vidyodaya., II, pt.I, pp.11-12.
2. Dal.S., p.113; pratāpapayi is used to denote the same meaning in the Kaṇḍavuru Sirita, the Pāpiliyāna Inscription and the Ratnapura Maha Saman Dēvālayē Sannasa. (Sin.Sa.Lipi., p.65; Ktk.Sng., p.46; Saparagamuvē Pārani Liyavili, ed. K. Nanavimala, Colombo, 1942, p.44.
3. There is no unanimity on the correct reading of sakpañca vaddāru. Ratnasuriya reads it as sak and pañca vaddāru denoting two kinds of musical instruments (Dal.S., ed. V. Ratnasuriya, Colombo, 1949, p.49). Sorata rejects this reading on the basis that sakpañca is used in the Thūpavamsaya to denote a kind of drum (Dal.S., Introduction, pp.XXVIII and p.104). He reads it as sakpañca and vaddāru meaning two kinds of drums (Dal.S., p.104). However, the meaning of sakpañca appears to vary according to the context in which it is found. Although it indicates a kind of drum in the Thūpavamsaya (ed. D.E.Hettiaratchi, Maradana, 1947, pp.80-81 and 139), sak and pañca are used in the Saddharmālakāraya (ed. Bentota Saddhatissa, Panadura, 1934, pp.103-04) to denote two kinds of musical instruments, i.e. the conch and the drum or five drums (sak sinnam pañca lohobera). The Cakkhupāla Vastuva of the Saddharmaratnāvaliya (ed. D.B.Jayatilaka, pt.I, Colombo, 1930, p.42) states that the blind thera Cakkhupāla heard the sounds of sakpañca when he was arriving at Sāvatti and asked Sakka 'where is that being sounded and blown?' (tela gasannē piṁbinnē kotendāi). The use of the expression gasanne piṁbinnē (sounded and blown) in this context suggests that two or more instruments are referred to and not one. The Thūpavamsaya (p.171) and the Kaṇḍavuru Sirita (Sin.Sa.Lipi., p.65) again refer to sakpañca and sakpañca dhuraya as an offering and a service to the king respectively. It is not certain what instruments were referred to in these contexts but taken in the light of the evidence of the Saddharmaratnāvaliya, it is possible that when sakpañca is used as a single compound it refers to some musical instruments which consisted of the conch and the drum. It is not impossible that sakpañca is an

(Contd. on next page.....)

ivory) kāhala (horanā - trumpets) and on festival days with sēsāt¹ (white umbrellas) and the mahādhuraya² (great band).

The attendants who bring the offerings should have their mouths covered with mukavādam (a veil).³ Everyone present in the temple on this occasion should remain standing.⁴ When offering the victuals (mē), the cooks (arakkāmiyan) should cover their mouths with a veil. They should first offer (dāvatu (softened sticks for use as a Tooth brush) strained water for rinsing the mouth, and pour it in to the spittoon; remove the spittoon and

(...contd. from previous page)

abbreviated form of sankhatālādipaṅcāṅgaturiya (five musical instruments such as the conch, cymbals and the like) found in the Cūlavamsa (Cv., 100.33) or saksinnam ādivū paṅcadhuraya (five musical instruments such as the conch, clarinet and the like) found in the Pāpiliyāna Inscription (Ktk.Sng., p.46) and denotes ḍavula (a cylindrical drum), tammāṭṭa (double kettle drum), horanā (trumpet), nāga sinnam (a kind of clarinet according to Sorata, Dal.S., p.106 and Tamil Lexicon, IV, p.2195) and sak (conch) as Jayatilaka suggested (Saddharmaratnāvalī Granthipada Vivaranaya, p.77).

1. The sēsāt which is used during religious ceremonies as a decorative item has a long pole and a moon-shaped head with decorative motifs. But the literal meaning of the word, 'white umbrellas' seems more suitable for this occasion.
2. Dhuraya means a band of musicians. (Ktk.Sng., p.46; Sin.Sa. Lipi., p.65). Parānavitana interpreted mahādhuraya as 'royal band' (UCHC., I, pt.II, p.759). Dhammavisuddhi points out the possibility that the Tooth Relic temple had a larger band than the one employed in the daily services which was implied in the present context. (Dhammavisuddhi, op.cit., p.334).
3. Dal.S., p.50, regulation no.5; see also ibid., p.104 ff.
4. Ibid., p.50, regulation no.6.

then offer food in a row of dishes placed on a carpet (pāvāḍa). This should be done within eight hours¹ (aṭapā) and also to the accompaniment of music (Dhuraya).²

It is of interest to compare the ritual stipulated above with that observed today at the Tooth Relic temple in Kandy, for the better understanding of the manner in which the ritual is conducted and the differences between the two periods. At present, there are three services daily, i.e. the dawn service (aluyam pūjāva), the day service (daval pūjāva or namapāpūjāva) and the evening service (hāndā pūjāva).³ Of these the dawn and evening services comprise two parts, viz. the tēvāva (Tamil Tevai, Sin. sēvaya which means service) and the offering of victuals; at the day service only the offering of victuals takes place. The dawn service begins at about half past five⁴ with the drumming, and blowing of the trumpet (horanā). The two officiating monks of the relic chamber start the tēvāva with a salutation to the Buddha, inviting him to receive worship out of compassion for the world. First, a vessel of water is offered

-
1. Following a misprint of the Sorata edition of the Daladā Sirita Dhammavisuddhi reads it as half an hour (aḍapā). Dhammavisuddhi, op.cit., p.334. But the earlier editions of Rajasekhara (Dal.S., p.47) and Ratnasuriya (Dal.S., p.56) and the Br.Mus.Ms., Or.6606(31) folio khau (reverse) have the correct reading āṭapā (eight hours).
 2. Dal.S., p.50, regulation 7.
 3. MASC., IV, p.18.
 4. Ibid., p.18 ff.

for the washing of hands, which is followed by the offering of a tooth brush (dāvaṭu or dāhāṭi).¹ Then the officiating monk symbolizes the washing and wiping of the Buddha's body.² Three robes (ticīvara) are offered next, and this act is followed by the washing of the feet, the offering of a seat, fanning, waving the fly whisk, ringing a little bell seven times (minipūjāva), lighting the camphor lamp, and offering fragrant scent and flowers.³ The whole of this procedure seems to indicate that homage is rendered to the Tooth Relic as though it was a living Buddha.⁴

At the end of the tēvāva, the pingo-bearer (kattiyana rāla), accompanied by the store-keeper (gebarāla or geparāla),⁵ brings the offerings in baskets (pratāpapayi), suspended on the pingo, to the accompaniment of music. The victuals are put into the bowls of silver and gold, and are kept on the altar which is covered by a cloth.⁶ The monk first offers the dakkhinodaka (water to wash the hands and mouth) and then gruel, rice, curry and sweatmeats and invites the Buddha to partake of the

1,2,6, compare with the regulations 5 and 7 of the Dal.S., cited above.

3. This ritual comprises most of the features of the Sōḍasopacāra (sixteen kinds of offerings) prevalent in India. See below, pp. 379-82.

4. In fact, at one stage of the ritual the officiating monk states that he is washing Buddha's body as did Ananda. MASC., IV, p.21, stanza 8.

5. Ibid., p.24.

6. Ibid., p.24.

offerings.¹ Then he comes out and, after a short interval, during which the Buddha is supposed to partake of the offerings, goes in again and symbolizes the washing of the Buddha's hands by pouring water three times into the spittoon and the wiping of his mouth by waving a little square piece of white cloth up and down. After this come the offering of betel, the second offering of flowers and the offering of incense. Then, with an invitation to the gods and the nāgas to share in this merit and preserve the faith of the world,² the dawn service comes to an end.

The evening service starts at about half past six, and, apart from two differences, is similar to the dawn service. The offering of the tooth brush and food does not take place in this service for it is improper for Buddhist monks to take food after noon. Drinks, usually fruit juice are offered instead.³

The day service begins nine Sinhalese hours after sunrise.⁴ For this reason it is called the namapāpūjāva (nine hour's worship). This takes place at about 9.30 a.m.⁵

1. Ibid., pp.24-25.

2. Ibid., pp.26-27.

3. Ibid., pp.28-29.

4. A Sinhalese hour is equal to twenty-four minutes of modern reckoning. The hours are counted from 6 a.m. which is considered the standard time of sunrise. See, Dal.S., p.114.

5. MASC., IV, p.18; about 9.45 a.m. according to the Diyavaḍana Nilame.

At the day service the priest first cleans the altar and then offers flowers to the Relic. The pingo-bearer brings the victuals to the sound of drumming. After the food is provided in bowls it is handed in and the tooth brush is laid on the table. A conch is blown at this point ~~for~~ a long time. The priest then pours water into the bowl, offers the tooth brush, pours water into the spittoon and empties the bowl into the spittoon in the usual manner. This is followed by the removal of dishes and the offering of betel and flowers.¹

On the basis of the present practice it seems possible to understand the ritual mentioned in the Daladā Sirita. The regulations which provide that victuals should be brought in baskets with a canopy held over it to the sound of music, and that all those present should remain standing on this occasion are observed even at the present time although with slight variations.² Regulation no.7 seems less precise for it contains characteristics of both the dawn and day services, and for this reason one is left in doubt as to which service it implies. The offering of the tooth brush and water to rinse the mouth,

1. MASC., IV, pp.27-28.

2. Unless on special occasions the drummers do not come in procession and the attendants do not cover their mouths.

followed by the offering of food are characteristic of the present dawn service which, as stated above, consists of two ceremonies, viz. the tēvāva and the offering of food. But the offering of the tooth brush alone does not necessarily indicate a dawn service in this context, for this is a feature of the day service as well. In fact the provision that the service should be performed within eight hours lends support to the view that what is implied in this context, is a day service.

According to Sinhalese reckoning stated earlier, eight Sinhalese hours end at 9.12 a.m.¹ The present practice, it should be recalled, is to perform the day service at nine Sinhalese hours after sunrise i.e. about 9.36 a.m.² The change of the time of the ritual by twenty-four minutes may be explained as a recent development, and this difference is not a serious objection to the suggestion that the regulation in question refers to a day service rather than a dawn service. This supposition in fact gains strength from the Kaṇḍavuru Sirita.

According to this work, Parākramabāhu II, was accustomed to the habit of worshipping the Tooth Relic daily at dawn with sixteen kinds of offerings (Ṣoḍaśopacārayen).³ snāna (bath), āsana (seat) and puṣpa (flowers) are stated to have been among

-
1. See above, p.377 fn. 4 ; Dal.S., p.114.
 2. MASC., IV, p.18; see above, p.377 fn.4.
 3. Sin.Sa.Lipi., p.64.

these sixteen kinds of offerings but it is difficult to ascertain what the other offerings were, for the term does not appear in any other Sinhalese work at our disposal.

Ṣoḍaśopacāra appears quite often in Indian literature.

The Brahma Vaivarta Purāna mentions āsana (seat), vasana (clothes), pādyā (water to wash the feet), arghya (water used at the respectful reception of a guest or a kind of honey),¹ ācamanīyaka (water to sip or to drink), puṣpa (flowers), candana (sandalwood), dhūpa (incense), dīpa (lights or lamps), naivedya (food), gandha (scents, incense), mālya (garlands), saiya (bedding), jala (water), anna (victuals or boiled rice), tāmbūla (betel in a betel tray) as sixteen kinds of offerings.²

The Tamil Lexicon provides two lists of offerings to explain

ṣoḍaśopacāra. According to the first list, offering a seat, cordial reception (cuvākatam), offering water to wash feet, water used at the respectful reception of a guest (arkkiyam, Skt., arghya), water to drink or to sip (ācamanīyam), honey and milk mixed with fruits (matuparkkam), water to rinse mouth (ācamanam), bathing, clothes, jewellery, scent, flowers, incense, lights or lamps, food and worship constitute ṣoḍaśopacāra.³

The second list which differs slightly from the first has offering

-
1. Monier-Williams, Sanskrit-English Dictionary, s.v. arghya.
 2. Brhama Vaivarta Purānam, ed. Vinayaka Ganesa Apte, (Anandāśrama), Poona, 1935, Brhama Khanda, ch.26.90-91.
 3. Tamil Lexicon, III, p.1663.

ceremonial bath, flowers, scent, incense, light or lamps, water, rice, cloths or garments, arecanut, metallic mirror, umbrella, fly whisk, circular fan (sēsata?), fan, dance and music.¹ It is noteworthy that snāna, āsana and puṣpa mentioned in the Kaṇḍavuru Sirita as some offerings of the Ṣoḍaśopacāra are mentioned in the first list of the Tamil Lexicon. Besides, the Kaṇḍavuru Sirita in this context has ādi (and the like) after snāna, āsana, and puṣpa which seems to be an indication of the rest of the offerings. It is impossible however, to be certain whether the sixteen kinds of offerings in Ceylon were identical with those of South India or whether there were any variations peculiar to Ceylon.

It is of particular interest to note that the offerings made at present at the dawn service bear a close resemblance to those found in the above-mentioned lists. There one finds the ceremonial bath, the washing of the feet and offerings of robes (instead of cloth), seats, fan, fly whisk, bells (minipūjāva), lamps, sandalwood water, flowers, water to drink, food, betel and incense. This list does not wholly tally with the Indian lists, but it contains most of the offerings found in the latter. This may perhaps be explained as an adaptation of ṣoḍaśopacāra

1. Ibid., p.1663.

to the customs of Ceylon. Moreover, if Ṣoḍaśopacāra mentioned in the Kaṇḍavuru Sirita may be understood in this connotation it would then follow that there was a dawn service even in the thirteenth century which bore a close resemblance to that of today. Such a resemblance further suggests that there has been no remarkable change in ritual - if not throughout the whole period under discussion - at least between the thirteenth century and the present day. Finally, as it is evident from the foregoing discussion that there was a dawn service since the thirteenth century, it is reasonable to hold that the service performed within eight hours (aṭapā ātulata), as mentioned in the Daladā Sirita, was no other than the day service which at present is conducted at nine Sinhalese hours after sunrise i.e. about 9.30 a.m.

The regulations concerning the offering of victuals raises another question as to who officiated at this ritual at the Tooth Relic Temple. None of the regulations referred to above is explicit in this respect; some are even misleading. If regulation no.7 is taken at its face value it would imply that the offering of food was carried out by arakkāmiyan (cooks).¹ From the Kaṇḍavuru Sirita we learn that the mulaṅginā (head of

1. Dal.S., p.50.

the royal kitchen) together with the mahavedanā (chief physician) presented food to the king.¹ This may have been a popular practice in every royal household but it is very unlikely that arakkāmiyan performed the ritual of offering food at the Tooth Relic Temple, for this would be in direct contrast to the manner in which the ritual is conducted in Buddhist temples in general and the Tooth Relic Temple in particular.

Officiating at Buddhist ceremonies, such as offering alms to the Buddha, chanting pirit (P. paritta) and the like is the duty of Buddhist monks. The Jetavanārāma Sanskrit inscription stipulates that the monks in the vihāra should attend to the monastic duties connected therewith.² The Ratnapura Maha Saman Devālayē Sannasa records that Parākramabāhu VI appointed some monks for the chanting of paritta, preaching the dhamma (bana) and other activities of the vihāra.³ In the Lankātilaka-Vihāra, a monk carries out the offering of food to the Buddha.⁴ This is the custom in the Tooth Relic Temple, too, where, as witnessed by Hocart, the offering of victuals and the conducting of other rituals are carried out by two monks, assisted by a lay official.⁵

1. Sin.Sa.Lipi., p.64.

2. Ep.Zeyl., I, p.7.

3. K.Nanavimala, Sabaragamuvē Pārāṇi Liyavili, p.43.

4. Hans Dieter Evers, Monks, Priests and Peasants, Leiden, 1972, pp.49-51.

5. MASC., IV, pp.11, 14.

Taken together all these references imply that the presence of Buddhist monks was of decisive importance for the conduct of Buddhist rituals. The Tooth Relic Temple in the fourteenth century may not have been an exception to this general rule, for in the light of the elaborate ritual conducted at present, one may imagine how elaborate and respectable it must have been at the time under discussion, when the Tooth Relic was the palladium of the Sinhalese kingdom. In these circumstances the most probable explanation of the regulation found in the Daḷadā Sirita is that the arakkāmiyan prepared the food as was the case of those who performed a similar service to the Mahābodhi¹ and arranged it for presentation, as the gebarāla (geparāla) does at present.² The offering of the victuals, was no doubt carried out by monks, although there is no mention of their presence on this occasion in the Daḷadā Sirita. But it remains uncertain whether the method of presentation was more or less elaborate than that of today.

Another remarkable feature of the daily and weekly rituals at the Tooth Relic Temple was the manner in which the rulers and state officials worshipped the Relic. According to a provision made in the Daḷadā Sirita, a pious ruler of Ceylon was expected to worship the Relic once a day. He should enter the temple after

-
1. Sinhala Bodhi Vamsaya, ed. Gunapala Senadhirā, Colombo, 1970, p.286.
 2. MASC., IV, pp.12, 24.

cleansing himself and also leave his retinue outside. He should sweep the floor with his own hands and then offer jewels (ruvan), flowers and the like. He should then worship the Relic by meditating on the nine virtues of the Buddha and undertake to observe the formula of the five precepts.¹

The interest which Parākramabāhu IV is said to have taken in the composition of the Daladā Sirita suggests that this work records the practice followed by the king himself. There is, however, evidence suggesting the prevalence of this practice even before his reign. The Kaṇḍavuru Sirita, which deals with the daily routine of Parākramabāhu II of Daṁbadeṇiya, provides corroborative and more conclusive evidence in this connexion. According to this work, Parākramabāhu was accustomed to worship the Tooth Relic once a day at dawn. Meditating on the nine virtues of the Buddha, it is said, he went to the upper storey of the Tooth Relic Temple, as if he were going to see the living Buddha. He swept the floor with the jewel-studded broom of hair, offered jewels (ruvandevu) and worshipped the relic with the sixteen kinds of offerings and service (ṣoḍaśopacārayen), including snāna (bathing), āsana (seat) and puṣpa (flowers). He also sprinkled lavender water on every flower that had been offered.

1. Dal.S., p.50, regulation 9.

He venerated the Relic in this manner and took upon himself the religious vows.¹

If a comparison is drawn it would seem that the account of the Kaṇḍavuru Sirita is similar to, but more elaborate than that of the Daḷadā Sirita. The time when Parākramabāhu II used to worship the Relic (which may not necessarily have been the same as with the other rulers), and the manner in which he worshipped it as well as the place where the Tooth Relic was kept are the details which received particular attention in the Kaṇḍavuru Sirita. Its elaboration is quite understandable, for the Daḷadā Sirita simply regulates the minimum type of worship expected from a ruler, whereas the Kaṇḍavuru Sirita records an instance where the details of the regulation was put into actual practice.

The Daḷadā Sirita further lays down that the king should make a special offering of a bowl of rice (pohōtaliyak) on every pōya (P. upōsatha) day.² The ministers of the state, too, each according to his rank should offer rice, daily in rotation. They seem to have provided another offering termed as 'mandalīkatali', which was an offering provided collectively either by them all (the term's literal meaning) or by 'territorial magnates' as

1. Sin.Sa.Lipi, p.64.

2. Daḷ.S., p.50, regulation 10.

according to Parānavitana's interpretation.¹

In addition to the Tooth Relic, there seems to have been other relics too, which received homage at the Tooth Relic temple. One regulation stipulates that a bowl of rice should be offered daily to the Lord Mahākassapa (mahasupsāmin) and other relics, (dhātuvarunvahansē).² Whether 'dhātuvarunvahansē' (other relics) implies in this context, some relics of the Buddha or of his disciples is not certain, but mahasupsāmin doubtless denotes the Tooth Relic of Mahākassapa one of the chief disciples of the Buddha. This relic, as has been stated earlier,³ received homage of Parākramabāhu II but no further sources are found elsewhere to account for its movements. But, the regulation cited above suggests that during the Kurunāgala period it was enshrined in the Tooth Relic temple.

1. UCHC., I, pt.II, p.759.

2. Mahasupsāminat dhātuvarun vahansētāt davasa bat taliyak puḍa karanuva isā (Dal.S., p.51, regulation 12). Dhammavisuddhi translates this as 'a bowl of rice should be offered to the Lord Mahākassapa and his relics' (op.cit., p.335). He seems to have mistaken mahasupsāmin found in this regulation as well as in regulations 13 and 31 (Dal.S., pp.51, 53) and construed it as an image of Mahākassapa. Although it is not impossible that an image of Mahākassapa was kept in the Tooth Relic temple, the regulation in question does not necessarily convey this meaning. What actually implied in these contexts, was the Tooth Relic of Mahākassapa, as Sorata rightly suggested (Dal.S., p.115). The term mahasupsāmin is meant as a personification of this relic, as svāmin in regulation 25 (Dal.S., p.52) was used to denote the Tooth Relic.

3. See above, p.195.

There is an indication in the Daladā Sirita suggesting the prevalence of a ceremony of purification in the Tooth Relic temple. The regulation concerning this ceremony as it appears in the various editions and manuscripts of the work, is incomplete.

The relevant clause runs as follows: 'daladāgeṭa nānumurayak sanat...mahasupsāmīnaṭat masakāṭa devārayak bāgin puda -ōlakkam karanuva isā.'¹

A literal translation of this regulation depends on the understanding of what 'sanat' stands for in this context. Two interpretations may be advanced. First, 'sanat' in the expression 'nānumurayak sanat' could be derived from /sana - to mix, prepare in a temporal or conditional sense, and the expression may be translated as 'whenever a nānumura is mixed or prepared'. Second, sanat may be a derivation of /sanaha - to bathe or anoint, that too, in a temporal or conditional sense meaning 'whenever a nānumura is anointed or bathed'. It would appear from the following pages that 'nānumura' here itself denotes bathing or a bathing ceremony.² Hence the use of the word sanat to denote the same meaning makes no sense. On the other hand preparing nānu (a mixture), which is later used for bathing, is an essential

1. Dal.S., p.51, regulation 13; Dal.S., ed. Rajasekhara, p.57; Br.Mus.Ms., Or.6606(31) folio khām. Masakāṭa does not appear in some manuscripts and editions. See Br.Mus.Mss., Or.6606(29) folio khau and Or.6606(30) folio ghau; Dal.S., ed. V. Ratnasuriya, p.50.

2. See below, p.389 ff.

feature of a bathing ceremony. Hence the more appropriate meaning for sanat in this context is, 'prepared or mixed'. In the light of this interpretation the regulation in question may be literally translated as 'whenever a nānumura is prepared for the Tooth Relic house a pudaōlakkam should be performed for (the relic of) Mahasupsāmin.'

In 1931, Parnavitana first translated this regulation as: 'every time a nānu service is prepared for the house of the Tooth Relic, an assembly (ōlakkam) for the worship of Mahākassapa should be held twice a month'.¹ Later he took the regulation to mean that 'a ceremony of bathing was performed at intervals for the Tooth Relic; this was done twice a month for the relic of Mahākassapa' and that 'there were special offerings and audiences of the relics on these occasions'.² Dhammavisuddhi agrees with this interpretation but casts doubt on what other meanings are denoted by puda ōlakkam in this context.³ Thus although Parnavitana has interpreted nānumura as nānu service and bathing ceremony, he made no attempt to understand how often and in what manner it was performed; both he and Dhammavisuddhi are not certain what is implied by puda ōlakkam in this context. This

1. MASC., IV, p.35.

2. UHC., I, pt.II, p.759.

3. Dhammavisuddhi, op.cit., p.

regulation therefore deserves a careful examination in the light of the instances where these words have been used. A comparison with the present practice at the Tooth Relic Temple may also help to understand its exact significance.

The term nānumura is a compound of nānu + mura (nānu = a mixture or bathing; mura is Tamil murai¹). It occurs in Sinhalese works with two meanings. The author of the Jātaka Pota translates nahānacunnamulañ in the Seyyansa Jātaka of the Jātakaṭṭhakathā as nānumuraya.² This is found in a context where the village of Kāsī was given to a sister of king Kōsala as a dowry at her marriage to Bimbisāra. Nānumura therefore implies here not a bathing ceremony but the toilet requisites, possibly kinds of lotions, powders, soaps and the like which were used in bathing. The Dambadeṇi Asna refers to a kind of official nānuvaḍannō³ meaning 'those who present nānu (a mixture or toilet requisites). In the Alutnuvara Dēvālaya Karavīma, nānumura denotes a day on which a bathing ceremony of God Upulvan took place (ek nānumura dinayekhi).⁴ This is the popular meaning of the term, at present used to denote a ritual of purification, which is performed by cleaning the image of the Buddha or a god

-
1. Murai has one of several meanings such as 'order', 'manner', 'regularity', 'system', 'routine', 'turn by which work is done' (Tamil Lexicon, VI, pp.3299-3300). The last meaning seems more appropriate in this context.
 2. Pansiya Panas Jātaka Pota, ed. Dhammananda, Colombo, 1955, p.492; Jātakaṭṭhakathā, (SHB)., XXIV, Colombo, 1928, p.282.
 3. Dmb.A., p.34.
 4. Sin.Sa.Lipi., p.68.

reflected in a mirror. The term seems to have been used also in the Daḷadā Sirita with the same meaning. This interpretation gains strength from the manner in which the nānumura is performed even now at the Tooth Relic temple.

The nānumuramaṅgallaya, 'festival of bathing', is performed every Wednesday. Hocart states that the attendents in the kitchen prepare the mixture of nānu in a bowl, with leaves of white water lily (heḷāmbula = *Nymphaea lotus*), some flour (piṭi), hibiscus (vadamal), myrobolan (nelli) and slices of lime.¹ This bowl, together with another vessel containing sandalwood paste and water, is placed on a silver tray. A piece of sandalwood is also placed on the tray which is covered with a cloth.

When the doors of the relic chamber are in the usual manner opened for the day service, a canopy is brought to the kitchen. The store-keeper (gebarāla), lower floor chief (palleṃālē rāla) carrying nānu mixture, and the pingo-bearer carrying warm water, preceded by the torch bearer, go to the relic chamber, to the accompaniment of drumming, conch blowing and singing. Meanwhile, in the relic chamber the monks prepares the necessary accessories, as for the dawn service, with the exception of the spittoon which is placed on a small table in front of the altar, and some scented oil in a cup. When the

1. MASC., IV, p.30.

nānu is brought up it is arranged in a receptacle while scented water and hot water are arranged in two more receptacles for offering.

The ceremony then begins with the auspicious drum (maṅgul beraya). The monk starts the ritual with a salutation and applies scented oil on the mirror held over the spittoon facing the Tooth, by the lay assistant.¹ The bowl of nānu is then offered. At the same time the monk says that he anoints the Sage's body with fragrant myrobolan,² and pours it over the mirror causing it to flow into the spittoon. This is followed by the offering of warm water on which occasion the monk says that he is washing the Buddha as did Ananda.³ Then follows the offering of scented water,⁴ and two towels to wipe the head and the

-
1. Ibid., p.30. The monk chants the following verse at this point.
'Siniddhagattam sumukham, lokajettham narāsabham,
'Pasannasurabhigghandha-telena bhyanjayām'aham.'
(Let me anoint with pure, fragrant oil, the bull among men, best in the world, of smooth limbs and fair face).
 2. Ibid., p.31.
'suvannavanne rucire, jananettarasāyane,
'Karomi munino gatte, gandhāmalakalepanam'
(On the Sage's golden-coloured resplendent body that conveys sweetness to the eyes of the people I perform the anointing with fragrant myrobolan').
 3. Ibid., pp.31 and 21 verse 8.
'Bhadant' Ananda therova, suddhakappena vārinā,
'Nahāpayām'aham Sākya - pungavam lokasotthiyā'
(Like the Blessed Father Ananda let me wash with pure water the Sakyan bull for the salvation of the world')
 4. Ibid., p.31.
'Parissāvitasuddhena, suvannakalasambunā,
'Ṣugandharasamissenā - bhisekam munino kare'.
(Let me anoint the Sage's head with the waters of a golden pitcher, strained clean, mixed with sweet savours')

body¹ with these offerings the bathing ceremony comes to an end. The nānumuramangallaya at the Lankātilaka temple too, is identical with the one described above.²

It is beyond doubt that nānumura in the Daḷadā Sirita denotes a bathing ceremony of this kind, but how far it is identical with the one described above cannot be ascertained. From the account of Hiuen-Tsang we learn that the king washed the Tooth Relic three times a day with perfumed water and sometimes with powdered perfumes.³ Hiuen-Tsang's account however, is not a reliable source by itself. Besides this description finds no confirmation from the manner in which the daily ritual was performed at the Tooth Relic temple, as mentioned in the Daḷadā Sirita. The only possibility is, as has been mentioned earlier, that a ceremony of anointing the Tooth Relic took place daily in the morning (at dawn). The nānumura ceremony, therefore, may

1. Ibid., pp.31, 21.

'Tilokatilakam settham, Lokālokadivākaram
Karomi sirase tuyham, paṭenōdakapunchanam'

('I perform on the head with a cloth the wiping away of water for thee, ornament of the three worlds, excellent maker of daylight for the world');

'Tanuseta dukūlena, paṭavāsasugandhinā,
Karomi munino gatte, nahānodakapunchanam'.

('With a thin white cloth scented with clothes-perfume I perform on the Sage's body the wiping off the bathing water').

2. Evers, Monks, Priests and Peasants, pp.53-54.

3. Si-Yu-Ki, Buddhist Records of the Western World, transl., S.Beal, II, London, 1906, p.248.

have been a more elaborate form of this daily ritual, performed weekly, as at the present day. But how far it is identical with the present manner of performance remains a matter of conjecture.

The term puda ōlakkam which occurs in the second part of the regulation seems to have been used in the same sense as nānumura to convey the same meaning, in the case of the bathing ceremony of Mahākāśyapa. Ōlakkam is a Tamil term which means, 'assembly of state', 'audience', 'royal presence', 'darbar', and 'a hall'.¹ In the Kaṇḍavuru Sirita, ōlakkam is used in the sense of 'royal audience'.² But puda and ōlakkam used as a single compound seem to imply 'making offerings' or 'conducting ritual'. A few instances where this word occurs may be cited in support of this view.

The Laṅkātilaka Inscription has deviyaṅṅa buduṅṅa nirantarayen bat-mal-pahan-puda ōlakkam pavatvana lesaṅṅa, which Parānavitana interpreted as '...maintaining without cessation the offerings of cooked rice, flowers and lamps to the Buddha and the Gods and for conducting audiences....'.³ Although Parānavitana, probably in view of the Tamil usage, had taken

1. Tamil Lexicon, I, p.629.

2. Sin.Sa.Lipi., p.66; Br.Mus.Ms., Or.6606(145), folio kī.

3. UCR., XVIII, nos. 1 & 2, 1962, p.8, II, lines 20-21; transl., p.12.

puda ōlakkam to mean 'conducting audiences', it need not necessarily be taken in this sense. The context in which it is found in the Alutnuvara Dēvālaya Karavīma,¹ shows that it denotes 'making offerings and conducting ritual'. The Dambulu Sirita too uses the term in the sense of making offerings.² Besides, it is evident from the Mihintale Tablets of Mahinda IV, that ōlakkam in this sense, eventually gave rise to the office of a temple functionary named Olkāmiyak, who, according to Gunawardhana, was the official who supervised the daily ritual at the Cetiyaḡiri Monastery.³ In view of these examples, it seems reasonable to hold that puda ōlakkam in the Laṅkātilaka Inscription also conveys the meaning 'making offerings and conducting ritual' and not 'conducting audiences' as suggested by Paranavitana. If this is acceptable it would follow that the term in the Daḷadā Sirita, too, carries the same meaning i.e. conducting ritual, viz. that of the bathing ceremony. Hence the second part of the regulation can be translated as 'a nānumura was conducted twice a month for the relic of (Mahasupasāmin) Mahākassapa.

1. Br.Mus.Ms., Or.6606(145), folio kī; Sin.Sa.Lipi., pp.67-68.

'Dēvapātīrāja nam agra amātyayānanta yaḡa kiyana lada puda paṅḡduru siyallama bhārakoḡa ema avuruddē āsala pūjā perahāra puda ōlakkam ādivū siyallak apagē nāmayen pavatvālavai...'

2. N.Mudiyanse, Sāstrīya Lipi Sangraha, Colombo, 1971, pp.53-64.

3. Ep.Zeyl., I, p.95 II line 10; transl., p.108; Gunawardhana, op.cit., pp.161-62.

This brings us to the question of whether the bathing ceremony of the Tooth Relic, was also performed twice a month as was the case with the relic of Mahākassapa, or weekly, as has been suggested earlier. The latter seems very likely to have been the case, and that for two reasons. First, as we have often seen in this discussion, there has been no remarkable change in the conduct of the ritual since the thirteenth century, and hence it is quite possible that a nānumura for the Tooth Relic was performed weekly as it is today. Second, the honours accorded to the Buddha cannot be expected to have been accorded, without any change to his disciples as well. The latter were bound to receive comparatively less veneration. For this reason, if a ceremony of bathing was performed for Mahākassapa twice a month, it is quite possible that the same ceremony was performed for the Buddha more often than that, for instance four times a month.

Another noteworthy aspect which merits discussion at this stage is the particular care taken in the admission of worshippers to the Tooth Relic temple. Four regulations of the Daladā Sirita permit only certain specified persons to enter the temple through its three portals. Permission to enter the perfumed chamber (gaṇḍakiliya) through the third portal was given only to those whose duty it was to prepare the altar.¹

1. Dal.S., p.49. regulation 1.

The members of the Saṅgha, princes, officials who had the right to enter the voṭunugē (place where the crowns were kept),¹ officials in charge of the Tooth Relic temple and dharmadharayan² were permitted entrance through the second portal,³ while the ministers were allowed to enter through the first portal.⁴ All others were expected to worship the Relic from outside the first portal.⁵

The fact that yān aturannan (those who prepare the altar) were allowed to enter the perfumed chamber where the Relic was kept, merits further discussion, for this seems to indicate either that they were considered personages of greater importance

1. Ibid., p.112.

2. The term literally means 'those who are versed in the religious lore' but it is not certain whether it is the clergy or laity that are denoted in this context. Dharmadharayan usually denotes monks but as they are already mentioned in the same regulation, the term probably indicates either a special group of monks or else members of the laity who were well versed in the dhamma.

3. Dal.S., p.50 regulation 2.

4. Ibid., p.50 regulation 3. The regulation has tunveni ranbāven ātulata which means 'through the third portal'. There seems to have been a confusion in the enactment of the first and the third regulations. The first suggests that the portals were counted from outside; as a result the inner-most portal became the third. By this system the outer-most portal would be the first. Regulation three, however, indicates that the portals were counted from inside for it names the outer-most portal as the third.

5. Ibid., p.50 regulation 4.

than those who were granted permission to enter through the second portal or they were a special category of officials. The Daḷadā Sirita does not specify whether they were ecclesiastics or lay officials. But another regulation of the same work may clarify this point. From that we learn that in order to be taken in the annual procession the relic casket was removed from the perfumed chamber by the chief incumbent of the Uttaramūla (uturuḷumuḷu ayatān siṭitān) and the suitable members (nissan) of the Ganavāsi and Kiḷiṅ families.¹ This suggests that they were the only persons who had the right to enter this chamber. One wonders therefore, whether the yān aturannan in the above context² implies those who were entitled to enter the relic chamber.

This however, seems unlikely for various reasons. The Daḷadā Sirita and the Kaṅḍavuru Sirita, although they regulate the manner in which the rulers worshipped the Relic do not suggest that the kings prepared the altar. If that, too, had been one of their duties it certainly would have been mentioned in either of these works. It is also unlikely that the chief incumbent of the Uttaramūla who was in charge of the administration of the fraternity and had various other duties in this connexion could, apart from participating on special occasions where his

1. Ibid., p.51 regulation 16.

2. See above, p.396.

presence was necessary, spare any time to prepare the altar of the Tooth Relic temple. On the other hand, the main task of the members of the Ganavāsi and Kiḷiṅ families seems to have been that of providing protection for the Tooth Relic. In the reign of Parākramabāhu I, as the Cūlavamsa records, they were stationed, sword in hand, around the maṇḍapa on which the relic was exhibited.¹ The Daḷadā Sirita records that two members of these families mounted the chariot on which the Tooth Relic was kept in order to take in in procession and that they were present when the seals of the caskets were broken to take the Relic out for exhibition.² Both these passages suggest that the members of the two families were entrusted with the protection of the Relic. Hence yān aturannan in this context, seems to indicate some officials other than those who were allowed admittance to the inner chamber of the Tooth Relic temple, but we are still left in doubt as to who they were.

An examination of the personages engaged in the daily ritual at the present Tooth Relic temple at Kandy may be helpful in this respect. According to Hocart, the present practice is that the chief incumbents of the Malvatta and the Asgiriya monasteries in turn appoint two monks to conduct the ritual at the temple for one year. A lay official termed as vaṭṭōrurāla or vaṭṭērurāla,³

1. Cv., 74.213-14.

2. Dal.S., pp.51-52; regulations 16, 23.

3. The term literally means 'the official (rāla) who prepares lists or inventory (vaṭṭōru).

whose duty it is to carry the keys in order to open the door of the shrine and take them back, assists the monks in the ritual by sweeping the floor¹ and, according to Sorata, by preparing the altar.² He is the only lay official permitted to enter the sanctuary and in his absence the monks have to perform his duties in addition to their own. Hence although the monks occasionally prepare the altar the vaṭṭorurāla appears to be the person normally in charge of this task, and for this reason he may well be the modern counterpart of the yān aturannan mentioned in the Daladā Sirita.³ It should, however, be noted that it is by no means possible to determine whether the yān aturannan like the present vaṭṭōrurāla, assisted the monks in the ritual or whether the monks themselves prepared the altar during the period under discussion. It is therefore not certain whether yān aturannan in this context indicates a lay official or the monks who officiated at the ritual in the Tooth Relic temple or both, but not any others who were granted permission to enter the relic chamber through the third portal.

1. MASC., IV, pp.11-12.

2. Dal.S., p.112.

3. It is believed that in ancient times the king himself conducted the ritual with the help of the water-presenting officer (ḍiyavaḍana ṇilamē). But apart from the fact that the king worshipped the relic once a day as the Daladā Sirita and the Kaṇḍavuru Sirita record, the evidence at our disposal does not shed any light on this point.

II

Annual celebrations of the Tooth Relic

The procession and exhibition of the Tooth Relic highlighted the annual celebrations of the Tooth Relic temple. As for the daily and pōya day rituals the Daladā Sirita furnishes us with a detailed description of the manner in which these ceremonies were conducted. In addition to the Daladā Sirita there are some other works which provide information in this connexion. The Dāṭhāvamsa, the account of the Daladā Sirita concerning the reign of Siri Meghavanna, and the record of Fa-Hsien throw valuable light on the annual celebrations during the Anurādhapura period. It should be noted, however, that the Dāṭhāvamsa and the corresponding account of the Daladā Sirita do not specifically mention an annual celebration. They imply such a celebration when the state that Meghavanna celebrated a festival for the Tooth Relic and decreed that the same ceremony should be performed annually in an identical manner.¹ The manner in which he celebrated the Tooth Relic festival may therefore be taken as the basis of later festivals. Fa-Hsien, on the other hand, is more explicit, for he describes annual celebrations which he himself witnessed.² There are some other accounts too, such as those of

1. Dav., v. 67; Dal.S., p.41.

2. The Travels of Fa-Hsien, pp.70-71.

Pridham, and the Disāva of Vellassa¹ which provide a picture of the Tooth Relic festival during the Kandyan period. These sources however, belong to a period beyond the scope of this thesis, and they have been utilized only for comparison, when necessary, for the better understanding of some remarkable changes in the festival.

The Daladā Sirita gives fourteen regulations (16-29) to prescribe the manner in which the celebrations were to be held. On a day when the planetary conjunctions were auspicious, the Tooth Relic temple was to be cleansed and decorated with canopies (viyan) and divers kinds of silk clothes. Thereafter the king, the inmates of the harem, ministers of state and the citizens were to celebrate a festival with offerings of rice, flowers, lamps and the like. In the forenoon of the seventh day flowers, lamps and the like were to be offered. In the afternoon, after the city had been decorated like that of the gods, the relic casket was to be taken out of the perfumed chamber by the head of the Uttaramūla and suitable members of the Gaṇavāsi and Kilin families, and be placed on an auspicious

-
1. Charles Pridham, An Historical, Political and Statistical Account of Ceylon and Its Dependencies, London, 1849, pp.325-27; Millāva, Disāva of Vellassa, 'Account of the Perahāra', in the Ceylon Government Gazette, 13th Sept., 1817, reproduced in R.Pieris, Sinhalese Social Organisation, Colombo, 1950, pp.135-138.

couch on a diversely adorned chariot. Two members of the Gaṇavāsi and Kiliñ families were to mount the chariot to hold the casket.¹ A gaily caparisoned elephant with auspicious marks was to be yoked to the chariot.² The monks, preceded by the chariot, was to go in procession while chanting pirit (paritta) and holding the pirit-thread which was tied to the chariot.² During the course of the procession pirit pān (paritta water) was to be sprinkled on the city from a silver pitcher by a suitable member of the Doranāvāsi family;³ white umbrellas were to be held and fly whisks waved on either side of the chariot.⁴ The officials and musicians of the Tooth Relic temple were to walk close to the chariot performing their services⁵ and they were to be followed by those of the palace.⁶ Next to them the ministers were to march with the four-fold army as a guard of honour to the Tooth Relic.⁷

The procession which, in this manner, went round the city in a clockwise direction, came back to the Tooth Relic temple. The exhibition of the Relic followed. The Daladā Sirita stipulates

-
1. Dal.S., p.51 regulation 16 ; Br.Mus.Ms., Or.6606(29) folio khau.
 2. Dal.S., p.51 regulation 17.
 3. Ibid., p.52 regulation 18.
 4. Ibid., p.52 regulation 19.
 5. Ibid., p.52 regulation 20.
 6. Ibid., p.52 regulation 21.
 7. Ibid., p.52 regulation 22.

that the seals of the relic casket should be broken in the presence of the king, the chief incumbent of the Uttaramūla (uturuṣumulu ayatān siṭitān), and two representatives of the Gaṇavasi and Kiḷiṅ families and guardians (gebalannan) of the temple. The Tooth Relic was to be taken out of the casket and first presented to the Saṅgha by the chief incumbent of the Uttaramūla and then handed over to the king who would reverentially place it on an elevated dais (usva penena tenekā). From here the Relic was to be exhibited to the crowds while yak-tail fans (cāmara) were waved, white umbrellas (sesat) held, conches blown, and, while the chief incumbent of the Uttaramūla, the members of the community (mahāsaṅgha), members of the Gaṇavāsi and Kiḷiṅ families, and ministers were in attendance.¹ The Relic was to be exhibited to outsiders (amutuva āvavunaṭa) from a distance and also with the necessary precautions.² When the exhibition was over, the Relic was to be placed back in the casket, in the presence of the king and secured with the three seals, taṭukassa, pāmulpeṭṭiya and ganaya.³ Seven or five monks

1. Ibid., p.52 regulation 23.

2. Ibid., p.52 regulation 24.

3. Ibid., p.52 regulation 25.

chanted pirit incessantly (during this period).¹ The worship was to be carried out annually in this manner.²

It is of interest to compare and contrast this festival with those that prevailed in the Anurādhapura period and in Kandyan times. First, it would appear from the foregoing description of the Daḷadā Sirita that, although it refers to the king's participation in the festival, it does not state clearly under whose auspices the ceremony was performed. From the accounts of the Dāṭhāvamsa and the Daḷadā Sirita concerning the reign of Meghavanna we learn that the ceremony was performed under the auspices of the ruler for it was he who directed the people to decorate the city and the way leading to the vihāra (vihāra maggaṃ) for which task he spent 900,000 kaḥāpaṇas.³

But one would observe that neither of these two works lays much emphasis on the king's role concerning the preliminary arrangements of the ceremony. Fa-Hsien, on the other hand, has left for us an excellent record in this respect. According to him, ten days before the festival, the king adorned and

-
1. Ibid. ., p.53 regulation 28. It is not specified whether chanting pirit was carried out throughout the year or only during the annual celebrations but the latter seems more suitable for the content in which it is found.
 2. Ibid. ., p.53 regulation 29.
 3. Day., vv. 47, 66; Dal.S., p.39. Only the Day., mentions that the king spent 900,000 kaḥāpaṇas.

caparisoned a large elephant on which was mounted a clear-voiced man. He rode on the elephant along the streets, beating a drum and proclaiming the greatness of the Buddha, that he took great pains in his previous existences to promote the welfare of all beings and that in ten days his Tooth Relic would be taken out and brought to the Abhayagiri-vihāra. All monks and laymen, he added, who wished to gain merit might make arrangements for this festival by smoothing the roads i.e. by laying out the roads adorning the lanes and streets, and providing offerings of all kinds of flowers and incense. The king also ordered artists to paint five hundred forms of the previous lives of the Buddha.¹

This account, it would seem, emphasizes the king's role more strongly than any other work as far as the preliminary arrangements of the ceremony and the means by which it was announced to the people are concerned. It is true that all these works provide information on the Anurādhapura period and not on later periods, but this should not lead us to conclude that these preliminaries were confined to the Anurādhapura period. For, on the one hand, the king's participation in various stages of the Tooth Relic festival, as we see in the Daḷadā Sirita,² makes it clear that the

1. The Travels of Fa-Hsien, pp.70-71.

2. See above, pp.402, 404.

ceremony was performed under his patronage and for this reason he may well have made all necessary arrangements. On the other hand, the method of public announcement described by Fa-Hsien was regularly used in ancient Ceylon. Our sources often refer to kings who used this device to proclaim important issues.¹ Indeed the practice, although not so prominent as in ancient times, prevailed until its place was taken in recent times by other media such as newspapers, pamphlets and radio. Thus, as the method of proclamation recorded by Fa-Hsien was not confined to the fifth century, it is quite possible that a similar practice was followed during the Kurunāgala period when the regulations of the Daladā Sirita took their final form.

Second, the regulations of the Daladā Sirita do not mention the season or month in which the annual celebrations were to be held. It does not mention this either in its account concerning the reign of Siri Meghavanna. Again, the Dāthāvamsa, the accounts of Fa-Hsien, and of the Disāva of Vellassa throw a valuable light on this aspect of the Relic festival. When Siri Meghavanna informed the Saṅgha of the people's desire to venerate the Relic, the Dathāvamsa states that the Saṅgha suggested that the Relic should be exhibited in spring time (vasantasamaye).²

-
1. Mv., 31.32; Dal.Pjv., p.2; Dharmapradīpikā, ed. Dharmakīrti Sri Dharmarama, Colombo, 1951, pp.344-45; Saddharmaratnāvalīya, I, ed. D.B.Jayatīlaka, Colombo, 1930, p.3; Pansiya Panas Jātaka Pota, ed. Naulle Dhammananda, Vol.I, p.2; II, p.903, etc.
 2. Dav., v.352.

As it is not mentioned that the king disagreed with this suggestion it follows that this ceremony was indeed held in spring. This is further confirmed by the fact that the city was decorated with banana trees so that it would look beautiful as a forest in spring.¹ Yet it still remains to be determined precisely in which month the festival was held. The account of Fa-Hsien provides an answer to clarify this. He mentions that the ceremony was performed in the third month which is very likely to have been the third month of the Chinese calendar. Fa-Hsien, as we know, was in Ceylon in c. A.D.411-13.² These three years were the seventh, eighth and ninth years respectively of Yi-hsi in the reign of An-ti, emperor of the East Tsin dynasty. The Chinese new year in these three years started on 9th February, 30th January and 17th February respectively.³ Even if the Chinese pilgrim's stay in Ceylon were dated two years before A.D.411 or also two years after A.D.413, it would appear that the new year started either in February or in the last week of January.⁴ Further, as can be seen in Chinese chronological tables, in the majority of cases, the new year begins in February, the first day of which is counted from the appearance of the full moon.

1. Ibid., v.388.

2. UCHC., I, pt.I, p.15.

3. Chronological Tables of Chinese History, II, ed. Tung-Tso-Ping, Hong Kong, 1960, p.52.

4. Ibid., p.52. 1st February and 20th February in A.D.409 and 410, 6th February and 26th January in A.D.414 and 415.

Thus, if Fa-Hsien's reference is to the third month of the Chinese calendar, it corresponds to May which in turn is a spring-time month. Fa-Hsien's account therefore, not only corroborates the detail of the Dat̥hāvamsa but also elaborates it by specifying the month in which the celebration was held.

The Disāva of Vellassa on the other hand, states that the festival was held in the month of Āsala (Skt., Asādhā, July),¹ which for this reason is named the Āsala Perahāra. What particular factor brought about the change of dates of the celebration from May to July is not clear but it seems to have been the result of the amalgamation of the Tooth Relic festival with an earlier festival. It is of interest to note that although the full-moon day of Āsala is significant as the date on which the Buddha preached the dhamma and thus set in motion the dhammacakka, this event appears to have had no bearing on the Āsala Perahāra. According to some traditions the birth of Viṣṇu and his victory over the Asuras took place in the month of Āsala² while according to another tradition this month is connected with Gajabāhu's invasion of the Coḷa country which resulted in the recovery of 12000 Sinhalese previously captured by the Coḷas, as well as the capture of 12000 Coḷas, the golden anklets of Pattini, the sacred utensils of the four dēvalēs and

1. Ralph Pieris, op.cit., p.135.

2. Davy, op.cit., p.170; Ralph Pieris, op.cit., p.135.

the Bowl Relic of the Buddha.¹ It is possible that these traditions may explain the origins of the Āsala Perahāra. But since it appears that the two traditions refer to a ceremony which was in some way or other connected with Vignu and Pattini who received worship among other gods in this ceremony, and since the Tooth Relic procession was combined with it only in the reign of Kitti Siri Rājasinha (A.D.1747-80), it is very likely that the Āsala Perahāra was originally a non-Buddhist festival. The reason for the amalgamation of the two festivals, according to tradition, was either the attitude of the Siamese monks who visited Ceylon in the reign of Kitti Siri Rājasinha and were surprised to see that no place was given to the Buddha in the Āsala Perahāra or else the instructions of the famous saṅgharāja of Vālivīṭa.² The amalgamation may then be explained as a result of the revival of Buddhism under Kitti Siri but at the same time it indicates that the Tooth Relic festival had lost its significance some time before his reign. This would not be surprising as the period prior to his reign, was a time when there was a general decline of Buddhism,³ and this may well account for a change of dates of the festival after the revival of Buddhism under Kitti Siri.

1. Pridham, op.cit., p.329.

2. CJHSS., VI, no.2, 1963, p.171.

3. K.Wachissara, Vālivīṭa Saranaṅkara and the Reivival of Buddhism in Ceylon, Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, 1961, p.90 ff, Saranaṅkara Saṅgarāja Samaya, Colombo, 1963, p.29 ff.

However, as it appears that conducting annual celebrations in July (Āsala) is a recent development, it is hardly possible to use this to date the celebrations of the period referred to in the Daḷadā Sirita. Neither is it possible to ascertain whether the relic festival was performed in the spring as mentioned in the Dāḥhāvamsa and the account of Fa-Hsien. The latter however, is not unlikely for we do not know for certain whether the author of the Dāḥhāvamsa (c. A.D.1210) recorded a practice prevalent in his time. If such was the case there may not have been a remarkable change during the following hundred years, i.e. up to the reign of Parākramabāhu IV, when the regulations of the Daḷadā Sirita were formulated. This, it should be emphasized, is by no means decisive, but seems a reasonable view until further evidence is brought to light.

Third, other ceremonies such as making offerings and decorating the city before the procession and exhibition of the Tooth Relic, deserve particular attention. In the regulations referred to above the Daḷadā Sirita presents a vivid picture of the manner in which a celebration was held for seven days prior to the festival.¹ This is not mentioned in its account concerning the reign of Siri Meghavanna, nor is it mentioned in any other work. As regards the preparation of the city for the festival,

1. Dal.S., p.51, regulation 16.

the Daladā Sirita regulates that it should be decorated 'like that of the gods'¹ but no further details are given. This phrase, although it brings to mind a beautifully decorated city, is inadequate for it does not state what the decorations were. Their nature may be understood from the narrative of the Daladā Sirita concerning the festival of Meghavanna, as well as those of the Dāḥāvaṃsa, Fa-Hsien and the Cūlavāṃsa.

The Dāḥāvaṃsa provides a detailed description of the decorations in the reign of Siri Meghavanna: the streets along which the procession marched were cleansed, and watered and sand was strewn on them so that they appeared beautiful; triumphal arches decorated with such figures as tigers (vyagghas) and adorned with gold and the like were set up in the streets; canopies were held to ward off the rays of the sun while banana trees were set upon each side of the street to make the roads equal in beauty to a forest in spring. New pots full of water (navapunnakumba) were placed and the city was fumigated by the burning of incense such as camphor (kapuru), frankincense (tuvaralā) and aloe wood (agil). There were mandapas adorned with hanging garlands of pearls, and flowers were set in them to attract bees.

1. Day., vv. 387-390.

The corresponding account of the Daladā Sirita, although differing in some respects, basically agrees with that of the Dāṭhāvamsa, and is more elaborate. It records with the Dāṭhāvamsa that the streets were cleansed, strewn with sand and fumigated by the burning of incense. It makes no mention of the paintings of vyagghas which decorated the triumphal arches, but adds that they were adorned with gold, silver and jewels, and that the city was decorated like Amarapura¹ (the city of the gods).

Fa-Hsien, on the other hand, does not mention these decorations but records that the sides of the street, through which the Relic was led in procession to the Abhayagiri, were decorated with the paintings² of five hundred forms of the previous lives of the Buddha such as Sydana, Sāma, the king of elephants, the deer and the horse. It is not clear what Sydana stands for in this context³ but Sāma may perhaps be a reference to the Sāma Jātaka.⁴ It is also difficult to determine what exactly was meant by the king of elephants and by the deer

1. Dal.S., pp.39-40.

2. The Travels of Fa-Hsien, pp.70-71; Some translations have that the king set images of the five hundred forms. Chinese Literature, I, no.3, 1956, p.179.

3. There is no Jātaka by this name in the Pali or Sinhalese Jātakas. But, there is one named Sutanu Jātakaya; Pansiya Panas Jātaka Pota, I, ed. Naulle Dhammananda, pp.673-74. Fa-Hsien may perhaps have referred to this Jātaka.

4. Ibid., II, pp.1367-78.

for the Bodhistva's existence in these forms appear in many Jātakas.¹ Similarly his existence as a horse is mentioned in several Jātakas.² It is not unlikely, however, that by the reference to the painting of a horse, the Chinese pilgrim implied the Valāhassa Jātaka. Certainly it was this Jātaka which was mentioned by Hiuen Tsiang in his narrative to explain the beginnings of the Sinhalese kingdom.³

Fa-Hsien's description seems to be confirmed by the account of the Dāṭhāvamsa. It has been mentioned in the foregoing discussion that the triumphal arches which were set up in the streets were decorated with representations (rūpa) of such animals as vyagghas (vyagghādi).⁴ The Sinhalese paraphrase of the Dāṭhāvamsa renders the term vyagghādi into Sinhalese as siṅhavyāgrādi (such animals as lions and tigers).⁵ The mention of the representations of these animals is particularly noteworthy in this context for it suggests some importance attached to these

-
1. For instance the elephant appears in Mahilāmukha, Caddanta and in five other Jātakas. (Pansiya Panas Jātaka Pota, ed. Naulle Dhammānanda, I, pp.70-73; II, pp.1084-94) while the deer appears in such Jātakas as the Lakkhanamiga, Nigrodhamiga, Vātamiga and Kuruṅgamiga. (ibid., I, pp.36-38; 38-45; 47-50; 60-61).
 2. Ibid., I, pp.64-66; 66-67; 362-63; 459-61.
 3. Buddhist Records of the Western World, II, London, 1906, p.242.
 4. See above, p.412.
 5. Dav., v.387 and its paraphrase.

paintings but one may wonder what this significance was. Both these animals are not native to Ceylon and hence one may suggest that they were used as decorative motifs. But, one can hardly expect the presence of paintings of tigers and lions - both ferocious animals - in a religious ceremony, if no religious importance is attached to them. A likely explanation is that they were indications of the representation of Jātaka stories. In Jātakas we often come across the Bodhisatva's existence as a lion.¹ The references to his previous births as tigers is not found in Pali Jātakas. There is, however, a Vyāgri Jātaka, in Sanskrit works, which mentions that the Bodhisatva offered his body as food to a famished tigress in order to save the life of her newly born young ones which she was prepared to eat.² Fa-Hsien may well have referred to this Jātaka when he stated that the Bodhisatva 'offered his body to a ravenous tiger'.³ It is very likely, therefore, that, in its reference to a painting of a tiger, the Dāṭhāvamsa refers to the Vyāgri Jātaka. It is also noteworthy that the compound ādi found herein implies some other painting as well, probably of animals such as those

-
1. Pansiya Paṇas Jātaka Pota, ed. Naulle Dhammānanda, pp.288-90.
 2. This Jātaka is first found in the Mūlasarvāstivādi Vinaya from which Avadāna no.2 of the Divyāvadāna seems to have taken. Kṣemendra in Avadāna Kalpalatā refers to this in Avadāna no.51 and 95. For details, see, The Jātakamāla of Aryasura, ed. R.G.Dwivedi and M.R.Bhat, Delhi, 1966, Introduction, p.XVII.
 3. The Travels of Fa-Hsien, pp.70-71.

mentioned in Fa-Hsien's account. These references - in Fa-Hsien and the Dāṭhavaṃsa - may therefore be taken as corroborating each other, and also as an indication of the prevalence of the paintings of five hundred previous lives of the Buddha as decorative motifs in the Tooth Relic festival during the reign of Siri Meghavanna. Whether or not such paintings were used as decorative motifs in later times cannot be determined in the present state of our knowledge.

The Cūlavāṃsa on the other hand, gives an idea of the manner in which the streets were decorated for Tooth Relic festivals celebrated in the reign of Parākramabāhu I and Parākramabāhu II. It should be noted that the Cūlavāṃsa does not refer to annual celebrations on these occasions, but the decorations used in these festivals might have been similar to those used in annual celebrations during the Polonnaruva and Daṃbadeṇiya periods. In the account concerning the festival of Parākramabāhu I, it is stated that the king had triumphal arches erected with coloured pictures and beneath these spread canopies tied with garlands of flowers. The upper parts of the pillars of the arches were provided with rows of umbrellas and whisks, bunches of flowers, and fluttering cloths and banners. The two sides of the streets were adorned with fruit-bearing trees such as king coconut, banana, areca and coco-palms, with vases filled with charming nose-gays, and with lamps and incense. With

these adornments the streets looked like Sudassana, the street of the gods.¹ A similar description of the decorations is found in the two relic festivals of Parākramabāhu II.²

Thus it would seem that although there were slight differences, there was no fundamental change in the street decorations of the relic festival until, at least, the end of the Daṁbadeṇiya period. Since there is no evidence to suggest any change of this aspect during the next half a century, it seems reasonable to hold that such decorations have been used even in the Kurunāgala period. Hence, surapuramen pura sarahā (the city decorated like the city of the gods) in the above context of the Daḷadā Sirita may be taken as implying such decorations as those mentioned in other works referred to above.

Fourth, another detail which merits discussion at this stage is the role played in the affairs of the Tooth Relic by the chief incumbent of the Uttaramūla (uturuḷumulu ayatān sititān) and the members of the Gaṇavāsi and Kiliṅ families. It has been mentioned that they removed the relic casket from its shrine and that they were present when the seals of the casket were broken and also at the exhibition of the Relic.³ We further learn that two members of the Gaṇavāsi and Kiliṅ families did mount the chariot in order to take the Relic in procession,⁴ and that all disputes concerning

1. Cv., 74.199-206.

2. Ibid., 85.4-15 and 89.13-16.

3. See above, pp. 402-04.

4. See above, p. 403.

the temple were to be settled by the chief incumbent of the Uttaramūla sitting in session with the king's ministers.¹

All this evidence, though not found elsewhere, suggests the special significance attached to these dignitaries in the affairs of the Tooth Relic. The prominent place given to the chief incumbent of the Uttaramūla is quite understandable for, as has been seen earlier,² he was the custodian of the Tooth Relic. But, it is not known who Gaṇavāsi and Kiliṅ families were and why they were given such a prominent place in the affairs of the Tooth Relic.

Gaṇavāsi and Kiliṅ, appear to have been two families connected with the Lambakaṇṇa clan which had close connexions with secular and religious affairs of the country. Parānavitana interprets the term Gaṇavāsi as gaṇa = monastery, vāsi = employee, and takes it to mean a temple official.³ The Sagama Inscription of Bhuvanekabāhu V, and the Saddharmaratnākara provide almost an identical description concerning the origin of the Gaṇavāsi family.⁴ The latter work states that Gaṇavāsi is another name for the Lamāṇi family (Lambakaṇṇa) which was descended from the Śākya princes, Sumitta and Bodhigupta who had accompanied Saṅghamittā in bringing the Bō sapling to Ceylon.

1. Dal.S., p.53, regulation 34.

2. See above, pp.188-89.

3. UCHC., I, pt.II, p.748.

4. Ep.Zeyl., IV, pp.303 ff, 309, II, lines 5-6; Srk., pp.294-95.

The name Gaṇavāsi, according to this work, was given to that vaṃsa as it gradually became bigger; it was also called Lamāṇi because it was pure on both sides and because the descendents of the lineage had long ears.¹ In the regulations concerning the selection of leaders of the āyatanas, the Daṃbadeṇi Katikāvata stipulates that the candidates for these posts should be scions of the families named Saṅgamu and Gaṇavāsi.² Their connexions with the religious life of the country gains further strength from the Gaḍalādeniya Inscription³ where it is stated that Sīlavāṃsa Dharmakīrti, one of the prominent members of the Saṅgha in the fourteenth century, was a scion of the Gaṇavāsi family.

There is also evidence to show the connexion of this family with the political affairs of the country. The Saddharma ratnākaraya states that Parakramabāhu VI, was a scion of this family,⁴ while according to the Sagama Inscription, Alakēśvara III belonged to it on his mother's side.⁵ Their connexions with royalty and the administration of monastic property as well as the tenuousness of their connexion with the Lambakāṇṇas of the early Anurādhapura period have been discussed by other writers.⁶

1. Ibid., p.294.

2. Ktk.Sng., p.9.

3. Ep.Zeyl., IV, p.103, II. lines 3-4.

4. Srk., p.295.

5. Ep.Zeyl., IV, pp.309 II lines 5-8.

6. UCHC., I, pt.II, p.663; H.B.M.Ilangasinha, op.cit., p.154 ff.

Although it is evident that Kiliṅga, according to the context in which it is found in the Daladā Sirita, denotes a family name, the derivation of the term is not clear. Hocart thinks that it derives from Kāliṅga, i.e. the territory of that name in Eastern India.¹ In its narrative of the bringing of the Bō Tree, the Samantapāsādikā mentions a kula by the name of Kaliṅga.² This kula is termed Kuliṅga in the corresponding accounts of the Mahāvamsa and the Mahābodhivamsa.³ The Sinhala Bōdhivamsaya gives the name Kuliṅgu⁴ which seems to be a derivation of Pali Kuliṅga. The function of Kuliṅgu according to this work, was to supply fresh flowers for offering to the Bō Tree.

Although the Samantapāsādikā had used Kaliṅga as an equivalent of Kuliṅga and Kuliṅgu found in other works, these two words are used in the Cūlavamsa to denote people of two separate origins. The Cūlavamsa refers to Mahinda VI, who killed Vijayabāhu II, as a Kuliṅga (eko kuliṅgo) and describes his assassin, Nissāṅkamalla as 'one who is born in Kaliṅga' (Kaliṅgajo).⁵ The use of these terms here to describe Mahinda and Nissāṅkamalla suggests that they were not synonyms but two separate words with different meanings. Kuliṅga in Sanskrit denotes 'a bird of prey',

1. MASC., IV, p.2 and p.36, n.3.

2. Smp., (PTS)., I, p.96.

3. Mv., 19.2; Mbv., p.102.

4. SBV., ed. G.Senadheera, Colombo, 1971, pp.285-86.

5. Cv., 80.15, 18.

'the fork-tailed shrike' and it is very likely that it designates a clan having a totemistic origin - as Geiger suggests.¹ If such was the case, it is understandable why the Cūlavamsa used Kuliṅga to distinguish Mahinda from Nissaṅkamalla who was of Kāliṅga origin.

Kiliṅ, on the other hand, appears to be derived from Kuliṅgu. Mahinda VI, who is referred to as a Kuliṅga in the Cūlavamsa is described in the Pūjāvaliya as kesdā kiliṅ mihindā!² where Kiliṅ is thus equated with Kuliṅga. Hence it is quite probable that Kiliṅ which occurs in the Daḷadā Sirita is the Sinhalese form of Kuliṅga.

Whatever the connexion between the later Gaṇavāsi and the Lambakanna of the Anurādhapura period and whatever the origin of Kiliṅ, there is evidence to show that the term Lambakanna was used to denote members of both these families. In connexion with the Tooth Relic festival of Parākramabāhu I, the Cūlavamsa states that the king placed on a costly maṇḍapa the casket containing the Tooth Relic and also the Bowl Relic, and placed around the maṇḍapa, along with other nobles (Kulīna), Lambakannas bearing umbrellas, yak-tail fans (cāmara), swords and the like, for the protection of the relics.³ This suggests that

1. Mv., transl., fn. to 19.2.

2. Pjv., p.24.

3. Cv., 74.213-14.

the function carried out by the Lambakannas on this occasion was that of holding the umbrellas, waving yak-tail fans and providing protection to the Tooth Relic. These functions, it would seem, are identical with those performed by the members of the Ganavāsi and Kiliṅ families as regulated in the Daladā Sirita. Their presence on occasions such as taking the Relic casket out from the perfumed chamber and taking the Relic in procession, breaking the seals of the casket as well as re-sealing it, and the exposition of the relic, is evident from the Daladā Sirita.¹ These references suggest that these families were entrusted with certain duties concerning the protection of the Relic. The Ganavāssan, in fact, finds mention in the Daladā Sirita among the officials who were entrusted with the protection of the Tooth Relic temple.² Another regulation, as mentioned earlier, stipulates that yak-tail fans be waved and umbrellas held from either side of the chariot.³ The Daladā Sirita does not specify what officials should carry out these duties, but it seems likely that either the two members of the Ganavāsi and Kiliṅ families who mounted the chariot, or some other members of their families were in charge of these formalities.

-
1. Dal.S., pp.51-52 regulations 16, 23.
 2. Ibid., p.51 regulation 15.
 3. Ibid., p.52 regulation 19.

It would appear that the duties earlier performed by the Lambakannas, as is stated in the Cūlavamsa, later became those of the Gaṇavāsi and Kiliṅ families, as described in the Daḷadā Sirita. This cannot however be explained as indicating that these duties were taken over by other families in the course of time for, as is evident from the Saddharmaratnākaraya, at least one of these families was known as Lambakanna (Lamāṇi). Therefore the more likely explanation is that the Cūlavamsa took these two families collectively by their clan name Lambakanna while the Daḷadā Sirita adopted a different method and named them separately. Hence, if we rely on the account of the Saddharmaratnākaraya concerning the origin of the Gaṇavāsi family and take Kiliṅ as a derivation of Kuliṅga, it is reasonable to hold that these families who originally served the Bō-Tree later extended their service to the Tooth Relic. But how long they remained in its service after the Kurunāgala period is a matter of conjecture.

Finally, particular attention should be paid to the parts which constituted the Tooth Relic procession, its destination and exposition. According to the Daḷadā Sirita, one of the elements of the procession was an elephant with auspicious marks which was yoked to the chariot on which the Tooth Relic¹ was placed.

1. Dal.S., p.51, regulation 17.

This is still the case except that the relic casket is placed on the elephant instead of in the chariot.¹ But there is a difference regarding the manner in which the Relic was taken in procession. From the account of the Dāṭhāvāṃsa, as well as that of the Daladā Sirita concerning the Tooth Relic festival of Meghavanna, we learn that the Relic was placed on an exquisite chariot drawn by white steeds.² The use of an elephant to pull the chariot, therefore, seems to be a new feature added to the Tooth Relic procession at some time after the fourth century. Fa-Hsien in the fifth century does not mention this detail in his record of the festival. The Cūlavāṃsa, though stating that the Relic was placed on a chariot makes no mention of the animal which drew it.³ It is therefore extremely difficult to explain when and why this change took place. Perhaps an elephant with auspicious marks might have been preferred to horses as a mark of respect to the Tooth Relic when the importance of the latter was growing. But what other considerations were taken into account cannot be determined in the present state of our knowledge.

The participation of the monks in the procession is also particularly noteworthy, for it suggests a remarkable change in the aim that the participants in the Tooth Relic procession

-
1. Ralph Pieris, op.cit., pp.135-36; CJHSS., VI, no.2, 1963, pp.172-74.
 2. Dav., v.392; Dal.S., p.40.
 3. Cv., 74.211-12; 85.25; 89.16.

had in mind. The monks on this occasion, we are told, marched in procession chanting pirit, while a member of the doranāvāsi family sprinkled pirit water on the streets.¹ The participation of the monks in the Tooth Relic festival is evident from the Cūlavamsa in its narrative of the Relic festival of Vijayabāhu IV,² but this work makes no mention of their chanting pirit on the occasion. The actions of the monks, however, bear a close resemblance to those during rain-making ceremonies performed in the Anurādhapura period. It has been mentioned earlier that an image of Ananda was taken around the city while the monks chanted paritta and sprinkled water on the streets to ward off the danger of drought and pestilence.³ No further evidence for this practice is available after the downfall of the Anurādhapura kingdom. There was, however, a different ceremony during this period, as is evident from the Cūlavamsa, viz. a procession of the Tooth Relic around the city while the monks chanted paritta and sprinkled water.⁴ Even the Daladā Sirita stipulates that the Tooth Relic should be taken in procession in the prescribed manner, i.e. the manner laid down in the above mentioned regulations, when rains fail.⁵ This

1. Dal.S., pp.51-52, regulations 17-18.

2. Cv., 89.17.

3. See above, pp.121.

4. Cv., 87.1 ff.

5. Dal.S., p.53, regulation 30.

suggests that the annual celebrations of the Tooth Relic by this time were not a mere religious ceremony performed for the acquisition of merit but also a ceremony of protection performed for the welfare of the country. The presence of the monks was, no doubt, required for this reason.

The sprinkling of water by a member of the doranāvāsi family too is a feature which is not found in earlier accounts of the Tooth Relic festival. Doranā literally means 'the door keeper'. The Sinhala Bodhi Vamsaya uses the term doranā to denote a person who guards the door of the Mahābodhi shrine.¹ But there is no mention of this term being used to denote an official who sprinkled pirit water on the streets in a Tooth Relic procession or in any other purification ceremony. But in later times this term seems to have been used to denote an official who presented water to the king. The Kaṇḍavuru Sirita on two occasions refers to an official termed mahadoranā. Once he is mentioned in a list of high dignitaries of state who presented themselves to the king, and the context does not disclose what the function of this dignitary was.² Parānavitana equates him with the dovārika in earlier times and renders the term as 'chamberlain'.³ On the other occasion, however,

-
1. SBV., ed. G.Senadheera, Colombo, 1971, pp.285-87. The person who sprinkled piritpān to the Bō-Tree at the Mahabō festival, according to this work, was given the office of Koturugānā.
 2. Sin.Sa.Lipi., p.65.
 3. UCHC., I, pt.II, p.734.

mahadoranā was the official in charge of the royal baths.¹

In this case the term had undergone a semantic change. The cause of this change is not known but the fact that the doranā were constituted as a separate family is evident from the Daladā Sirita by its reference to the doranāvāsi kula. It is therefore possible that some members of the family served the king while others extended their services to the Tooth Relic during this period.

Particular attention may be given among the other parts of the Tooth Relic procession to the participation of the members of the Ganavāsi and Kilin families, officials and musicians of the Tooth Relic temple and those of the royal palace. Of these, the role of the two families in the affairs of the Tooth Relic has been discussed in the foregoing discussion. The presence of the temple officials and musicians in the procession points to a well developed stage in the history of the Tooth Relic temple. In its account of the Tooth Relic festival in the time of Siri Meghavanna, the Dāṭhāvansa makes no mention of musicians who participated in the procession whereas Daladā Sirita states that there were female dancers who danced to the accompaniment of music provided by five musical instruments (pasaṅgaturu).² The

1. Sin.Sa.Lipi., p.64.

2. Dal.S., p.40.

Cūlavamsa refers to dancers and musicians in the Tooth Relic festivals of Parākramabāhu I and Parākramabāhu II. The procession of the former consisted of dancing girls accompanied by people bearing lutes, flutes, drums and the like, and by bands of female musicians,¹ while that of the latter, (Parākramabāhu II) consisted of musicians², singers, dancers and performers.³ But none of these sources specifies whether the musicians were associated with the temple, with the palace or whether they were specially engaged for the occasion. The account of the Daḷadā Sirita is important in this respect for it suggests that by this time there were two categories of musicians, i.e. those attached to the Tooth Relic temple and those attached to the royal palace, both taking part in the procession. The fact that the temple of the Tooth Relic had musicians of its own suggests that it was a well organized institution by this time. This, too, bears a close resemblance to the practice prevailing in Kandyan times and on a smaller scale, even at present. During this period the temple had musicians, dancers and other officials of its own, who performed various duties in the procession.⁴ They held temple lands and so were obliged to

1. Cv., 74.215-17.

2. Ibid., 89.33. The Cūlavamsa does not directly refer to musicians but to the sound of five musical instruments which indicates that there were musicians.

3. Ibid., 89.33-35;

4. Ralph Pieris, op.cit., p.136; CJHSS., VI, no.2, 1963, p.174.

perform some services to the temple. It is quite possible that such a system was followed during the Kurunāgala period in the case of temple musicians but how far back this practice can be dated is uncertain.

The annual Tooth Relic festival was also an occasion where the people could witness the ruler's devotion towards the religion as well as his power and magnificence. Although the king's participation in the preliminaries of the festival, the exposition of the Relic and the sealing of the casket are referred to, the Daladā Sirita makes no mention of his presence in the procession. Instead, it states that musicians and officials of the royal palace and the ministers of the state accompanied by the fourfold army marched in the procession.¹ This raises some doubt as to whether the king took part in the procession. An examination of the earlier and later practices may help to clarify this.

The presence of the king and his army in the Tooth Relic procession is evident from the Dāṭhāvamsa, the corresponding account in the Daladā Sirita, the Cūlavamsa and the accounts of Davy and Millāva. The Dāṭhāvamsa mentions that Siri Meghavanna, accompanied by a large retinue (mahatīyā parisāya saddhiṃ),

1. Dal.S., p.52, regulations 21, 22.

marched in the procession¹ which brought the Tooth Relic to the Abhayagiri. What is implied by parisāya in this context is not certain. It may have implied either the devotees who are said to have been dressed in garments suitable for the festival and carried scented powders, umbrellas and baskets full of flowers,² or the officials and the fourfold army of the state. The latter alternative in fact gains support from the Daladā Sirita where it is stated that the king was accompanied by the fourfold army of the state.³ The Cūlavamsa too, although it does not refer to annual processions of the Tooth Relic, makes mention of the presence of the rulers, ministers, princes and the fourfold army of the state in the processions which it does describe.⁴ This suggests that they would have participated in the annual celebrations too.

A more elaborate version of this practice is attested in the Kandyan times. The procession which the Disāva of Vellassa (Millava) records was constituted as follows:

1. The king's elephants with Gajanāyaka Nilamē.⁵
2. Gingals with koḍituvakku lēkam.⁶
3. The people of the Four Kōraḷēs disāvane, carrying gingals, muskets, and flags, with the disāva⁷ and petty chiefs of the disāvane.⁷

-
1. Dav., v.394.
 2. Ibid., v.391.
 3. Dal.S., p.40.
 4. Cv., 74.221-226; 85.24; 89.24-28.
 5. Official in charge of royal elephants (Ralph Pieris, op.cit., p.14).
 6. Leader of king's artillery men (ibid., p.16).
 7. Disāva = a provincial governor
Disāvane (disāvani) = one of the twelve principalities of the Kandyan kingdom.

4. The people of the Seven Kōralēs.
5. Those of Uva)
6. Of Matale) All appointed and attended
7. Of Sabaragamuva) like the people of the
8. Valapana) Four Kōralēs.
9. Of Udapalāta)
10. The bamboos or images representing devils covered with cloths.
11. The elephant of the māligāva bearing the shrine, followed by other elephants and the people of the māligāva, who precede the diyavaḍana nilamē and nānāyakkāra lēkam¹ with umbrellas, talipats, flags, fans, shields, tom-toms, drums, flutes etc., accompanied by dancers.
12. The elephant of the nāta dēvāla bearing the bow and the arrow of the god, attended by the women of the temple, and followed by the basnāyaka nilamē,² with the same pomp of attendants as the former.
13. The elephants, bows and arrows, and people of the mahā viṣṇu dēvāla.
14. Of the kataragam dēvāla.
15. Of the pattini dēvāla.
16. The people of the maha lēkam³ department, carrying muskets and flags, and preceding their chiefs.
17. The people of the ātapattu department, similarly equipped, followed by the ātapattu lēkam,⁴ and the raṭēmahātmayās⁵ of Uḍunuvara, Yaṭṭinuvara, Tumpanē, Hārīspattu, Dumbara and Hēvāhāṭa.
18. The people of veḍikkāra⁶ department, followed by their lēkam.
19. The people of the vaḍanatuvaḅku⁶ department with their lēkam.
20. The people of the paḍikāra⁷ department and their lēkams.⁸

Millāva further describes that under the former government, i.e. the Sinhalese government⁹ the king accompanied the procession.

-
1. Chief of the royal emissaries (Ralph Pieris, op.cit., p.18).
 2. Lay custodian of a dēvāla (shrine).
 3. Secretarial department (Ralph Pieris, op.cit., p.14).
 4. Chief of those who conveyed royal messages (ibid., p.15).
 5. Officials lesser in rank than the Disāvas (ibid., p.24).
 6. Artillery (ibid., p.18).
 7. Paid soldiers (ibid., p.18).
 8. Ibid., pp.135-36.
 9. Millāva describes the procession of 1817 which was conducted under the auspices of the English government. Ralph Pieris, op.cit., p.138 fn.

Hence it would seem that the king's participation in the procession together with his retinue, was a practice followed in various stages of the history of the Tooth Relic. The Kurunāgala period during which the regulations of the Daḷadā Sirita were composed, may not have been an exception to this general rule. Besides, when one considers the opportunity which the procession gave the king, to display his piety and might, one would hardly expect him not to be present as a focus to attract the goodwill and loyalty from his subjects. It is therefore, likely that the king, together with his fourfold army, officials and musicians of the palace took part in the procession of the Tooth Relic, although this particular detail, for some unknown reason, is omitted in the Daḷadā Sirita.

The Tooth Relic procession is said to have circumambulated and ended back at the Tooth Relic temple.¹ Although the circumambulation is the traditional way of conducting a procession of honour, the ending of the procession at the Tooth Relic temple seems to be a new feature differing from the practice followed during the Anurādhapura period. As is evident from the Dāḷhāvamsa, the Daḷadā Sirita and the account of Fa-Hsien, the procession of the Tooth Relic was, during the early centuries after its arrival in Ceylon, a

1. Dal.S., p.52 regulation 23.

periodical excursion to a customary destination. The Dāḥhāvamsa implies that the Tooth Relic was taken in procession to the Abhayagiri and was exhibited there.¹ So does the Daḥadā Sirita.² But these two works, it is worthy of note, make no mention of the duration of the exhibition. According to Fa-Hsien it lasted 90 days.³ This may have been the usual period of exhibition at this time although it is possible that it was shortened or lengthened in special circumstances. The regulation concerning the exposition of the Tooth Relic, as it appears in the Daḥadā Sirita, does not specify the duration of the exhibition⁴ during the Kurunāgala period. Nor do the other sources mention this.⁵ Hence although it is not unlikely that a practice similar to that of the Anurādhapura period may have been followed, the duration of the exhibition during this period cannot be determined with any degree of precision.

-
1. Dav., v.406.
 2. Dal.S., pp.40-41; see above, p.130 ff.
 3. The Travels of Fa-Hsien, p.71.
 4. Dal.S., p.52, regulation 23.
 5. The Cūlavamsa states that Vijayabāhu IV, after bringing the Relic to Polonnaruva, celebrated a festival there for three months, Cv., 89.46. This work does not necessarily refer to an exhibition but the duration of the festival may perhaps have been equal to that of the annual exhibition.

However, the evidence cited above clearly indicates that the procession during the Anurādhapura period was directed to the Abhayagiri. This seems to have been changed at a later stage as follows from the regulation of the Daladā Sirita but when and why did this change occurred cannot be determined with any degree of precision. Perhaps it occurred after the downfall of the Anurādhapura kingdom when the doctrinal rivalry of the Mahāvihāra and the Abhayagiri was less pronounced and the Tooth Relic temple became the centre of religious worship of the country.

The manner in which the relic casket was sealed after the exposition of the Relic is a detail which finds mention only in the regulations of the Daladā Sirita cited above. This work stipulates that, after the exhibition, the Relic should be placed in the casket in the presence of the king and secured with the three seals, taṭukassa, pāmulpetṭiya and ganaya,¹ but does not mention whose seals they were.

Sorata interprets taṭu in taṭukassa as 'plates for taking meal' and kassa as 'a receptacle' or 'a container', and takes this word to mean a room or cupboard where plates were kept.² In the Dambadeni Asna, taṭugeya is used to denote a 'plate room' of

-
1. Dal.S., p.52 regulation 25; Br.Mus.Mss., Or.6606(31), folio khām; Or.6606(27) folio khām.
 2. Dal.S., pp.118-19.

the palace.¹ On the assumption that the plates which the king used for taking meals were of gold, Sorata suggests that there may have been a special treasury (taṭugeya) in the palace to deposit these golden receptacles. Comparing this term taṭugeya with taṭukassa he further adds that the seal of this treasury was called taṭukassa in a secondary sense (abhedopacārasāyena).²

Pāmulpeṭṭiya is used in the Dāmbadeni Asna to denote the royal treasury.³ Hocart states that this term is used in modern Sinhalese folklore to mean a 'royal treasure chest'. Pāmul he says, is the Sinhalese term for Pali pādamūla, 'the soles of the feet' and peṭṭiya means 'box' and therefore pāmulpeṭṭiya is the 'box of the royal feet', which represents the king.⁴ However, taking the use of this word in the Dāmbadeni Asna into consideration, Sorata suggests that the pāmulpeṭṭiya in this context denotes the royal treasury and in a secondary sense 'the seal of the royal treasury'.⁵

Although the term gana is sometimes used in the sense of a group of scholars (viyatpat aṭaganaya)⁶ and a company or guild of merchants (vaṇig-gaṇāih),⁷ it has been widely used to denote

1. Dmb.A., p.34.

2. Dal.S., pp.118-19.

3. Dmb.A., p.31.

4. MASC., IV, p.36, n.5.

5. Dal.S., p.119; Rājasekara (Dal.S., p.69) interprets the term as a box in which valuables are kept.

6. Nks., p.65.

7. Ep.Zeyl., IV, p.158. II line 3.

a group of monks living together. The Pācittiya refers to the communal meal of members of a gana as gana-bhojana¹ while the Majjhima Nikāya mentions a practice of reciting suttas in a gana (gana sajjhāyana).² The Cūlavamsa and the Saddharmaratnāvaliya too use this term to denote a group of monks living together in a monastery.³ It has been used in numerous other occasions with the same meaning.⁴ It is clear therefore that ganaya in this context denotes a group of monks probably those of the Tooth Relic temple and in a secondary sense the seal which belonged to the monks of that temple. Sorata and Dhammavisuddhi give the same interpretation.⁵

Thus according to Sorata's interpretation of the terms the seals, by which the relic casket was secured, were those that belonged to the royal plate room (taukassa), the treasury (pāmulpetṭiya) and the community of monks (ganaya). Of these interpretations there is hardly any doubt with regard that of pāmulpetṭiya and ganaya. These seals in all probability, were used by the king and the chief incumbent of the Uttaramūla who participated in these activities. However, the interpretation

-
1. Pācittiya, ed. Sri Ariyavamsa, Colombo, 1929, p.74 ff.
 2. Majjimanikāyaṭṭhakathā, ed. Sri Dharmarama, Colombo, 1917, pp.150, 214, 354, 698.
 3. Cv., 89.18; Saddharmaratnāvaliya, ed. D.B.Jayatilaka, Kālaṇiya, 1946, p.845.
 4. For a detailed discussion of the term see, H.B.M.Ilangasinha, op.cit., pp.132-38.
 5. Dal.S., p.119; Dhammavisuddhi, op.cit., pp.340-41.

of taṭukassa that has been suggested above seems unlikely.

In the first place, the interpretation raises a doubt as to whether taṭukassa should necessarily be taken to mean the 'royal plate room' or whether it could mean some other place. It is worthy of note that although taṭugeya is used in the Daṃbadeṇi Asna in the sense of a royal plate room, the term may well have been used also to denote a similar place in an ordinary household or in a temple where such vessels were kept. For instance it is not unlikely that this term denoted a place where the treasures such as golden vessels of the Tooth Relic temple were kept.¹ It has been observed elsewhere that offerings made by some rulers to the Tooth Relic consisted of flags of gold and silver, golden and silver vessels, golden and silver fly-whisks, gold and silver chests, golden and silver fans, golden and silver bowls with lotus flowers, and punnakalāsā (jars filled with water).² It is very probable that there was a treasury in the Tooth Relic temple to store such donations. It may be recalled that the Vinaya texts often point to the existence of storehouses in monasteries.³ The Galapāta Vihāra Rock Inscription refers to the purchase of some slaves with the gold of muṇḍu karaṇḍuva of the temple.⁴ Paranavitana interprets the

1. See above, pp.345-46.

2. Cv., 85.26-29.

3. See above, p.337.

4. Ep.Zeyl., IV, p.206 II. line 13.

term muṇḍu karaṇḍuva found herein as a 'sealed casket or box' and suggests that valuables such as gold and jewels belonging to the monastery may have been kept there.¹ The existence of a treasury in such monasteries as the Galapāta-vihāra leaves little doubt that a treasury existed at the Tooth Relic temple, which was the centre of religious worship of the period. It is of interest to note that in the present Tooth Relic temple at Kandy too there is an apartment called maha aramudala or 'great treasure room' where gold vessels of the temple are kept.² Such a treasure room which was called the taṭugeya or taṭukassa may well have existed in the past to store gold vessels like those donated by Parākramabāhu II.

The suggestion that taṭukassa in this context does not denote the 'royal plate room' gains further strength from another consideration. As has already been referred to, the Daladā Sirita regulates that the seals of the relic casket should be broken in the presence of the king, the chief incumbent of the Uttaramūla and two members of Gaṇavāsi and Kilin families, and gebalannan.³ The necessity of the presence of these three parties on this occasion suggests that it was their duty to break the seals possibly because they had sealed it on a previous

1. Ibid., IV, p.210, n.4; Dhammavisuddhi, op.cit., pp.155-57.

2. MASC., IV, p.9.

3. See above, p.404; Dal.S., p.52 regulation 23.

occasion. But in its reference to the re-sealing of the casket the Daladā Sirita refers only to three seals and not to those who possessed them. Perhaps it was selfevident to the author of this work that those who were responsible for the breaking of the seals did the re-sealing as well. However, this vagueness of the regulation led scholars like Sorata to conclude that two of the seals (taṭukassa and pāmulpeṭṭiya) belonged to the king and the third to the community of monks thus excluding the guardians of the temple from the scene. It seems however, more likely that each of the three parties had a seal of their own.

As has already been observed, it is evident from the Daladā Sirita that the members of the Gaṇavāsi and Kilin families were engaged in the affairs concerning the protection of the Tooth Relic as well as its temple.¹ It has also been observed that there was every possibility of the existence of a treasury in the Tooth Relic temple.² The administration of this treasury would not have been the task of the head of the Uttaramūla for the Vinaya rules do not permit monks to engage in such affairs.³ It is also unlikely that the king should interfere with such

-
1. See above, p. 418 ff.
 2. See above, p. 437.
 3. See above, pp. 358-62.

affairs of the temple. On the other hand, since it is evident that the members of the two families mentioned above were engaged in the protection of the temple the possibility is that they controlled the affairs of the treasury as the lay administrator, the Diyavaḍana Nilamē, does today.¹ If such was the case, it is quite possible that they owned the seal of the treasury known as the taṭukassa, and used it for re-sealing the casket as a part of their responsibility for the protection of the Relic.²

Hence it is likely that taṭukassa was not the seal of the royal plate room but that of the 'treasury of the Tooth Relic temple'; and that it was owned by the lay custodians of the temple. In view of these circumstances, it may be concluded that the re-sealing of the casket was done by the Gaṇavāsī and Kilīṅ families, by the king and by the chief incumbent of the Uttaramūla who owned the seals taṭukassa, pāmulpeṭṭiya and ganaya respectively.

1. MASC., IV, p.11.

2. Ibid., p.4. This is in agreement with the present practice. According to the Diyavaḍana Nilamē, the Tooth Relic is kept in a golden casket covered by six other caskets. There are three sets of keys to the caskets. The key to the outermost casket is with the Diyavaḍana Nilamē. The next three can be opened without keys. The keys to fifth and sixth caskets are with the principals of Malvatta and Asgiriya monasteries. Thus the caskets cannot be opened unless these three parties are present. The Diyavaḍana Nilamē is the modern counterpart of the guardians of the temple. The king's place has been taken by one of the principals of the two schools.

III

Special celebrations of the Relic

Particularly noteworthy is the ceremony performed in times of drought. Immediately after regulating the manner in which the annual celebrations were to be held, the Daḷadā Sirita states that the same ceremony should be performed when rains fail.¹ As has been stated elsewhere² this indicates that the ritual performed during the annual celebration could also be carried out as a ceremony of purification.

Another special celebration was to be held at times when the kings occupied newly built palaces. Concerning this ceremony, the Daḷadā Sirita stipulates that the palace which is to be occupied by the king should first be rendered safe by the presence of the Tooth and the Bowl Relics, the chanting of pirit by the Saṅgha and the sprinkling of piritpān. The king should make offerings to the Three Gems (tunuruvanaṭa) and then enter the palace.³ No instance where this regulation was put into actual practice is found in our sources, but a similar practice is described in the Cūlavamsa during the opening ceremony of a vihāra built in Sirivaddhanapura by Parākramabāhu II.

-
1. Dal.S., p.53 regulation 31.
 2. See above, pp.425-26.
 3. Dal.S., p.51 regulation 14.

After the construction of this vihāra, it is said, the Tooth and Bowl Relics were brought in procession from Daṃbadeṇiya and a festival was celebrated for seven days. The vihāra was then dedicated to the Order.¹ The similarity of the two narratives suggests that the ritual embodied in the Daḷadā Sirita may have been followed in the case of the inauguration of both secular and religious buildings - a practice which is followed even at present - apart from the presence of the Tooth Relic. But the extent to which this practice was popular in ancient times cannot be determined as no evidence in this connexion is found elsewhere.

1. Cv., 85.1-56.

CONCLUSION

This study reveals that the Tooth Relic, despite reverses and occasional disasters, gradually gained a wider recognition in both religious and political spheres between A.D. 300 and 1500, a period which may justifiably be called the first phase of the Relic's history. The background for this period is provided by the Dāṭhāvamsa tradition according to which the Tooth Relic was brought to Ceylon from Dantapura in Kāliṅga. Most of its details, notably the names of rules, appear to be fabrications of the chronicler (or his direct source) who borrowed from such works as the Jātakas, Purānas and the Mahābhārata. Of the many views that have been advanced concerning the identity of Dantapura, that of Krishnarao, identifying it with modern Dantavuram, is the most plausible.

The discussion establishes two stages in the history of the Relic in the period A.D. 300-1500. In the first of these, ending with the downfall of the Anurādhapura kingdom (c. A.D. 1000) the Tooth Relic secured a firm footing in the religious life of the Island. In the second period (c. 1000-1500) the Tooth Relic occupied a prominent place in both the religious and the political sphere. Some notable aspects of the first period are the location of the Meghagiri-vihāra, the place where the Relic was

first exhibited and the reasons which determined the Relic's position. This study indicates that the Meghagiri was located outside the northern gate of Anurādhapura. It was affiliated to the Abhayagiri-Vihāra which was also the place where the Relic was first exhibited. We have concluded from the material at our disposal that some of the apparent inconsistencies concerning the Relic's position can be explained by sectarianism in the Order.

In the second stage from c.A.D.1000-1500, almost every ruler was a patron of the Tooth Relic. The Relic was transferred to new capitals and sometimes to hideouts in accordance with the demands of the day. During the alien rule which prevailed after Bhuvanekabāhu I, Ārya Cakravarti captured the Relic and transferred it to the Pāṇḍya kingdom.

Our study suggests that the conventional views on Mānābharāṇa and Vīra Alakēśvara must be revised. The former is accused in the Cūlavamsa of abusing the riches of the Tooth Relic. This view has been shown to be unjust; it may have been an attempt to villify the character of Mānābharāṇa to the advantage of Parākramabāhu I. Similarly the accusations of the Chinese that Vīra Alakēśvara was a heretic have been shown to be unfair. On the contrary he appears to have bravely resisted a Chinese aggression: this probably was the reason for the accusations by the Chinese.

Four reasons have been suggested to account for the prominence of the Tooth Relic during this period. Foremost among these was the existence of cordial relations between the nikāyas. This enabled the monks to lessen their sectarian feelings and come to a compromise whereby they venerated equally the objects entrusted to different fraternities. Secondly, the Tooth Relic seems to have been a symbol of nationalism which unified the Sinhalese against foreign rulers. Thirdly, it was believed to have mysterious powers to produce rain; and finally, its mobile character saved it from disasters and enabled the rulers to take it to new capitals.

The political significance of the Tooth Relic was its most important aspect during the period under discussion. Its importance was less pronounced at first but later, as is evident from the events of the reigns of Vikramabāhu II, Gajabāhu II, Mānābharana, Parākramabāhu I, Vijayabāhu III and Parākramabāhu II, the possession of the Relic became a prerequisite justifying a prince's claim to the throne. Its political role is further illustrated during the foreign invasions of the thirteenth century, as well as in six fifteenth-century inscriptions which refer to its use in such political functions as taking oaths, concluding alliances, pledging allegiance, and enforcing royal decrees. It was the position established in this period which made the Tooth Relic so important in later times.

Owing to the donations of rulers made on a lavish scale, contributions of state officials, customs duties, tolls, poll tax and other taxes assigned to it, the Tooth Relic temple had become one of the richest Buddhist institutions of the period. We have recognized four categories of income from landed property, and maintained that they always depended on the nature of the donations and terms of tenure, two aspects never specified in our sources with regard to the Tooth Relic. The dedication of royal personages and state dignitaries was shown to have served three purposes, viz. demonstration of the complete devotion of the donor, making of offerings, and securing of protection for the donated person. The terms masran and davasran are interpreted as taxes charged from shops and stalls, the first monthly, the second daily. The acceptance of all kinds of offerings was found to be quite in keeping with the provisions made in the commentaries on the Vinaya.

In course of time, an elaborate system of ritual grew around the Tooth Relic. The comparison of daily and pōya day ritual mentioned in the Daladā Sirita with that of the present day reveals that there was no remarkable change in this respect during the two periods. The annual celebration in the Anurādhapura period later became a ceremony of purification and also a means of demonstrating the pomp and splendour of royalty,

which prevailed even in Kandyan times. It has been established that the term tajukassa denotes a seal belonging to the Tooth Relic temple and that it was used by the lay custodians of the temple.

Thus this study attempts to analyse the factors owing to which the Tooth Relic gained supremacy in the religious and the political fields and its temple became one of the wealthiest Buddhist institutions. It also stresses the continuity of its ritual and of its political role, which has persisted till at least the end of the eighteenth century.

Appendix I

Administration of Temple Affairs

The prominent place held by the chief incumbent of the Uttaramūla and the Mahāsaṅgha in settling disputes concerning the temple is particularly noteworthy. The Daladā Sirita stipulates that if a dispute arose with regard to the Tooth Relic temple it should be settled by the ministers appointed by the king, sitting in session with the chief incumbent of the Uttaramūla. Any matters which were left undecided should be settled by the whole community of monks (mahasaṅgana).¹

It would thus seem that the final verdict of some complicated matter rested with the Saṅgha, not with royal officials. This is in direct contrast to the practice followed in other institutions.

It is evident from the tenth-century inscriptions that, in monasteries like the Cetiyaḡiri and the Abhayagiri, there was a committee of management consisting of monks. The issuing of orders to employees and their dismissal as well as

1. Dal.S., p.53. regulation 34.

the scrutiny of annual income and expenditure, were the responsibility of the members of this committee. The Slab Inscription of Kassapa V, which embodies monastic rules for the Abhayagiri, records that the monks of the fraternity should sit in council and settle the matter if an act of misconduct, such as a tumultuous dispute, arose among the apilisarana vathimiyan,¹ the recipients of benefits (lābha laduvan), or those who had received cells (avas laduvan). If the dispute were not settled in this manner, they should hold a conference with the princes (samdaruvan) and settle it after due investigation.² The Slab Inscription No.2 of Mahinda IV in Mihintale, states that every year the records concerning income and expenditure as well as those concerning the land given in nimi³ and dasakāra⁴ tenure, should be read before the monks

-
1. Ep.Zeyl., I, p.54. Wickramasinghe interprets the term as 'destitute masters of religious ceremonies. Gunawardhana takes the term to mean 'highly ordained monks' (op.cit., pp.169-71).
 2. Ep.Zeyl., I, p.48 II lines 29-31; transl., p.54.
 3. Ibid., I, p.240, n.1. Wickramasinghe suggests that the term nimi indicates either a tenure under which the grantee has the exclusive possession of the land without payment of any part of the revenue or a tenure which was definite in its incidence as opposed to vague or undefined services.
 4. Wickramasinghe explained the term as 'tenth part' and 'servile tenure'. (Ep.Zeyl., I, pp.56, 103; n.2, 240 n.1) Gunawardana thinks that both these meanings are possible. (op.cit., p.189).

and, if a dispute arose the royal officials should hold session and settle it.¹ These two instances clearly indicate that the final verdict of any dispute was made by the royal officials and not by the community of monks. Further evidence of this practice is forthcoming in the Slab Inscription of Udā Mahayā.²

It would thus seem that the mahāsaṅgha played a prominent role in settling disputes concerning the Tooth Relic temple while royal officials played a similar role in the affairs of other religious institutions. This should not necessarily lead us to conclude that the royal officials never had a chance to give a final verdict concerning a dispute of the Tooth Relic temple, for there is no evidence to show that the practice followed in the fourteenth century already existed in the tenth. One might suggest, therefore, that the general practice known for monasteries like the Abhayagiri and Cetiyaḡiri may have been followed even in the case of the Tooth Relic temple in the tenth century and that this practice was changed only in later times to give the Tooth Relic temple special treatment in view of its supreme position in the religious sphere. This is not unlikely; but on the other hand one should not rule out the possibility

1. Ep.Zeyl., I, p.236 II lines 44-50; transl., pp.239-40.
 2. Ibid., I, p.187 II lines 33-39, 43-44.

that the rules of the Daladā Sirita can be dated back to an earlier period,¹ and in this case it would be reasonable to hold that the administration of the Tooth Relic temple differed from that of the other institutions.

Another aspect which merits discussion here is the right of asylum enjoyed by the temple. The Daladā Sirita regulates that anyone who enters the Tooth Relic temple in fear of something should not be molested.² This indicates that the temple enjoyed the right of asylum, a privilege often granted to temples.³ The Vēlaikkāra Inscription records that the Vēlaikkāra mercenaries promised to protect those who took refuge in the relic temple.⁴ It is not unlikely that the Vēlaikkāras recorded the protection of a privilege already enjoyed by the temple; but at the least this establishes that the right of asylum recorded in the Daladā Sirita had been enjoyed by the Tooth Relic temple in the eleventh century.

1. See above, p.37 ff.

2. Dal.S., p.53, regulation 37.

3. Ep.Zeyl., II, p.24 II.C lines 20-23; p.31 II.G, lines 5-9; p.37 II.D. lines 2-4. Cv., 53.14-24 show the effects of the violation of such privileges.

4. Ep.Zeyl., II, pp.252-53, lines 30-38; transl., p.255.

Appendix II

The Guardians of the Temple; their
Official Dress

The Daladā Siritā regulates that ganavāssan, kapuvan and gebalannan, who are engaged in the guard of the Tooth Relic temple, should be dressed in sāṭṭa and mayilakkattu.¹ There is no doubt that ganavāssan and gebalannan in this context denote the members of the Ganavāsi family and the guardians of the temple.² The term kapuvan too implies here a kind of official charged with the protection of the temple but the actual function of these people seems, as we learn from other sources, to have been somewhat different. The term kapuvan is the plural form of kapuvā which is derived from Pali kappaka (skt. kalpaka). Kalpaka and kappaka usually denote a 'barber',³ but these terms sometimes have been used to mean a 'master of the wardrobe'.⁴

The Makhādeva Jātakaya and the Muvadevdā vata use the

-
1. Dal.S., p.51, regulation 15.
 2. Paranavitana interprets the term as 'supervisors of the house' (MASC., IV, p.35).
 3. Monier Williams, Sanskrit-English Dictionary, s.v. Kalpaka. Childers, Dictionary of the Pali Language, s.v. Kappako. Sorata, Sri Sumāṅgala Śabda Kosaya, I, p.214.
 4. Milinda Praśnaya, ed. U.P.Ekanayaka, Colombo, 1928, p.248; DAG., ed. D.B.Jayatilaka, Colombo, 1933, p.52; DAG., ed. M.Vimalakitti, Colombo, 1960, p.49.

term in the sense of a barber.¹ The Sinhala Bōdhi Vaṃsaya refers to an official called kapunā, the head of the kapu kula, who served the Bō-Tree with the supply of ladapasmal (lājapañcamaka puppha).² The same term is found in the Kaṇḍavuru Sirita in a list of royal officials, but the context does not help to determine what his function was.³ He may perhaps have been the king's barber or the master of the wardrobe as we see from the Jātakas and the Dampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya. The Munneśvaram Dēvālayē Gal Sannasa includes kapuvan among others (āvatēvakārayan) who looks after the shrine.⁴ So does the Lakṣmana Maha (Saman) Dēvālayē Rock Inscription of the fifteenth century.⁵ The term seems to have been used in these contexts in the sense of those officiating at the temple of a god, the meaning in which this term is widely used even at present.⁶

-
1. Pansiya Panas Jātaka Pota, ed. Naulle Dhammananda, I, pp.32-33; Muvadevdā Vata, ed. M. Kumaranatunga, Colombo, B.E. 2475, pp.144-45.
 2. SBV., ed. G.Senadheera, Colombo, 1971, pp.285-87.
 3. Sin. Sa. Lipi., p.65.
 4. Vidyodaya., III, no.8, p.239.
 5. Saparagamuvē Pāraṇi Liyavili, ed. K.Nanavimala, Colombo, 1946, p.43.
 6. Evers, Monks, Priests and Peasants, Leiden, 1972, pp.40-41, 123; O.H.de A. Wijesekara, 'The Semantic History of Sinhalese kapuvā', Paranavitana Felicitation Volume, ed. N.A.Jayawickrama, Colombo, 1965 ; pp.329-34.

None of these interpretations, is suitable to explain the function of kapuvan in the Daḷadā Sirita. It is evident from this work that it indicates those engaged in the protection of the temple (daḷadāgeyi rakavala siṭinā). Hence, whatever the meaning of the term may have been, the kapuvan seem to have had this function, but it is uncertain whether they also performed other duties.

The regulation that these officials should wear sāṭṭa and mayilakkattu seems to indicate that at least some officials of the temple were supposed to attend to their duties in an official dress. The term sāṭṭa undoubtedly denotes a tunic and the term mayilakkattu appears to have been a derivation of Tamil mayir-k-kattu. In Tamil it denotes 'lock of hair', 'hair tied up in a knot', and 'turban'.¹ The last meaning seems more fitting in this context for the regulation refers to some kind of official dress.

It is of interest to note that the practice of attending in official dress was not limited to the Tooth Relic temple, but occurred in other institutions too. The Mihintale Tablets of Mahinda IV mentions that the employees of the relic house, image

1. Tamil Lexicon, V, p.3075; Sorata, Śri Sumaṅgala Śabda Kosaya, II, p.700.

house, and the refectory of the Cetiyagiri monastery, were dressed in an upper garment (poronākasu) lower garment (pilī) and head dress (his kōl).¹ They, together with the washermen, were given three kiri of land while some others were given yearly a kalaṇḍa of gold for cloths.² This clearly suggests that some employees of the Cetiyagiri monastery attended to their work in an official dress. This may have been the practice followed in the Abhayagiri too.³ Besides, the above mentioned passage implies that the employees at the Cetiyagiri were given a clothing allowance. A similar practice may have been followed in the case of the employees of the Tooth Relic temple.

1. Ep.Zeyl., I, p.97 II B. lines 52-54; transl., p.112.

2. Ibid., I, p.95 II B. lines 20-21.

3. The inscription records that the rules set down here were selected from those prevailing at the Abhayagiri monastery (Ibid., I, p.91 II A. lines 6-7; transl., pp.98-99).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Literary Sources

Pali and Sanskrit SourcesArthasāstra

ed. and transl. by R.P.Kangle, 3 Vols.,
Bombay, 1960, 1963, 65.

Bhāgavāta Purāna

ed. T.R.Krishnacharya, Kumbakonam, 1916.

Brahma Vaivarta Purāna

ed. Vinayaka Ganesa Apte (Anandāśrama),
Poona,

Buddhavaṃsa

ed. R.Morris, PTS., London, 1882.

Cūlavāṃsa

ed. Wilhelm Geiger, 2 Vols., PTS.,
London, 1925, 1927.

Cūlavāṃsa

transl., Wilhelm Geiger, translated
from the German into English by
C.Mabel Rickmers, 2 pts., I, London,
1929, II, Colombo, 1953.

Dāṭhāvāṃsa

with Sinhalese Paraphrase, ed.
Āsabhatissa Thera, Kalāṇiya, 1883.

ed. Halavegoda Silalankāra Thera,
Alutgama, 1914.

ed. Mayiyave Ananda, Udugampola, 1956.

English translation by Mutu Coomaraswamy,
London, 1874.

Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā

ed. H.C.Norman, 5 Vols., PTS.,
London, 1906-15.

Dīgha Nikāya

ed. T.W.Rhys Davids and J.E.
Carpenter, 3 Vols., PTS, London, 1947.

Gautama Dharmaśāstra

ed. F.Max Muller, SBE., II, Oxford,
1879.

Hatthavanagallavihāvaṃsa

ed. C.E.Godakumbura, PTS., London,
1956.

Jātaka

together with Its Commentary, ed.
V.Fausboll, 7 Vols., Volume VII,
Index by Dines Anderson, London,
1877-97.

Jātakamālā

edited and translated by R.G.Dwivedi
and M.R.Bhat, Delhi, 1966.

Jatakaṭṭhakathā

ed. Vidurupola Piyatissa, SHB.,
7 Vols., Colombo

Jinakālamālī

ed. P.Buddhadatta, PTS., London,
1962.

English translation by N.A.

Jayawickrama, PTS., London, 1968.

Kāvyaḍarsā

ed. V.Narayana Iyer, Madras, 1952.

Mahābhārata (Udyogaparvan)

ed. S.K.De, Poona, 1940.

Mahābodhivaṃsa

ed. Pedinnoruve Sobhita Thera,
Colombo, 1890.

Mahāvagga

ed. H. Oldenberg, London, 1879.

Mahāvāṃsa

ed. Wilhelm Geiger, PTS., London, 1908.

Mahāvāṃsa

English translation by Wilhelm Geiger
assisted by M.H. Bode, reprinted,
Colombo 1960; first published, 1912.

Mahāvastu

ed. É. Senart, 3 Vols., Paris,
1882-97.

Majjimanikāyaṭṭhakathā

ed. Sri Dharmarama Thera, Colombo,
1917.

Manu-Smṛiti

ed. F. Max Muller, SBE., XXV, Oxford
1886.

Matsya Purāna

ed. Anandāśrama, Poona, 1907.

Pācittiyaṭṭhā

ed. Sri Ariyavaṃsa Thera, Colombo,
1929.

Pāli Muttakavinayaviniccaya

ed. Dehigaspe Pannasara Thera,
Colombo, 1931.

Papañcasūdanī

ed. J.H. Woods, D. Kosambi and I.B.
Horner, 5 Vols., PTS., London,
1940-52.

Paramattajōtikā

(Suttanipātaṭṭhakathā)

ed. Mahagoda Siri Nanissara, SHB.,
VII, Colombo, 1920.

Rājataranginī

Translated by M.A. Stein,
Westminister, 1900.

Samantapāsādikā

ed. J.Takakusu and M.Nagai, PTS.,
London, 1924-47.

ed. B.Piyaratana Thera and W.
Pemaratana Thera, 3 pts., SHB.,
Colombo, 1929, 1945, 1946.

Sārathhasamuccaya

(Catubhānararatṭhakathā)

ed. Doranagoda Nanasena, SHB.,
Colombo, 1929.

Sumaṅgalavilāsini

ed. W.Stede, 3 pts., PTS., London,
1931.

Vaṃsatthappakāsini

ed. G.P.Malalasekara, 2 Vols., PTS.,
London, 1935.

Vasiṣṭha Dharmasāstra

Translated by Georg Buhler, SBE.,
XIV, Oxford, 1882.

Vāyu Purāṇa

ed. Anandāśrama, Poona, 1905.

Vimativinodanṛ

ed. B.Dhammadhara Tissa Thera,
Colombo, 1935.

Vinayālaṅkāra

ed. P.Nanavimala, Colombo, B.E.2443.

Vishnu Smriti or

Vaishnava Dharmasāstra

ed. F.Max Muller, SBE., VII, Oxford,
1880.

Sinhalese SourcesAlakēśvara Yuddhaya

ed. A.V.Suravira, Colombo, 1965.

Butsarāṇa

ed. Valivitiye Sorata Thera, Colombo,
1953.

Daḷadā Itihāsakāvya

ed. Ratnapura Dhammaratana,
Maradana, 1947.

Daḷadā Pūjāvaliya

ed. T.Sugatapala, Colombo, 1929.

Daḷadā Sirita

ed. Valivitiye Sorata Thera,
Colombo, 1961.

ed. E.S.Rajasekhara, Kandy, 1920.

ed. Vajira Ratnasuriya, Colombo,
1949.

Daṁbadeṇi Asna

Kuvēni Asna, Sihabā Asna, Daṁbadeṇi

Asna, ed. K. Nanavimala Thera,
pp.30-39, Colombo, 1960.

Dampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya

ed. D.B.Jayatilaka, Colombo, 1933.

ed. Madauyangoda Vimalakitti Thera
and Nahinne Sominda Thera, Colombo,
1960.

Dharmapradīpikā

ed. Dharmakirti Sri Dharmarama,
sixth edition, Colombo, 1951.

Elu Attanagalu Vamsaya

ed. Makuluduve Piyaratana Thera,
Colombo, 1954.

Elu Attanagalu Vamsaya

ed. Ra Tennakon, Colombo, 1954.

(Vidāgama)

Girā Sandēsa Vivaraṇaya

ed. M.Kumaranatunga, Colombo, 1950.

Haṁsa Sandēsa

ed. C.E.Godakumbura, Colombo, 1953.

Jātaka Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya

ed. D.B.Jayatilaka, Colombo, 1943.

Kaṇḍavuru Sirita

ed. D.B.Jayatilaka in his Sinhala Sāhitya Lipi, pp.63-66;

reprinted Maharagama, 1956.

Katikāvat Saṅgarā

ed. D.B.Jayatilaka, reprinted

Kālaṇiya, 1955; First published Colombo, 1922.

Kōkila Sandēśaya

ed. W.F.Gunawardhana, Colombo, 1945.

ed. Hadigalle Pannatissa, Colombo, 1945.

Mahābodhivaṃsa Granthipada

ed. Ratmalane Dharmarama, Colombo, 1910.

Vivaraṇaya

ed., W.A.F.Dharmawardhana, Colombo, 1949.

Mayura Sandēśaya

ed. U.P.Ekanayaka, Colombo, 1928.

Milinda Prasānaya

ed. M.Kumaranatunga, Colombo, B.E.2475.

Muvadevdāvata

ed. C.A.Hevavitarana, Colombo, 1926.

Narēndracaritā-

valokanapradīpikāva

ed. S. de Silva, A.M.Gunasekara, and W.F.Gunawardhana, Colombo, 1907.

Nikāya Saṅgrahaya

English translation by C.M.

Nikāya Saṅgrahaya

Fernando, Colombo, 1908.

Pansiya Panas Jātaka Pota

ed. Naulle Dhammananda and
Devinuvara Ratanajoti, 2 Vols.,
Colombo, 1955.

Pārakumbā Siritā

ed. Sri Charles de Silva, Colombo,
1954.

Pārakumbā Sirit Peheliya

ed. D.G.Abhayagunaratna, Colombo, 1922.

ed. A.Gunavardhana, Colombo,
B.E. 2497.

Parevi Sandēsa Vivaraṇaya

ed. M.Kumaranatunga, Colombo,
B.E. 2476.

Pūjāvaliya

Chapter XXXIV, ed. Mabopitiye
Medhankara, Colombo, 1932.

English Translation, 'A
Contribution to the History of
Ceylon', B.Gunasekara, Colombo, 1895.

Chapters 1-11, ed. D.E.Hettiaratchi
and D.C.Dissanayaka, Colombo, 1936.

ed. A.V.Suravira, Colombo, 1961.

Rājaratnākaraya

ed. Simon de Silva, Colombo, 1907.

ed. P.N.Tissera, Colombo, 1929.

Rājāvaliya

ed. B.Gunasekara, Colombo, 1911.

English translation, B.Gunasekara,
Colombo, 1900.

Rājāvaliya

ed. Vatuvatte Pemananda Thera,
Colombo, 1959; first published in
1923.

Saddharmālan̄kārāya

ed. Bentota Saddhatissa, Panadura,
1934.

Saddharmaratnākarāya

ed. Kosgoda Nanavimala, Colombo, 1931.

ed. K.L.Dharmakirti, Colombo, 1912.

Saddharmaratnāvaliya

ed. D.B.Jayatilaka, fourth edition,
Colombo, 1930.

ed. Sahitya Pracaraka Samagama,
Colombo, 1952.

Sālalihini Sandēśaya

ed. M.Kumaranatunga, Colombo,
B.E.2474.

Saṅgharāja Sād̄hucariyāva

ed. Henpitagedara Piyananda Thera,
Colombo, 1954.

Sikhavalaṅḁa Vinisa

ed. D.B.Jayatilaka, Colombo, 1934.

Sinhala Bodhivaṃsaya

ed. G.Senadheera, Colombo, 1970.

ed. Baddegama Kirti Sri

Dhammaratana, Matara, 1911.

Sinhala Daḁadā-Vaṃsaya

ed. H.Sarananda, Alutgama, 1916.

Thūpaṃsaya

ed. D.E.Hettiaratchi, Maradana,
1947.

Translations from other languages

- Beal, Samuel Si-Yu-Ki, Buddhist Records of the Western World, 2 Vols., London, 1906.
- Gibb, H.A.R. Ibn Battuta, Travels in Asia and Africa, 1325-1354 A.D., London, 1929.
- Giles, H.A. Travels of Fa-Hsien (399-414 A.D.) or Record of the Buddhistic Kingdoms, Cambridge, 1923.
- Ho Chang Chun 'Fa-Hsien's Pilgrimage to Buddhist Countries', Chinese Literature, I, no.3, 1956, pp.153-81.
- Legge, James Fa-Hsien - A Record of Buddhist Kingdoms, Oxford, 1886.
- Mills, J.V. 'Notes on Early Chinese Voyages', JRAS., 1951, pp.3-25.
- Nilkanta Sāstri, K.A. Foreign Notices of South India from Megasthenes to Ma Huan, Madras, 1939.
- Pelliot, Paul 'Les Grands Voyages Maritimes Chinois au Debut du XV^e Siecle', Toung Pao, XXX, pp.237-455.
- Pe Maung Tin and Luce, G.H. Glass Palace Chronicle, London, 1923.
- Rockhill, W.W. 'Notes on the Relations and Trade of China with the Eastern Archipelago and the Coast of the Indian Ocean during the Fourteenth Century', pt.2, Toung

- Pao, XVI, pp.374-419.
- Seneviratne, John M. 'Chino - Sinhalese Relations in the Early and Middle Ages', JRAS(CB)., XXIV, no.68, 1915-16, pp.74-105; translated from Sylvain Lévi's Article in J.A., 1900.
-
- 'Some Notes on the Chinese References' JRAS(CB)., XXIV, no.68, 1915-16, pp.106-18.
- Takakusu, J. I-Ching, A Record of the Buddhist Religion, as Practised in India and Malay Archipelago, Delhi, 1966, first published 1896.

Manuscripts

- Alutnuvara Dēvalaya
Karavīma British Museum Library,
Manuscript No. Or.6606(145).
- Daḷadāhaṭṭanē Kavi British Museum Library
Manuscript No. Or.6606(34).
- Daḷadā Sirita British Museum Library,
Manuscript Nos. Or.6606(29),
Or.6606(30) and Or.6606(31).

Dāṭhāvamsaya nohot

Dāgoppadīpayakiyana Kavipota

British Museum Library,
Manuscript No. Or.6606(27).

Dāṭhāvamsaya Kavi

British Museum Library,
Manuscript No. Or.6606(129).

Gampalē Galē Keṭū Liyuma

British Museum Library,
Manuscript No. Or.6606(165).

Kurunāgala Vistaraya

British Museum Library,
Manuscript No. Or.5042.

II. Archaeological Sources

Epigraphs bearing evidence on the Tooth Relic.

Mahinda IV (A.D.956-72)

'Anuradhapura; Slab-Inscription
of Mahinda IV near the Stone
Canoe', ed. D.M. de Z.

Wickramasinghe, Ep.Zeyl., I,
(1904-12), no.8, pp.113-120.

'Jētaranārāma Slab-Inscription
(No.1) of Mahinda IV (circa.
1026-1042 A.D.)', ed. D.M. de Z.

Wickramasinghe, Ep.Zeyl., I,
(1904-12), no.19, pp.213-229.

(eleventh/twelfth
centuries)

'Vijayabahu I: His Record at
Polonnaruwa' transl., H.Krishna
Sastri, Madras Report on
Epigraphy, no.961, August 1913,

pp.101-02.

'Polonnaruva Inscription of
Vijayabāhu', ed. S.Paranavitana,
Ep. Ind., XVIII (1925-26), no.38,
pp.330-38.

'Polonnaruva: Slab Inscription of the
Vēlaikkāras (circa 1137-1153 A.D.),
ed. D.M. de Z. Wickramasinghe,
Ep.Zeyl., II, (1912-27), no.40,
pp.242-55).

Nissaṅkamalla (A.D.1187-96)

'Polonnaruva: Hāṭa-dā-dē Portico Slab-
Inscription', ed. D.M. de Z.
Wickramasinghe, Ep.Zeyl., II (1912-27),
no.14, pp.84-90.

'Polonnaruva: 'Galpota' Slab-Inscription',
ed. D.M. de Z. Wickramasinghe, Ep.Zeyl.,
II (1912-27), no.17, pp.98-123.

'Polonnaruva; Prītidānaka Maṇḍapa
Rock Inscription', ed. D.M. de Z.
Wickramasinghe, Ep.Zeyl., II (1912-27),
no.29, pp.165-78.

Parākramabāhu V (A.D.1344-
59)

'Hapugastāna Inscription', ed. H.C.P.
Bell, JRAS(CB)., XXII, no.65, 1912,
pp.362-63; reproduced in N.Mudiyanse,

- Art and Architecture of the Gampola Period (1341-1415 A.D.), Colombo, 1963, pp.168-69.
- Vikramabāhu III (A.D.1357-74) 'Vīgulavatta Inscription', ed. H.C.P. Bell, RKD., pp.78-79; JRAS(CB)., XXII, no.65, 1912, p.363; reproduced in N.Mudiyanse, op.cit., pp.186-87; a variant reading of the text in Br.Mus.Ms., Or.6606(165), folio kū.
- Jayavīra Parākramabāhu (A.D.1467-69) 'The Gaḍalādeniya Slab-Pillar Inscriptions' ed. H.W.Codrington, Ep.Zeyl., IV, (1934-41), no.3, pp.16-27.
- Bhuvanekabāhu VI (A.D.1470-78) 'Dādigama Slab-Inscription of Bhuvanekabāhu VI', ed. S.Paranavitana, Ep.Zeyl., III, (1928-33), no.29, pp.278-86.
- Dhammaceti of Burma 'A Preliminary Study of the Kalyāṇi Inscriptions of Dhammaceti, 1476 A.D.', ed. Taw Sein Ko, Ind.Ant., XXII, 1893, pp.11-17, 29-53, 150-59, 206-13, 236-43, 274-75; Kalyāṇi Prakaranaya, ed. Gintota Medhankara, Colombo, 1924.

Senāsammata Vikramabāhu

'The Gaḍalādeṇiya Inscription of
Sēnāsammata Vikramabahu', ed.

H.W.Codrington, Ep.Zeyl., IV
(1934-41), no.2, pp.8-15.

'Alutnuvara Slab-Inscriptions',
ed. S.Paranavitana, Ep.Zeyl.,
IV, (1934-41), no.34, pp.261-70.

Archaeological material concerning Tooth

Relic Temples

Anurādhapura

ARASC., 1897, p.3; July 1934,
pp.J.8-9;

MASC., III, 1936, p.15.

Polonnaruwa

ARASC., 1903, pp.8-11, 13-14;
1904, p.5 ff;

CJS(G)., II, 1933, p.163.

Yāpahuva

ARASC., 1910-11, pp.55-56.

Epigraphs dealing with Dantapura

Gaṅga Indravarman

'Jirjingi Plates of Gaṅga

Indravarman: the year 39', ed.

R.K.Ghoshal, Ep.Ind., XXV, (1939-
40), no.29, pp.281-88.

Indravarman

'Purle Plates of Indravarman:
The (Gaṅga) year 149', ed. G.Ramdas,
Ep.Ind., XIV, (1917-18), no.27,
pp.360-63.

Anantavarman and
Vajrahasta II

'Two Eastern Gaṅga Grants from
Andhavaram', ed. R.Subramanyam,
Ep.Ind., XXXI, (1955-56), no.26,
pp.199-204.

Anantararman Coḍagaṅga
(A.D.1078-1148)

'The Korni Copper Plate Grants of
Anantavarman Coḍagaṅga' (Saka
Samvat 1034), ed. G.V.Sitapati,
JAHS., Vol.I, pt.III, 1926,
pp.106-124.

'Vizagapatam Copper-Plate Grant of
Anantavarman Coḍagaṅgadeva, Saka
Samvat 1040', ed.J.F.Fleet,
Ind.Ant., XVIII, June 1889, pp.165-76.

Sources of Other Cited Archaeological Material

Annual Reports of the
Archaeological Survey of
Ceylon

Colombo, 1890-1968.

Ceylon Journal of Science
(Section G)

2 Vols., Colombo, 1928-1933.

<u>Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum</u>	5 Vols., 1925-1963.
<u>Epigraphia Zeylanica</u>	5 Vols., 1904-1955.
<u>Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of Ceylon</u>	6 Vols., Colombo, 1924-1953.
<u>South Indian Inscriptions</u>	Archaeological Survey of India, Madras, 20 Vols., 1891-1964.

Further discussion on archaeological material appearing in periodicals has been included in Section IV (Modern Works).

III. Reference Works

Brown, C.P.	<u>Telugu-English Dictionary,</u> Second Edition, Madras, 1903.
Burrow, T. and Emeneau, M.B.	<u>A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary,</u> Oxford, 1961.
Carter, C.	<u>A Sinhalese-English Dictionary,</u> Colombo, 1924.
Childers, R.C.	<u>Dictionary of the Pali Language,</u> London, 1875.
Malalasekara, G.P.	<u>Dictionary of Pali Proper Names,</u> 2 Vols., London, 1937/38.
Monier Williams	<u>Sanskrit-English Dictionary,</u> Oxford, 1899.

- Muni Dipavijaya Abhidhānarājendra, A Lexicon of Jain Prakrit, 7 Vols., Rattlam, 1913-25.
- Rhys Davids, T.W. and Stede, William Pali-English Dictionary, PTS., Surrey, 1925.
- Sircar, D.C. Indian Epigraphical Glossary, Delhi, 1966.
- Sorata, Valivitiye Śri Sumaṅgala Śabda Koṣaya, 2 Vols., Colombo, 1952, 1956.
- Tung Tso-Pin Chronological Tables of Chinese History, 2 Vols., Hongkong, 1960.
- University of Madras Tamil Lexicon, 6 Vols., Madras, 1926-39.

IV. Modern Works

- Appadorai, A. Economic Conditions in Southern India, (1000-1500 A.D.), Vol., I, University of Madras, 1936.
- Ariyapala, M.B. Society in Mediaeval Ceylon (The State of Society in Ceylon as Depicted in the Saddharmaratnāvaliya

- and other Literature of the Thirteenth Century), Colombo, 1956.
- Arunachalam, Sir P. 'The Worship of Muruka or Skandha (the Kataragama God)', JRAS(CB)., XXIX, no.77, 1924, pp.234-61.
- Bell, H.C.P. Report on the Kāgalla District of the Province of Sabaragamuva, Sessional Paper XIX, Colombo, 1892.
- Buddhadatta, A.P. 'Some Corrections of Geiger's Cūlavamsa Translation', UCR., VIII, 1950, pp.96-109, 161-80.
- Caldwell, R. Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian or South Indian family of Languages, London, 1875.
- Codrington, H.W. Ceylon Coins and Currency, Memoirs of the Colombo Museum, Series A, no.3, Colombo, 1924.
- -----
Ancient Land Tenure and Revenue in Ceylon, Colombo, 1938.
- 'Pāpiliyāna Pilipāṇḍa Lipi Samaharak', Vidyodaya, I, nos. 8, 10, 11, 1926.

- 'Mr. Wickramasinghe and the
Daḷadā Pūjāvaliya', CALR., IX, pt.IV,
 April, 1924, pp.183-87.
- 'Notes on the Daṃbadeṇiya Dynasty',
CALR., X, pt.II, July 1924, pp.88-99.
- Coedès, G. 'Le royaume de Crīvijaya', BEFEO.,
 XVIII, No.6 (1918), pp.1-36.
- Receuil des Inscriptions du Siam, I
 and II, Bangkok, 1924-29.
- Cohn, William Indische Plastik, Berlin, 1923.
- Cunningham, A. The Ancient Geography of India,
 London, 1871.
- Da Cunha, J.Gerson 'Memoir on the History of the Tooth
 Relic of Ceylon', JRAS(Bom.Br.).,
 XI, 1875, pp.115-46.
- Davy, John An Account of the Interior of Ceylon
 and of Its Inhabitants with Travels
 in that Island, reprinted in CHJ.,
 XVI, 1969, first published, 1821.
- Devendra, D.T. 'Meghagiri Vihāra', JRAS(CB), NS.,
 VIII, pt.I, 1963, pp.378-81.
- Dikshitar, V.R. Ramachandra Purāṇa Index, 3 vols., Madras,
 1951, 1952, 1955.

- Engnell, Ivan Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East, Uppsala, 1943.
- Evers, Hans Dieter Monks, Priests and Peasants, Leiden, 1972.
- Falk, Nancy E. 'Wilderness and Kingship in Ancient South Asia', History of Religions, XIII, no.I, Chicago, August, 1973, pp.1-15.
- Ferguson, Donald 'The History of Ceylon from the Earliest Times to 1600 A.D., as related by Joao de Barros and Diogo do Couto', JRAS(CB), XX, No.60, 1908.
- Ferguson, J. 'Description of the Amaravati Tope in Guntur', JRAS., NS., 1868, pp.132-66.
- Frankfurt, Henri Kingship and the Gods, A study of Ancient Near Eastern Religion as the Interpretation of Society and Nature, Chicago, 1948.
- Geiger, Wilhelm 'The Trustworthiness of the Mahāvamsa', IHQ., VI, 1930, pp.205-28; reprinted in CHJ., IV, 1954-55, pp.153-68.

- Culture in Ceylon in Mediaeval Times,
 ed. by Heinz Bechert, Wiesbaden, 1960.
- Gerini, G.E. Researches on Ptolemy's Geography of
 Eastern Asia, Further India and Indo-
 Malay Archipelago, London, 1909.
- Godakumbura, C.E. 'The Cūlavamsa, its authorship and date',
JRAS(CB)., XXXVIII, 1949, pp.123-25.

Sinhalese Literature, Colombo, 1955.

 'Historical Writing in Sinhalese',
Historians of India Pakistan and Ceylon,
 London, 1961, pp.72-86.
- Ghoshal, U.N. A History of Indian Political Ideas,
 Oxford, 1959.
- Harvey, G.E. History of Burma, London, 1967; first
 published 1925.
- Hettiarachchi, T. The History of Kingship in Ceylon up
 to the Fourth Century A.D., Colombo,
 1972.
- Hocart, A.M. 'The Temple of the Tooth In Kandy',
MASC., IV, London, 1931.
- Hooke, S.K. Myth, Ritual and Kingship, Essays on
 the Theory and Practice of Kingship in
 the Ancient Near East and in Israel,
 Oxford, 1958.

- Indrapala, K. 'Review of Paranavitana's Ceylon and Malaysia', JRAS(CB)., XI, 1967, pp.101-06.
- Jayatilaka, D.B. Sinhala Sāhitya Lipi, Second Impression, Maharagama, 1956.
- Jayawickrama, N.A. Paranavitana Felicitation Volume on Art, Architecture and Oriental Studies, Colombo, 1965.
- Kanapati Pillai, K. 'Mankānai Inscription of Gajabāhu II', UCR., XX, No.I, 1962, pp.12-14.
- Karunaratna, T.B. 'The Buddhist Wheel Symbol', The Wheel Buddhist Publication Society, Kandy, 1969, Nos. 137-38.
- Knox, Robert An Historical Relation of Ceylon, reproduced in CHJ., VI, Nos.1-4, July 1956 to April 1957; first published in 1681.
- Krishnarao, B.V. 'The Identification of Kalinganagara', JBORS., XV, 1929, pt.I, No.7, pp.105-115.
- Lévi, Sylvain 'Notes sur la Géographie Ancienne de L'Inde, I, Paloura - Dantapura', J.A.., 1925, pp.46-57.

-
- 'Location of Dantapura', JBORS., XXI,
1935, pp.137-38.
- Levi, Sylvain, Przyluski
Jean and Bloch, Jules 'Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidian in India',
English Transl. by P.C.Bagchi,
Calcutta, 1929.
- Liyanagamage, A. The Decline of Polonnaruwa and the Rise
of Dambadeniya, Colombo, 1968.
- Luce, G.H. Old Burma, Early Pagan, Artibus Asiae
Supplementum, 3 Vols., New York, 1969-70.
- Malalasekara, G.P. Pali Literature of Ceylon, reprinted
Colombo, 1958; first published 1928.
- Mehta, Ratilal N. Pre-Buddhist India, Bombay, 1939.
- Mendis, G.C. 'Vijaya Legend', Paranavitana
Felicitation Volume, ed. N.A.
Jayawickrama, Colombo, 1965, pp.263-92.
- Millāva, Disāva of
Vellassa 'Account of the Perahāra', Ceylon
Government Gazette, 13th September, 1817;
reproduced in Ralph Pieris, Sinhalese
Social Organization, Colombo, 1956,
pp.35-38.
- Mudiyanse, N. Art and Architecture of the Gampola
Period (1341-1415 A.D.), Colombo, 1963,

- Nānavimala, K. Śāstriya Lipi Saṅgrahaya, Colombo, 1971.
Saparagamuvē Paraṇi Liyavili, Colombo,
 194
- Needham, Joseph Science and Civilization in China,
 4 Vols., Cambridge, 1954 -1971.
- Nell, Andreas The Annals of the Tooth Relic, Kandy,
 1928, first published in 1925.
- Nilakantha Das 'Hints on the Significance and History
 of Jagannath', OHRJ., VII, pt.I, 1958,
 pp.1-36.
- Nilakanta Sastri, K.A. 'Ceylon and Śrī Vijaya', JRAS(CB).,
 NS., VIII, 1962, pp.125-40.
- Paranavitana, S. 'Buddhist Festivals in Ceylon',
Buddhistic Studies, ed. B.C.Law,
 Calcutta, 1931, pp.529-46.
- 'The Capital of Ceylon during the Ninth
 and Tenth Centuries', CJS(G)., II,
 1933, pp.141-47.
- 'Polonnaruva Topography', CJS(G)., II,
 1933, pp.161-73.
- 'Epigraphical Summary', CJS(G)., II,
 pt. DII, 1933, pp.175-227.
- 'Perumiyankulam Rock Inscription of
 Vasabha', JRAS(CB)., NS., V,
 pp.129-37.

- 'Laṅkātilaka Inscriptions', UCR.,
 XVIII, Nos. 1 & 2, 1960, pp.1-45.
- 'The Sculpture of Man and Horse near
 Tisāvāva at Anurādhapura, Ceylon',
Artibus Asiae, XVI, 3, 1953, pp.167-90.
- 'Ceylon and Malaysia in Mediaeval Times',
JRAS(CB)., NS., VII, pt.I, 1959,
 pp.1-42.
- 'Ceylon and Malaysia, A Rejoinder to
 Nilakanta Sastri', JRAS(CB)., NS.,
 VIII, pt.I, 1963, pp.330-77.
- Ceylon and Malaysia, Colombo, 1966.
- Sigiri Graffiti, 2 Vols., London, 1956.
- Pargiter, F.E. The Purāna Text of the Dynasties of the
 Kāli Age, Oxford, 1913.
- Perera, B.J. 'Some Political Trends in the late
 Anurādhapura and Polonnaruwa Period',
CHJ., X, 1960-61, pp.60-76.
- Perera, L.S. 'The Pali Chronicle of Ceylon',
Historians of India, Pakistan and
 Ceylon, London, 1961, pp.29-43.
- Philips, C.H. (ed.) Historians of India, Pakistan and
 Ceylon, London, 1961.

- Pieris, P.E. Sinhale and the Patriots, Colombo, 1950.
- Pieris, Ralph Sinhalese Social Organization, Colombo, 1956.
- Pridham, Charles An Historical, Political and Statistical Account of Ceylon and Its Dependencies, London, 1849.
- Rāhula, Walpola The History of Buddhism in Ceylon, Colombo, 1956.
- Ratnapala, N. The Katikāvatas (Laws of the Buddhist Order of Ceylon from the 12th Century to the 18th Century), Munchen, 1971.
- Ray, H.C. and Parनाविताना, S. (eds.) History of Ceylon, I, 2 pts., Colombo, 1959, 1960.
- Rowland, B. The Art and Architecture of India (Buddhist-Hindu-Jain), Penguin Book, 1953.
- Sahu, N.K. A History of Orissa, 2 Vols., Calcutta, 1956.
- Buddhism in Orissa, Utkal University, 1958.
- Seneviratna, H.L. 'The Āsala Perahāra in Kandy', CJHSS., VI, 1963, pp.169-80.

Sirisena, W.M.

'The Kāliṅga Dynasty of Ceylon and the Theory of Its South East Asian Origin', CJHSS., NS., I, Jan-June, 1971, pp.11-47.

Smith, Vincent A.

'The Inscriptions of Mahanāman at Bodh-Gaya', Ind.Ant., XXXI, 1902, pp.192-97.

A History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon, third edition, Bombay, 1961.

Stein, B.

'Economic Function of a Mediaeval South Indian Temple', JAS., XIX, No.2, 1960, pp.163-76.

Tennant, J.E.

Ceylon, An Account of the Island, Physical, Historical and Topographical with Notices of Its Natural History, Antiquities and Productions, fifth edition, London, 1860.

Turnour, George

'Account of the Tooth Relic of Ceylon, Supposed to be Alluded in the Opening Passage of the Feroz Lat Inscription', JRAS(Ben.Br.), VII, pt.2, 1837, pp.856-68.

-
- Vimalakitti, M. 'Further Notes on the Inscriptions on
the Columns at Delhi, Allahabad,
Betiah & c.', JRAS(Ben.Br.)., VI,
pt.2, 1837, pp.1049-64.
- Vogel, J.Ph. Sinhala Anduva, Colombo, B.E.2499.
Buddhist Art in India, Ceylon and
Java, Oxford, 1936.
- Wāchissara, K. Saranānkara Saṅgarāja Samaya, Colombo,
1963.
- Willetts, William 'The Maritime Adventures of Grand
Eunuch Ho, JSEAH., V, no.2, 1964,
pp.25-42.
- Wolters, O.W. Early Indonesian Commerce, A Study of
the Origins of Śrī Vijaya, New York,
1967.
- Wijesekera, O.H. de A. 'The Semantic History of Sinhalese
kapuvā', Paranavitana Felicitation
Volume, ed. N.A.Jayawickrama, Colombo,
1965, pp.329-34.

V. Unpublished Monographs

- Bandaranayake, S.D. The Architecture of the Monasteries
of Anurādhapura, D.Phil. Thesis,
University of Oxford, 1972.

Dhammavisuddhi, Y.

The Buddhist Saṅgha in Ceylon

(circa 1200-1400 A.D.), Ph.D. Thesis,
University of London, 1970.

Gunavardhana, R.A.L.H.

The History of the Buddhist Saṅgha
in Ceylon from the Reign of Sena I

to the Invasion of Māgha, Ph.D. Thesis,
University of London, 1965.

Ilangasinha, H.B.M.

A Study of Buddhism in Ceylon in the
Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries

(circa 1400-1600), Ph.D. Thesis,
University of London, 1972.

Indrapala, K.

Dravidian Settlements in Ceylon and the
Beginnings of the Kingdom of Jaffna,
Ph.D. Thesis, University of London,
1965.

Pathmanathan, S.

The Kingdom of Jaffna (circa. A.D.
1250-1450), Ph.D. Thesis, University
of London, 1969.

Perera, L.S.

Institutions of Ceylon from
Inscriptions, Ph.D. Thesis, University
of Ceylon, 1949.

- Ranawella, G.S. A Political History of Rohana from c.991-1255 A.D., Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, 1966.
- Siriweera, W.I. Economic Conditions of Ceylon (c.A.D.1070-1344), Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, 1970.
- Somaratna, G.P.V. Political History of the Kingdom of Kōtte (c.A.D.1400-1521), Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, 1969.
- Than Tun The Buddhist Church in Burma during the Pagan Period, Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, 1955.
- Wāchissara, K. Vālivīṭa Saranaṅkara and the Revival of Buddhism in Ceylon, Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, 1961.
- Wickramasinghe, S. The Age of Parākramabāhu, Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, 1958.
- Wijetunga, W.M.K. The Rise and Fall of the Coḷa Power in Ceylon, Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, 1962.

INDEX

k. king, m. monk, t. title, d. dignitary

Abhā Salamevan (k. Kassapa
V), 240; t. 265, 324.

Abhayagiri-nikāya, 241.

Abhayagiri-vāsins, 159-
60, 241.

Abhayagiri-vihāra, 22-24,
38, 72, 100-01, 124, 129-30,
132-34, 142, 146, 155-56, 158,
165, 167, 243, 335, 338, 348, 406,
413, 430, 433-34.

Abhayarāja-piriveṇa, 65.

Abhaya Salāmegha, see Abhā
Salamevan.

Abhidāna Rājendra, 103, 106.

ācamanam, 380.

ācamanīyaka, 380.

adikār, 254.

Africa, 222.

Agbō Mugayin Varadanā, 338.

Aggabodhi, k. I, 23, 139, II,
152, VIII, 142-43, 153.

agil, 412.

Alagakkōnāra, 210, 219-220.

Alakēśvara family, 32, 49, 68, 211,
214-15, 216, d. III, 419.

Alakēśvara Yuddhaya, 225-26.

A-lie-kou-nai-enl, 219, 221

see Alagakkōnāra

Allahabad praśasti, 97.

Alutnuvara Dēvālaya Karavīma,
Ms., 197-98, 390, 395.

Alutnuvara Inscription, 312-13.

aluyam pūjāva, 375.

āmaka dhañña, 358.

Amarāgiri, 176.

Amarapura, 413.

Ambagalla, 278.

amupa (land measure), 180, 332, 338.

Ananda, m. 121, 122, 248-50, 392, 425.

Anantavarman Coḍagaṅga, k. 109.

Andhavaram, 110.

Andhra Pradesh, 98, 112, 129.
(Andradēśa)

- āṅgabadda, 367.
- Aniruddha, k. of Pagan, 70,
165-66.
- Āniyaṅgana, k. 50.
- anna, 380.
- Anomadassi, m. 55.
- antarabhogika rāja, 216.
- An-ti, k. 408.
- Anurādhapura, p.20 et passim;
Slab Inscription of Mahinda
IV, 333, 335.
- anuturu, 125.
- anvayāgata vahalin, 354.
- āpā, t. 215.
- aparanna, 336.
- apavāraka, 111.
- arakkāmiyan, 374, 382-84.
- ārāma, 315.
- ārāmikas, 352-53, 361.
- Arankālē Sannasa, 328.
- arghya, 380.
- Arya Cakravarti, 29, 47, 50,
captured the Tooth Relic,
200-02, 206-07, 210-11;
230, 302-06.
- Asādha, 409.
- Āsala, 264, 409, Āsala Perahāra,
409-11.
- āsana, 379-81, 385.
- Asela, k. 290.
- Asgiriya, 399.
- Asoka, k. 91, 107, 152.
- Asokan Pillars, 259.
- aṭapā, 375, 382.
- aṭapattu lēkam, d. 431.
- Āṭavīragollīva Inscription, 355.
- aṭṭhakathās, 361.
- Aṭṭhasahassarattṭha, 176.
- aṭṭhāyatana, 320-21.
- ayabadu, 365.
- āyatanas, 419, see aṭṭhāyatana.
- Badaguna, 280.
- badu, 338, see ayabadu.
- Badulla Inscription, 369.
- balidaḍa, 366.
- bāna, 214.
- Bandāra lands, 340.
- Bārānasi, 88-89, 366.
(Benares).

basnāyaka nilamē, d. 431.

Bechert, Heinz 14.

Beligala, 53, 57, 191, 290.

Bhāgavata Purāna, 89, 95.

Bhaumakaras, 92, 93.

Bhimatittha, 40, 195

(Bentoṭa)

Bhūta, d. 275.

Bhuvanekabāhu k. I. 199-201,
207, 303, II. 36, 42, 49, 66, 208-09,
III. 210, IV. 328, V. 31-32, 43,
50, 211, 213-17, 225, 418, VI. 234-
36, 313, 328.

Billasela, see Beligala.

Bimbisāra, k. 361.

Bodhigupta, 102, 418.

Bodhisatva, 227, 256, 261; as a
lion 415.

Bodhisiri, upāsikā, 111.

Bō-Tree, 21, 23-24, 35, 97, 102,
(Bodhi Tree) 120, 130, 142,
151-52, 156, 255, 284, 350-51, 420,
423.

Bowl Relic, 122, 143, 171-72, 174,
176-82, 187-88, 190-91, 194, 203,
243-44, 250, 254, 256, 258-63, 268,
276, 279-80, 286, 304, 306-07, 309.

Brahma, 81, 309, 312-13.

Brahmadatta, k. of Kāliṅga
34, 81, 87-88, 90, 92.

Brahmi Inscriptions, 353.

Brahmajāla Sutta, 358.

Brahmans, 311.

Brahman Tissa, 301.

Brahma Vaivarta Purāna, 380.

Buddha, three visits to Ceylon,
80-85; parinibbāna of, 86;
property of, 320-21, 349;
offerings to, 375, 77, 383;
paintings of five-hundred
previous lives, 406.

Buddhadāsa, k. 134, 138.

Buddhadatta, m. 69.

Buddharakkhita, Tibboṭuvāvē, m.
19, 30.

Burma, 68, 163, 165, 235, 352.

Butsarana, 332.

Caddanta Jātaka, 90.

cakkādiratanam, 287.

Cakkavatti, 116, 246, 260-61,
265.

Caldwell, R. 104.

Calington, 104, 109.

cāmara, 404, 421.

candana, 380.

Candrabhānu, k. 29, 43, 47, 50,
54, 57, 194, 206-07, 298-300,
303.

Cannabar, 223.

cāritta, 37.

Cāṭikahāpaṇa, 369.

cavaṭṭhi, 81.

cawtha poujah, 363.

Cetiayagiri monastery,
342-43, 347-48.

Ceylon, Buddha's three visits
to, 85; land tax 331, 333;
distribution of rice in
347-48; dedication of animals
in, 356.

Cheng-Ho, 32, 50, 71, 219-20, 222-24,
230.

Chicacole, 110.

Chilka lake, 104.

China, 68, 71, 135, 305, 307.

Cittayāna, k. 81-82, 91-92, 101.

Codrington, H.W. 200, 202, 342, 367.

Coḷamaṇḍala, 300.

Coḷas, 45-46, 147, 48, 150, 162-65,
169, 240, 247-49, 251-52, 268,
298, 409.

Coḷiya Kassapa, m. 334.

Collar-bone Relic, 86.

Coomaraswamy, Ananda K, 120.

Coringa, 104.

Cunningham, A. 103-04, 109.

costus, 223.

Cūlavamsa, historical value
of part I, pp.18-25; II,
25-28; III, 28-30; IV.
30-32; et.passim.

Cullahatthipadopama Sutta, 358.

Cullapanthakatthera Vatthu,
366.

cuvākatam, 380.

daḍamuḍa, 366.

Dādigama, 210; Slab
Inscription, 78, 234, 313.

Dahastota, 196.

dāhāṭi, 376.

Dāgoppadīpayakiyana - 51.

Kavipota (Daḷadā
Itihāsakāvya)

Dakkhinadesa, 167,172-73,
177.

dakkhinodaka, 376.

Daladā Haṭṭanē Kavi, 51.

Daladā Māligāva, 11,241.

daladā paṇḍuru, 362.

Daladā Pūjāvaliya, historical
value of 43-48, et.passim.

Daladā Sirita, historical
value of, 35-43, et.passim.

Daladāvamsaya, 83-84.

dalahaṃ, 373.

Dāmbadeṇī Asna, historical
value of, 59-60;66,285,390,
434-35,437.

Dāmbadeṇī Katikāvata,
historical value of, 57-58;
284,419.

Dāmbadeṇiya, 40,55,57,60,79,
178,187,190,193,199,252,
283-84,285-86,290,349,
385,416-17,442.

Dāmbulla Cave Inscription, 242.

Dāmbulu Sirita, 395.

Damilas, 141,192,290-91,
295,298,301.

Dampiyā Atuvā Gāṭapadaya,
240-41,366.

dandabali, 366.

Dandagula, 103-04,107,109.

dandās, 318.

danpat, 328-29.

Dantadhātuvamsa, 69.

Dantakumāra, 41,67,82-83,91,99,
102-03,115,128-29.

Dantapura, 12;81,83,87,91,
(Dantavuram) 109-113.

Dantavakka, k. 103,106,

Dappula IV, k. 146.

dasamabhāgaṃ, 335.

dāsi-dāsa, 358.

Dāṭhāvamsa, historical value
of, 33-35; et.passim.

Dāṭhāvamsaya Kavi, 51.

Dāṭhopatissa, k. 24,141,143,
251.

daval pūjāva, 375.

davasran, 315, 337, 362, 365,
367, 68, 370-71.

dāvatu, 374, 376, see also
dāhāṭi.

Davy, John 254, 429.

Debarapaṭan, 298.

Delhi Topra Pillar, 91.

Demela Adhikāra, d. 354.

desantara, 202-03.

Devadatta, m. 241, 311.

dēvālēs, 358.

Devamantrīśvara, d. 226-27,
(Devhimi)

Devānaṃpiya Tissa, k. 128,
152, 243, 255, 257, 260, 287.

Deva Patirāja, d. 52.

Devrada Dampasaṅginā,
36-37, 41.

Devundara Inscription, 285.

Dhammacakka, 257, 259-62, 409.

Dhammacakkageha, 25.

Dhammaceti, k. of Pegu, 235.

Dhammakitti, m. author of the
Cūlavamsa, 19, 25.

Dhammakitti, m. author of the
Dāṭhāvamsa, 33, 84-85, 87-91,
93-94, 96, 100, 113,

Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā, 366.

Dhammapāla, k. 204.

Dhammarucikas, 146.

Dhammavisuddhi, Y. 15, 324, 389, 436.

Dhanamitra, 106.

Dhanumaṇḍala, 280.

dharmadharayan, 397.

Dharmakīrti, lineage of, 43;
school of, 61.

Dharmapradīpikā, 65.

Dharmāsoka, 50, see also Asoka.

Dhāṭhā-dhātughara, 141, 261.

dhātupūjā, 143, 145-46.

Dhātusena, k. 23, 43, 54, 70, 137-39,
165.

Dhratarāstra, 313.

dhūpa, 380.

dhuraya, 362-63, 375.

Dīgha Nikāya, 88, 103, 160, 356.

Dīghavāpi, 279-80.

Dimbulāgala Māravīdiyē Rock
Inscription, 265.

dīpa, 380.

Dīpādhirāja, 215.

Dīpavaṃsa, 44.

disāvane, 430.

Disāva of Vellassa, d. 402,
407-09, 429-30.

divelgam, 337-39.

Diyavaḍana Nilamē, d. 340-41,
431, 440.

Doranā, d. 426-27.

doranāvāsi kula, 403, 426-27.

dovārika, 152, 426, see Doranā.

Doyly, John, 51.

dukkaṭa vatthu, 360.

Dumbara, 431.

dūtakāvyas, 63.

Duṭṭhagāmani, k. 21, 152,
288, 308.

Dvādasasahasakarattṭha, 177.
(dolosdahasraṭa)

East Asian Archipelago, 222.

Eastern India, 420.

East Tsin Dynasty, 408.

Egyptian, 247.

Elu Attanagalu Vaṃsaya, 57,
84-87, 91, 96, 100, 113, 298;
Vidāgama version, 284.

Elu Daḷadā Vaṃsaya, 84-85,
87, 91, 96, 100, 113.

Fa-Hsien, 13, 15; historical
value of the account of,
72-73; 100, 132, 135, 158, 401,
405, 407, 09, 411-16, 424, 432-33.

Fei-Hsin, 220.

Ferguson, D. 12.

Gaḍalādeniya Slab Pillar
Inscription, 77, 234, 309,
312-13, 419.

Gajabāhu, k. I, 409; II. 169,
172-74, 238, 265-70, 283, 309;
Devana Gajabā, 46, 50.

Gajanāyaka Nilamē, d. 430.

Galapāta-vihāra, 354, 438; Rock
Inscription, 353, 437.

Gampola, 32, 68, 79, 210-13, 215-17.

gana, 360, 418, 435-36.

gana-bhojana, 436.

gana-sajjhāyana, 436.

Ganavāsi family, 398-99, 402-04,
417-19, 422-23, 427, 438, 440.

Ganavāssan, see Ganavāsi.

ganaya, 404, 434, 436, 440.

gaṇḍakiliya, 396.

gandha, 380.

Gandhabba, tree of, 130.

Gandhāras, 86.

Gantama, 367.

Ganges, 92.

Gaṇjam, 104; district 110.

Gautamīputra Sātakarni, 91.

gebarāla, d. 376, 384, 391.

gebalannan, 404, 438.

Geiger, W. 14, 18, 30, 183, 200,
203, 262, 421.

geparāla, see gebarāla.

Girā Sandēsaya, 63.

Gōdāvarī 103-04.

Godhagatta Tissa, m. 308.

Gōna, 298.

Gonnāva Dēvālē Inscription, 338.

Guha, k. 92, 95-96.

Guhasiva, k. 67, 69, 81-82, 91-94,
96-97, 99.

Guhesvarapāṭaka, 93.

Gunawardhana, R.A.L.H., 15, 39,
162, 343, 395.

Gunasekara, M. 67.

Guptas, 92.

hāṇḍā pūjāva, 375.

Haṅsa Sandēsaya, 63.

Hapugastāna Inscription,
77, 212-13, 326-27, 360.

Hārispattu, 431.

Harvey, G.E. 233.

Hāṭadāgē, 186.

Hāṭadāge Portico Slab
Inscription, 320, 352.

Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa,
53, historical value of, 54-57;
60, 66, 188, 189, 244, 298, 350.

Hatthigiripura, 208.

Hebrew, 247.

helāmbula, 391.

Hemajālā, 69.

- Hemamālā, 41, 67, 69, 82, 99, 101-02,
113, 115, 128-29, see also
Hemajālā.
- Hēvāhāṭa, 437.
- Hīnayāna, 22.
- Hintālayanagāma, 278.
- Hirumu, 111.
- hisran, 366, see isran.
- Hittite, 247.
- Hiuē-Tsiang, 72-73, 106, 393.
- Hmannan, 70.
- Hocart, A.M. 13, 399, 420-35.
- Hopiṭigamu, 368.
- horanā, 374-75, see kāhala.
- horse, Buddha's previous life as,
260.
- Hultzch, E. 91.
- Idan kai, 319.
- Īlamanḍala, 111, see Hirumu.
- Ilangasinha, H.B.M. 16, 18,
67, 162.
- India, land tax in, 331-32.
- Indradyumna, k. 107.
- Indrapala, k. 161, 192.
- Indravarman, k. 110.
- Isipatṭana, deer park of,
130.
- isran, 315, 337, 362, 365, 366.
- Isurumuni, 119, 123-27, 130.
- I-Tsing, 332.
- Jaffna, 210.
- Jagannāth, 88.
- Jagatpuruṣa, 108.
- Jaiya Inscription, 299.
- Jambukola, 128.
- Jātaka Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya
365-66, 369.
- Jātaka Pota, 332, 369, 390.
- Jātakas, 87, 103, 144-45.
- Jātakatṭhakathā, 332, 365.
- Jāvaka invasions, 296, 298, 306.
- Jayabāhu, k. 49, 265-67.
- jayabera, 144.
- Jayatilaka, D.B. 58, 217.
- Jayavardhanapura, 211, see
kōṭṭē.
- Jayavīra Parākramabāhu, 234,
309.

Jetavana, 142,146,239.

Jetavanārāma Slab Inscription,
147,153,383.

Jinabodhāvalī, 61.

Jinacarita, 44,61.

Jinakālamalī, historical value
of 68-70; 115,118,233.

Jinālaṅkāra, 44.

Jirgingi, 110.

Kābali laddā, 347.

kaḍapil, 368.

Kākavanna Tissa, k. 308.

kāhaḷa, 374, see horanā.

Kahāmbiliyāva, 264.

kahāpaṇas, 117,132,336,405.

kahavaṇu, 369, see kahāpaṇa.

Kalābu, k. 89.

Kāla Buddharakkhita, m. 153.

Kālaṇḍiya, 70,233.

Kāliṅga, 34-35,80,86-87,92,
96,98-99,102-03,105-07,109,
112,149,300,420.

Kāliṅgaṭṭam, 109.

Kaliṅgurad Pirivat Hāmbuvan, 338.

kalpaka, 452,

Kaludiyapokuna Inscription, 355.

Kalyānavatī, 50.

Kalyāṇi Inscriptions, 233,235.

Kamalakula, 297.

Kāmārṇava, k. I. 109; II. 109.

Kamassam, 347.

Kandavan Pilantavan Vallan, 264.

Kanda uḍa kaṭṭuva, 313.

Kaṇḍavuru Sirita, historical
value of 58-59;379,381-82,
385-86,394,398,426.

Kandy, 11,13,51,230,236,254,
375,399,438.

Kapila, 120.

kapuru, 412.

kappaka, see kalpaka, kapu.

kapu, 452-54.

kapukula,

Kāppetipola, d. 254.

kappiyabhaṇḍa, 336.

kappiyakāraḷas, 352-53,360-61.

Karaṇḍaka Sutta, 358.

Karaṇḍu, k. 87.

kāra tenure, 342-43.

karauvara, 366.

kārya, 342.

kārika, 342, see kāra.

kārttika, 45, 362-65,

(kāttiyē)

Kāsi, 88-89, 390.

Kāsirāja, k. 81, 87-90.

Kassapa, k. IV. 145, 309, 338;

V. 221, 335.

Kaṭadoravāḍa, 278.

Kaṭagamuva Slab Inscription,
180.

Kataragama, 138.

Kataragam dēvālē, 431.

Kattiyānarāla, 376.

Kāvyaḍarsa, 106.

Kavsiḷumina, 285.

Kēralas, 169.

Khantivādi Jātaka, 89-90.

Khema, m. 33, 80, 84, 86-87.

Khīradhāra, k. 82, 91-92, 101.

Khīragāma, 278.

Khudda Pārinda, 138.

Kiliṅ, 398-99, 402-04, 417-18,
420-23, 427, 438-40.

Kirallamoṭṭā, 326.

Kīravālla, 67.

kiri, land measure, 338.

Kiribatvehera, 127.

Kitsirimē, 83, see Siri
Meghavanna.

Kitti Siri Megha, 167, 169, 172-73,
177, 271, 273.

Kitti Siri Rājasinha, 19, 30-31,
48, 410.

Knox, Robert, 363-64.

Kodituvakku lēkam, 430.

Kōkila Sandēsaya, 63.

Kolayunu, 338.

kollu, 336.

komaḍu, 336.

Kon-tu, 105.

Korni Copper Plate Grant of
Anantavarman Coḍagaṅga, 109.

- Kosala, k. 390.
- Kosalas, 107.
- Kotmalē (Kotthumala), 29-30,
34, 41, 53, 55-56, 188-90, 203.
- Kōttē, 70, 79, 204, 211, 214.
- Krishnarao, B.V. 108, 111.
- Kublai Khan, k. 304.
- Kulam, 307;
- kulas, 152, 420.
- Kulasekhara, k. 200, 303.
- Kulāvaka Jātaka, 369.
- kuli land measure, 318.
- kulīna, 421.
- Kuliṅga, 420-21, 423.
- Kuliṅgu, 420-21, see kuliṅga.
- Kumāra Alakēśvara, 214.
- Kunakar, 210.
- Kurunāgala, 66, 68, 79, 209-10, 250,
252, 283, 287, 322, 407, 417, 423,
429, 432-33.
- Kurunāgala Vistaraya, 368.
- Kurundī, 298.
- lāha, 339.
- Lambakaṇṇa (Lamāni), 418-19, 422-23.
- Laṅkāpaṭṭana, 41, 83, 115, 128.
- Laṅkātilaka Inscription, 328,
354, 395.
- Laṅkātilaka vihāra, 328, 383,
393-94.
- Licchavis, 122.
- Ligor, 297.
- Līlāvati, queen, 29, 33-34, 50,
94, 187.
- Lion, Bodhisatva as a, 260.
- Liyanagamage, A. 14, 18-19,
28, 41, 97, 100, 161, 285, 291,
295, 299-300.
- Lohapāsāda, 22-24, 142, 239.
- Lokeśvara, k. 50.
- Ma'bar, 304, 306-07.
- Macca Jātaka, 90.
- maḍaran, 332.
- Madhukēśvara shrine, 110.
- Madhurinda, prince, 94.
- Madras presidency, 110.
- Madras Tamil Lexicon, 318, 380-81.
- Maḍuggallē, d. 254.
- Magadha, 92.

Māgha, 29-30, 42-43, 50, 53,
55, 187-90, 202-04, 246,
252, 283-84, 286, 288-90,
293, 299; seizes the
treasures of the Order,
321-22.

Maha aramudala, 438.

Mahābhārata, 93-94, 103, 113,

Mahābodhi, 384;
shrine, 426.

Mahābodhivaṃsa, 35, 65, 84, 102,
113, 119, 420; aṭṭhakathā,
119.

Mahābodhivaṃsa Granthipada
Vivaraṇaya, 118.

Mahācetiyaṃsaṭṭhakathā, 84.

Mahadāli Mahanā, k. 138, 153.
(Dāṭhika)

Mahādhāṭhika Mahānāga, see
Mahadāli Mahanā.

mahādhuraya, 374.

Mahadoranā, d. 426-27.

Mahājanaka, k. 301.

Mahājanaka Jātaka, 301.

Mahā Kassapa, m. 40, 195, 287-89,
394-96.

Mahākāvya, 182.

Mahalābim, 338.

Mahalēkam department, 431.

Mahāmeghavana, 119, 125, 128, 131.

Mahāmeru, 64.

Mahamevunā-giri-vehera, 125.

Mahānāgahula, 177, 179, 276.

Mahānāma, k. 71-72, 135, 97,
(Cha-cha-mo-ha-nan)

Mahāpāli, 141-42.

Mahāparinibbāna Sutta, 33, 35,
84, 86-87, 113.

Mahāsaman dēvālaya, 356
(at Ratnapura)

mahāsāmi, t. 242.

mahāsāṅgha, 191.

Mahāsena, k. 91, 97-101, 115-16, 129.

mahātheras, 190, 235.

Mahāthūpa, 21, 30, 151-52, 154-56, 324.

Mahātissa, m. 309.

Mahātitttha, 41, 45; gate, 184; 298.

Mahāvamsa, 20-21, 30, 33, 35, 44, 65,
93, 98, 113, 128, 133-34, 152, 154, 257-
58, 301, 420.

- Mahāvagga, 361.
- Mahavasa, 83, see Mahāvamsa.
- Mahāvastu, 103.
- Mahavedanā, t. 383.
- Mahāvihāra, 22, 24, 100, 123, 133-34, 142, 146, 151, 155, 156-60, 167, 235, 239-41, 244, 255, 280, 339, 434.
- Mahā Viṣṇu Dēvāla, 431.
- Mahavoṭi, 311; see Mahātittā.
- Mahayā Kitambavā, 338.
- Mahendra, 92, 96.
- Mahēśvara, 309.
- Mahinda, k. IV, 23, 43, 54, 74, 147-49, 333, 338, 395; V. 149, 202, 251; d. of Parākramabāhu I, 185; prince, 309; m. 130-31, see Mahendra; festival, 23.
- Mahiṣa, 92, 96.
- Mahiyaṅgana vihāra, 146, 350, 369.
- Majapahit Java, 223.
- Majjima Nikāya, 358, 436.
- Malacca, 223.
- Malaiyālar, 319.
(Malayālis)
- Malalasekara, G.P., 13.
- Malāraya, 312.
(marāla)
- Malaya, 144, 222.
- Mallas, 300.
- Malvatta, 399.
- mālya, 380.
- Mānābharāṇa, k. 26-27, 167, 173-78, 179-82, 265-73, 283, 289; Parākramabāhu's father, 178.
- Mānāmatu, 298.
- Mānavamma, 39, 140, 142, 168.
- Māṇḍalikarāja, 216.
- māṇḍalikatali, 386.
- maṇḍapas, 191, 399, 412, 421.
- Mandhātar, k. 287.
- Maṅgala Mahā Cetiya, 138.
- maṅgul beraya, 392.
- Māñju, d. 280.
- Mankanai Tamil Inscription, 265.
- Manu, 368.
- Manusmṛti, 58.

- Marco Polo, 206,304,306,
 Maricavaṭṭi, 142,156.
massa, 235,365,366,369;
 see kahāpaṇa, kahavaṇu.
masran, 315,331,362,365,
 366-68,370-71.
 Mātalē, 437.
Matsya Purāṇa, 95.
matuparkkam, 380.
 Maurya, 260.
Mayamata, 318.
 Māyāraṭṭha, 188,195,283,
 286,295-96,349.
mayilakkattu, 452, 454.
 Mayurapāda thera, 52;
 -parivena, 52.
Mayura Sandēsaya, 226.
mē, 373-74.
 Meghagiri, park, 130-31;
 -vihāra, 22,34,42,116-17,119,
 124-30.
mehe vādīma, 356.
 Mehta, Ratilal N, 104.
 Mēnavara Tunayan d. 234,309.
 Metgiri-vehera, 119.
 Metteyya, 249,312.
 Mihintale Tablets, 333,342,347,
 395.
 Ming Annals, 224.
Ming-Shih, 71,219,227.
miṇibera, 45.
miṇipā, 144.
mini pūjāva, 376,381.
 Mitta, 195,198.
 Mittasena, k. 52,66,134,136-37.
 Moggallāna, k. I. 153,273; III,
 114,140.
 Moratōta-paṭṭiya, 356.
 Mugalan, m. 167-70,189.
 Mugapakka^k Jātaka, 89.
mukavaḍam, 374.
 Mukhalingam, 109-10.
 Mulaṅginā, d. 382.
muṅ, 336.
muṅdu karaṅduva, 437-38.
muṅdukaranduyen randīlāgat
vahalin, 354.
 Munnēsvaram dēvālē, 356.
 Murunḍa, 92.
mutteṭṭu, 340.

- Muthucomaraswamy, 91.
 Nāgama Inscription, 338.
 Nagara, 109.
 Nāgārjuna Koṇḍa, 98, 105, 111.
 Nāgas, 35, 86, 377.
 Nāgāvali river, 111.
nahānacunnamūlai, 390.
naivedya, 380.
 Nālikirā, k. 87.
namapā pūjāva, 375, 377.
 Nāmbaṃbara, 60.
 Nānādeśanarādhipā, 294.
 Nānāyakkāra Lēkam, 431.
 Nandanavana, 126.
nānu, 392.
nānumura, 388-91, 393-96;
 - maṅgallaya, 391, 393.
nānuvaḍannō, 390.
narādhipa, t. 284.
 Narapati, k. of Ava, 233.
 Narasannapeta Taluk, 110.
Narendracaritāvalokanapradīpikāva,
 217.
naresvara, t. 284.
 Nāta Dēvālē, 437.
navapunnakumba, 412.
navatoṭin, 364.
 Na-Wang, 307.
 Needham, Joseph, 222.
 Nell, Andreas 13.
nelli, 391.
nidhānakathā, 365.
niganṭhas, 81-82.
nikāyas, 238-42, 244.
Nikāya Saṅgrahaya, 61-62, 65-66,
 68, 211, 215, 217, 224, 25, 242.
 Nilakanta Das, 107.
nīlam, 318.
niriṅḍun bihivū maṅgul, 322.
nissaggiyavatthu, 360.
 Nissaṅka Alakēśvara, d.
 214, 225-27,
 Nissaṅkamalla, k. 28-29, 41, 52,
 66, 76, 186, 320, 328, 332, 348, 351,
 353, 361, 420-21,
 Niyāṅḍavanē Phussadeva
 Sumāṅgala, m. 328-29.
 Niyāṅgampāya temple, 212-13.
 Nuvarakal Deva Senevirattār, 164.

- Odas, 107.
(Udras)
- Olkāmiyak, d. 395.
- paccimuttara, 118.
- pācittiya, 360.
- pācittiyapāli, 436.
- pādamūla, 435.
- pādda, 369.
- Padī, 298.
- Paḍikāra department, 437.
- Padma Purāna, 107.
- Padma-vaṃsa, 297.
- pādya, 380.
- pāla, 332.
- Palakalanai, 319.
- Palembang, 224.
- Pāṭalīputta, 81, 82, 98, 300.
(Pāṭaliputra)
- Paṭhamacetiya, 136.
- Pathmanathan, s. 161.
- Paṭittharaṭṭha, 291.
- Pattini Dēvāla, 431.
- pal, 104-06.
(palu, pallu)
- Palakonda, 110.
- Pallava, 95.
- Pallemālērāla, d. 391.
- palo, 105.
- Palur, 104-05, 107, 113.
(Palura, Paloura)
- Paṃsukulikas, 146, 172.
- pāmulpetṭiya, 404, 434-36, 439-40.
- pamunu, 322, 325, 330, 337-40.
- Panākaḍuva Copper Plate Charter,
163.
- Pāncāṇḍavaṃsa, 297.
- pañca vagga gāna, 163.
- Pāncayojana, province, 40, 195.
- Paṇḍu, k. 81-82, 91-94, 137, 139,
144, 285; Paṇḍus, 294, 298,
302-03; vaṃsa, 94-95.
- Paṇḍukābhaya, k. 93-94.
- paṇḍuru, 337, 339, 362.
- Pāṇḍya, invasion. 145; 200, 206,
208, 267, 305; rulers, 307;
see Paṇḍu.
- Pāpiliyāna, document, 354;
-vihāra, 354, 356.
- Parakkama, d. 33.

Parākramabāhu k. I. 15, 19, 25-27,
41-42, 44, 47, 52, 66, 68, 166, 169,
173-77, 179, 182-83, 185, 238,
241-42, 246, 268, 274, 277-282,
289-300, 302, 345, 416, 421, 428;
II. 28-30, 40, 42-43, 47, 52, 53-61,
66, 68, 191-98, 204, 243, 246, 249-50,
283, 285, 297, 302, 320-22, 344-45,
349-51, 354, 379, 385-87, 416-17,
428, 438, 441; III. 29, 42, 208, 302,
306, 309; IV. 29, 31, 36-38, 42-44,
48, 66, 209-11, 322, 325, 330, 345, 355,
358, 364, 385, 411; V. 32, 77, 201, 212,
326-27; VI. 16, 32, 61-64, 68, 70, 231-33,
344, 346, 354, 356, 365, 383, 419;
VII. 49, ⁷⁸236.

Pārakumbā piriveṇa, 36-37.

Pārakumbā Sirita, historical value
of, 64-65; 225, 323-25.

Parameśvara, k. 223.

Paranavitana, S. 13, 14, 119-20, 123-25,
127-28, 130, 147, 167, 202-03, 206-07, 285,
307, 322-23, 342, 353, 387, 389, 394-95,
426, 437.

Parantaka Coḷa, k. 146.

paravēṇi, 340, see pamunu.

Parevi Sandēśaya, 63, 231.

Pārinda, k. 95.

parinibbāna, 83-84, 86.
(parinirvāna)

paritta (pirit), 238,
248-50, 383, 403, 405,
425-26.

parivāra-k-kontam, 319.

parivāraya, 347.

pariveṇas, villages of,
320-21.

pāsāda, 185, 191, 231.

paśaṅgaturu, 427.

Pāsulu Sirisaṅgabō, k.
45-46, 50.

pāṭṭa, tenure, 342.

Pattini, goddess,
409-10.

pāvāḍa, 375.

pāvadā bat, 346.

Perera, L.S., 330, 343.

peresirit, 335.

Perumiyankulam
Inscription, 331.

Philips, C.H., 18.

Pien-i-tien, 71, 219, 221,
223, 227.

Pieris, P.E., 95.

Pihitirajaya, 204.

Pilima Talawe, d. 254.

Pilinādavacca, m. 361.

Pillai kāl Tānam,

pirit, 383, 441, see paritta;
pirit pān, 403, 441.

Pliny, 104, 107-09.

pohotaliyak, 386.

pola, 370.

Polonnaruva, 44, 46, 79, 114,
150-51, 162, 164-65, 172-78,
183, 193-94, 196, 199, 238,
240, 243-46, 249, 251-52,
262-64, 267-70, 281-83, 294-96,
368, 416.

pōya day, 369, 370, 386, 401.
see uposatha,

Prabhūrāja, 215, 217-18, 224-25,
227-28.

Pradeśarāja, 216.

Pradyumna, 95.

pratāpapayi, 373, 376.

Prayaga, 92.

Pridham, 402.

Prītidānaka Mandapa Rock
Inscription, 320.

Przyluski, J. 104-05.

puda ōlakkam, 388-89, 394-95.

puggala, 360.

Pūjāvaliya, 13, 36, 42, 48;

historical value of 52-54;

56, 60, 65, 66, 68, 136-37, 144,

185-86, 192, 196, 198-99, 202-05,

242, 284, 297-98, 333, 366, 421.

Pulatthinagara, 188, see
Polonnaruva.

Punākāmiyā, d. 347.

punnakalasā, 437, 346.

Purāna Index, 95.

purāṇdurupura, 201.

Puri, 107-08.

Purle, 110.

puruttarāya āsaya, 118.

puspa, 279-81, 385.

pusul, 336.

Rahula, W. 14.

Rājādhirāja, t. 94.

rājadvāram, 183.

rājakāriya, 340-41.

Rajamahendry, 103-04, 109.
(Rajamahendravaram)

Rājaratnākaraya, 13, 31, 49;
historical value of 65-66;
78, 196-98, 200-01, 209,
218, 235, 285, 365.

Rājarattha, 27, 162-63, 167,
172-73, 176, 180-82, 252,
268-73, 276-78, 280, 283, 295-96.

Rajasekhara, E.S. 124, 322-23.

Rājāvaliya, 101, 218, 226.

rājottama, 284.

rājyāntara, 200-03, 205-07.

Rakkha, d. 275.

Rambāva Inscription, 338.

rankot, 231.

Ranmalī, see Hemamālā,

ran vahalin, 354.

Ranawella, G.S. 18-19, 161-67,
175, 180.

Ratanapañña, m. 68.

Ratanapāsāda, 144, 152.

Ratana Sutta, 121-22.

Raṭemahatmayās, 437.

Ratnapura Maha Saman Dēvālayē
Sannasa, 383.

Ratnasuriya, V. 124.

Rattavanavihāra, of Chiengmai, 68.

Rayigama, 214-16.

Rohana, 26, 27, 44, 46, 49, 146-47,
149, 163, 166-67, 169, 172-79,
181, 183, 85, 211, 269-83.

Rowland, B. 260.

ruvan, 385.

(ruvandev)

Sabaragamuva, 431.

Saccavatī, 106.

saddhamma, 259.

Saddharmālankāraya, 61.

Saddharmaratnākaraya, 48;

historical value of, 61-63;
215, 219, 221, 225, 231, 232, 376,
418-19, 423.

Saddharmaratnāvaliya, 301, 436.

Saddhātissa, k. 152, 308.

Sāgalikas, 146.

Sagama Inscription, 226, 418-19.

Sahu, N.K., 88, 92-93.

Saivism, 240.

śaiya, 380.

saṅvatsarotsavaya, 322-23.

Sāketa, 92.

Sakka (Śakra), 86, 309, 312-13.

sakpañca, 373.

sālakahavaṇu, 369.

Sālalihini Sandēśaya, 63.

Salihundam, 112.

Sāma Jātaka, 413.

Samantakūṭavannanā, 61.

Samantapāsādikā, 335-36,
355-56, 359, 361-62, 420.

Samudragupta, k. 97.

sanaha, 388.

sanat, 388-89.

Sanchi, 259.

Sandēśa Poems, 225.

Saṅgamu, 419.

Saṅghamittā, theri, 98, 418,

Saṅgharāja of Vālivita, 410.

Saṅghatissa, k. II. 301.

Saṅgītikārakas, 359.

Sang-kia-lo, 73.

Sarabhu, m. 86.

sarak, 354-55.

Saranath, 259.

Sārasaṅgaha, 61.

śārīrika dhātu, 257, 263.

Sarvāṅgasundarī, 320.

Sasa Jātaka, 90.

śāsana, 152, 243, 255-56, 291-298.

satarakaṭu, 327.

(satarapasa)

Satara kōralē, 312.

sātṭa, 452, 454.

Satthabhu, k. 87.

satyakriyā, 290.

Sāyātnuvara, 67, 101.

(Sāvatti)

Selābhaya, 350.

Sena, k. I. 144, 251; II. 24, 43,
54, 121, 145, 154, 238, 309, 324; III.
145, 148; IV. 24, 147-48, 239; V.
148-49.

Senā Lankādhikāra, d. 354.

Senāsammata Vikramabāhu,
(Viravikrama), k. 65,
312, 314.

Seng-kia-li, 304.

śēsat, 374.

sēvaya, 375, see tēvāva.

Seyyaṅsa Jātaka, 390.

Shwezegon Pagoda, 70, 165.

Siam, 300.

Siddhantam, 111.

Sīgiri Graffiti, 39.

Sīhalatṭhakathā Mahāvamsa,
84.

Sikhavalaṅda Vinisa, 336.

Silāmeghavanna, k. 114.

Sīlavamsa Dharmakīrti, m.
419.

Sīnhala Bodhivamsaya, 420, 426.

Sīnhala Daladā Vamsaya, 46;
historical value of, 48-50;
77-78, 101, 176, 187, 199-200, 209,
212-13, 218, 234, 236, 303.

Sircar, D.C. 318.

Siri Meghavanna, k. 19-20, 22-24,
33-37, 42, 47-48, 50, 65, 67, 69, 83,
96-97, 99-100, 113-15, 125-26,
132, 134-35, 153, 257, 351, 354, 401,
405, 407, 411-12, 416, 424, 427,
429.

Siri Saṅghabodhi, k. 54, 154,
284, 350; t. 324.

Siri Vaddhanapura, 60, 193;
vihāra, 441-42.

Siri Vallabha, k. 167, 169, 172,
177, 178.

Siriweera, W.I., 162, 368-69.

Sirutānam, 319.

sīsakahāpaṇa, 365-66.

Siṭivāṭa, 62.

Siva, 81.

Sivalkolu Lakdivu Adhikāra,
d. 77, 212, 326.

Sivaskandhavarman, k. 95.

Sivi, k. 89.

Sivi Jātaka, 90.

Si-yu-ki, 230.

Skandha, god, 95.

- snāna, 379, 391, 385.
- śodāśopacāra, 379-82, 385.
- Somaraja, of Nāmbara, 285.
- Somaratna, G.P.V., 18, 67, 215, 227-28.
- Somatapura, 95.
- Sorata, W., 37, 119, 124-27, 201, 323, 400, 435-36.
- South-East Asia, 68.
- South India, traders from, 229, 318, 368; distribution of rice in temples, 347-48; śodāśopacāra in, 381.
- Śri Kakulam District, 110.
- Sri Krishna, 108.
- Śrī Māra Śrī Vallaba, 142, 144-45, 251.
- Subaddha, set̥̥hi, 90.
- Subhagiri, 298.
- Sudhamā, 185.
- Sudassana, street, 417.
- Sugalā, queen, 26-27, 175, 178-79, 181-82, 272, 276-78, 280, 282.
- suhurubaḍu, 215, 217.
- Sukhagirigāma, 278.
- Sūkharabhātudeva, d. 277.
- Sulūvasa, 45, see Cūlavamsa.
- Sumanagalla, 280.
- Sumāṅgalavilāsinī, 88, 103.
- Sumatra, 307.
- Sumedha, 33, 80, 85.
- Sumitta, prince, 418.
- Su-mu-ta, 307.
- Su-mu-tu-la, 307.
- Sunanda, k., charioteer, 81, 87-90.
- Sundarī Mahā Dēvi, 265.
- Sung-Shu, 71, 135.
- Suttantas, 359.
- Sydana, 413.
- Sylvain Levi, 104-05.
- Tai-ping-ya-lan, 223.
- tala, 336.
- Talāmunundugiri, 180.
- Tāmalitti, 83, 323.
(Tāmralipti).
- tāmbūla, 380.

- Tamil villages, 333-34.
 Tanabim, district, 338.
 Tanagaluka, 278.
 Tandulapatta, 278.
 Tanjore, 318.
 Tantric worship, 150.
 Tāraka, asura, 95.
taṭṭumāru, 341.
taṭu, 434.
taṭugeya, 434-35, 437-38.
taṭukassa, 404, 434-40.
 Tekkali, 110.
 Tennant, J.E. 135.
tēvāva, 375-76, 379.
 Thailand, 68.
 Thakūraka, general, 199.
 Theravāda, 240.
 Thūpārāma, 23, 142, 144, 151-52,
 156, 251, 257.
Thūpavaṃsa, 84.
ticīvara, 376.
 Tihathura, k. of Ava,
 Timur, k. 223.
 Tīrthankaras, 108.
 Tisīhala, 298, 300.
 Tooth Relic, et. passim.
toṭabadu, 365.
 Tumpanē, 431.
 Tunayesa, d. 218.
tunuruvan, 227, 441.
 Turnour, George, 12, 91.
 Tuttukuḍiya, 67.
tuvaralā, 412.
 Uḍapalāta, 431.
 Udaya, k. III. 238; IV. 146;
 Udeni Vastuva, 301.
 Uḍundora, 176-77, 276-80.
 (Uddhanadvāra).
 Uḍunuvara, 431.
 Uggata, k. 87.
 Uigur-i-hei-mi-shih, d. 304.
 Ujjain, 82.
 Ummadanti Jātaka, 89.
uṅdu, 336.
 Upatissa, k. 121.

urulātel, 60.

Uruvela, 176-78, 276-77,
279-80.

Utpalavarna (god Upulavan),
313, 390.

Uttaramūla, parivena, 15, 26,
55-56, 165, 167-68, 188-89.
(Uturulumulu); ayatān siṭitān,
39, 398, 402-03, 417-18, 436, 438-40.

Utur Mēgiri vatta, 127-28.

Uturu-vehera, 37, 132, see
Abhayagiri.

Uva, province, 431.

Vācissara, m. 30, 56, 188-89.

vadamal, 391.

Vaḍanatuyakku department, 431.

vaddāru, 373.

Vaḍukar (Telugus), 319.

vahal, 351.

vaharala, 353.

vajra, 241.

vajrakāya, 241.

Valāhassa Jātaka, 414.

Valan kai, 319.

Valapana, 431.

Valgampāya, mahāthera of, 65.

Vāligala Kiviyāra, 51, 75.

Vamsadharā, river, 108-10, 112.

Vamsatthappakāsini, 84.

vanig-ganāh, 435.

Vanni, 283, 286, 294.

vanuvak, maṅgula, 322-25;
raja, 324-25.

vasana, 380.

Vasiṣṭha, 367.

Vātagiri, 52.

Vathimi maharaja, t. 284.

Vat Hva Vian, 297.

vāṭikā, 318.

vāṭi tel, 337.

Vaṭṭagāmani Abhaya, k. 258, 301, 308.

Vaṭṭaka Jātaka, 90.

vatthu, 315.

Vaṭṭōrurāla, d. 399-400.
(Vaṭṭērurāla).

Vāyu Purāna, 89, 92.

Veḍikkāra, department, 431.

veheravāssan, 352-53.

(veravāssan)

Vēlaikkāra Inscription, army,
27, 133, 164, 167-70, 172, 189,
263, 316-19, 352.

velaṅḍavīdi, 368.

Vēli, land measure, 316-18.

Veśāli, 122.

Vessantara Jātaka, 90, 332.

veyyāvaccakas, 352-53, 361.

Vīdāgama Maitrī, m. 328.

Videha, 301.

Vidhura Jātaka, 90.

Vīgulavatta Inscription, 77,
212-13, 326-27.

Vijaya, k. 52.

Vijaya Āpā, d. 218.

Vijayabāhu, k. I. 19, 25, 43,
54, 70, 151, 163-67, 169,
173, 189, 267; II. 28, 50, 53,
420; III. 38, 53, 55-58, 66,
187-88, 190-91, 242, 246, 283-89,
293, 302; IV. 193, 195-99, 302, 425;
V. 210.

Vijayamalla, k. 284.

Vijayanagara, 218, 228.

Vijayasundarārāma, 192.

Vikramabāhu, k. II. 167,
170, 172, 174, 176, 182, 251,
264-67, 269, 283, 302; III.
32, 77, 211-12, 214, 326-27.

Vilgammula Saṅgharāja, 209.

Vimaladhammasūriya, k. I. 31,
51.

Vimalakīrti, m. 61.

Vimativinodanī, 334-35.

Vinaya, 336, 359, 437, 439,

Vinayālaṅkāra, 359, 361.

Vinayaṭṭhakathā, 334.

Vincent Smith, 97, 120.

Vīra Alakēśvara, 32, 50, 63, 71-72,
214-15, (A-lie-kou-nai-enl)
218-21, 223-30, 232.

Vīrabāhu, prabhūrāja, 32, 49-50,
215-18, 225, 227-28; son of
Nissankamalla, 320, 349.

Viraja, 92.

Vīravalanjiyārs, 368.

Viṣṇu, god, 64, 107, 309, 409-10;
Dharmasāstra, 368.

viyan, 402.

Vizagapatam Copper Plate
Inscription, 109.

voṭunugē, 397.

Voyalaggamuva, 280.

vyagghas, paintings of, 412-14.

Vyagrī Jātaka, 415.

Wang-Hiuan Tse, 97.

Wickramasinghe, D.M.deZ.

319, 342, 352; Sirima,

15, 18-19, 41, 161, 173,

179-80.

Wijetunga, W.M.K., 18, 20, 150,

161-63.

William Cohn, 120.

yakkhas, 144, 251.

Ya-lieh-ku-nai-erh, 219,

see Vīra Alakēśvara.

Yama, 179.

yān aturannan, 397-400.

Yang-Ting-Pi, 307.

Yāpahuva, 66, 68, 79, 199, 206,

(Subhagiri), 303.

Yaṭtinuvara, 431.

Yi-hsi, 408.

yojana, 183.

Yuan-shih, 304.

yuvarāja, t. 216; Mahinda, 301.

ANCIENT KALINGA

