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INTRODUCTION

Relations between Ceylon and the countries of South-east Asia go far back in history. Centrally situated in the Indian Ocean, Ceylon commands the entrance to the Bay of Bengal, and due to the extensive sea-borne trade between the east and the west became an important entrepôt between the two. Ceylon first came into contact with South-east Asia as a result of the maritime trade involving South-east Asian countries on the sea route between China and the west.

In the eleventh and twelfth centuries A.D. commercial activities paved the way for political contacts between Ceylon and South-east Asia. The relations of Vijayabahu I and Parâkramabâhu I of Ceylon with South-east Asia may be understood better in the light of the background of commercial activities in the Indian Ocean. The desire of the Pagan dynasty of Burma to weaken the Cola influence on commerce in the Malay Peninsula resulted in friendship between Vijayabahu I of Ceylon and Anawrahta of Burma. The maritime trade, on the other hand, was the main cause of Parâkramabahu's invasion of Burma.

The religious contacts that started as a result of commercial activities brought Ceylon and South-east Asia even closer. Interest in Theravāda Buddhism stimulated intercourse between these two regions from the eleventh century onwards. Ceylon had received this
Faith in the third century B.C. from India and ever since its introduction the Buddhist monks of Ceylon tried as far as possible to preserve it in what they believed to be its original form. In India Buddhism changed rapidly with the fusion of Hindu ideas and ultimately, as a result of the Hindu revival and the Muslim expansion, was wiped out in the country of its origin. In the eleventh century A.D., when interest in older forms of Buddhism revived in some countries of South-east Asia, Theravāda Buddhists had no place to turn to for religious guidance except the island of Laṅka. From then onwards until the arrival of the Portuguese in the sixteenth century Ceylon maintained her position as the fountain-head of Theravāda Buddhism, and contacts with South-east Asia were maintained.

Buddhism is rich in art traditions and wherever it spread its art traditions followed. South-east Asia is no exception. When Ceylon became the chief religious influence in that region, Sinhalese Buddhist art too became influential. In stūpas, in monasteries and in other Buddhist edifices as well as in the sculpture of South-east Asia this Sinhalese contribution is quite conspicuous. It is also noteworthy that Sinhalese architecture itself shows some South-east Asian influence.

The task of this thesis will be to examine such political, religious and cultural relations as existed between Ceylon and the countries of South-east Asia from the eleventh century until the
end of the fifteenth century A.D. Close relations date from the eleventh century. But because in certain respects these contacts were the continuation of those that had existed well before that time it will be necessary to trace the history of their origins. With the coming of the Portuguese in the beginning of the sixteenth century, contacts with South-east Asia came to a temporary halt and Ceylon lost her significance as a centre of Buddhist culture. In fact in later centuries countries such as Burma and Thailand came to the rescue of Theravāda Buddhism in the land which had formerly been its fountainhead by sending missions to restore the Faith. Hence we have taken the beginning of the sixteenth century as the terminal point in this study.

The term South-east Asia as used throughout this study refers only to the western countries within the general region, namely Burma, Thailand, Cambodia, the Malay Peninsula and some islands of Indonesia with whom Ceylon had relations in the period from the eleventh to the sixteenth century A.D. For the present purpose, such countries as Vietnam, Laos and the Philippines, which had little or no contact with Ceylon at this period, are not included in the name 'South-east Asia'.

---

1 The region known under the term South-east Asia, which came into use during the Second World War, comprises Burma, Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, the two Vietnams, Malaysia, Singapore, the Republic of the Philippines, and the Republic of Indonesia, Brunei and Timor. See Dobby, Southeast Asia, 7th ed. (London, 1960), p.17; D.G.E.Hall, Atlas of South-east Asia (London, 1964), introduction, pp.62-63.
A few scholars have already drawn attention to the importance of the subject of this thesis, but until recently it was a neglected field. Modern historical writing on ancient Ceylon has overemphasized the Indian influence on the history and the culture of the Island and has often neglected her other international relations during ancient times. Her proximity to the mainland no doubt encouraged much Indian influence, but we should not forget that Ceylon's central position in the Indian Ocean brought her into contact with the other parts of the outside world. Neglect of this fact may be noticed in the work of one historian who divides the history of Ceylon up to the coming of Europeans into North and South Indian periods. As Gunawardene has rightly pointed out, this tendency has been inherited from the chroniclers of the past who overemphasised the relations between Ceylon and the home of Buddhism and neglected other aspects of Ceylon's international relations. Evidence is forthcoming to show how the chroniclers were often silent even on the movements of Buddhist missions between Ceylon and South-east Asia.

3 Leslie Gunawardene, 'Ceylon and Malaysia: A Study of Professor S. Paranavitana's research on relations between the two regions'. Mimeographed paper dated 28th March, 1969, p.2.
Another point which may be raised in this connection is the exaggeration of Indian influence in South-east Asia. Some Indian writers refer to the early kingdoms of South-east Asia as Hindu colonies and the whole region as Greater India and they have failed to recognise the importance of the indigenous elements in South-east Asian culture and the contribution of other countries which perhaps disseminated Indian culture in locally modified form. In this thesis an attempt is made to point out Ceylon's contributions to South-east Asia, especially with regard to Buddhist culture. And further, we shall show that Ceylon in turn was reciprocally influenced by South-east Asia.

So far no comprehensive study of the subject has appeared, although from time to time several scholars have attempted to study certain aspects of it. On political relations, about a decade ago, Sirima Wickramasinghe, in her doctoral thesis, analysed the Cūlavamsa account of the invasion of Burma by Parākramabāhu I.\(^1\) Two years later she published in a paper the same material with a brief reference to religious contacts with Burma, the Malay Peninsula.

and Thailand. ¹ In 1965 G.H. Luce drew attention to some references to Ceylon.²

Of all writings on the subject the most revolutionary are those of S. Paranavitana. In 1960 he published an article under the title 'Ceylon and Malaysia in Mediaeval Times'³ and in the following year one entitled 'The Ārya Kingdom in North Ceylon'.⁴ In this he drew attention to Malayan activities in the northern kingdom of Jaffna. In 1963 Paranavitana dealt with the problem of Ceylon's relations with Malaysia in his paper 'Princess Ulakudaya's Wedding'.⁵ In 1964 in two public lectures delivered at the University of Ceylon, Peradeniya, he drew the attention of the students of the subject to certain interlinear inscriptions, one of which he later

---

¹ Sirima Wickramasinghe, 'Ceylon's Relations with South-east Asia, with Special Reference to Burma', CJHSS, Vol.III, No.1 (1960), pp.38-58. I am thankful to Sirima Wickramasinghe, because it was this article which stimulated me to select this subject for further study.

² G.H. Luce, 'Some Old References to the South of Burma and Ceylon', Felicitation Volume of South-east Asian Studies presented to Prince Dhaninivat (Bangkok, 1965), pp.269-82.


published. In the following year he published the text of the interlinear writing on an inscription from Aturupolayāgama. In 1966 his reading of the interlinear text of the slab inscription no. 2 of Mahinda IV from the site of the Abhayagiri monastery appeared with his comments. In the same year he brought all the material together in his book *Ceylon and Malaysia*.

In all these works Paranavitana has attempted to show Ceylon's close relations with Malaysia. According to his new discoveries the Kalinga mentioned in the Ceylonese sources from the tenth century onwards was not the familiar Kalinga in India but a place in Malaysia, and the Kalinga dynasty, which ruled Polonnaruva from the death of Parākramabāhu I, came from that region. If we accept Paranavitana's theory we must believe that Ceylon and South-east Asia had far closer relations than hitherto believed and it is necessary to re-write some portions of the history of Ceylon.

In his early work Paranavitana, with his thorough knowledge of the source material, has perhaps made a more significant contribution to the understanding of Ceylon's early history and culture than any other living man. Unfortunately, when one examines his new theory, one at once notices shortcomings and misinterpretations. His sources fall into two categories: the available literary material, and the new inscriptions discovered by him. These inscriptions are the most curious discoveries made anywhere in the world as far as the epigraphy is concerned. He writes:

There are to be seen on a large number of inscribed slabs and pillars of different dates found in various parts of the Island, writings superficially incised in minute characters, crowded together in between lines of the original inscriptions and also going over them. These writings are of such a nature that they may be totally overlooked when one's attention is focussed on the original inscription.¹

These interlinear inscriptions can be read only by Paranavitana. Other scholars have examined them and have not been able to trace any letters between the lines of the old inscriptions. We have discussed this problem in the appendix and since we could not trace any interlinear writings we have excluded the material drawn by Paranavitana from his mysterious inscriptions from the main body of our thesis.

¹ Paranavitana, 'Newly discovered historical documents relating to Ceylon, India and South-east Asia.' Mimeographed paper, dated 4th November, 1964, p.1.
In our chapters II, III and IV we shall attempt to examine Paranavitana's interpretation of the literary source material in great detail, because he has tried to establish the idea that from the tenth century onwards some of the ruling dynasties of South-east Asia and of Ceylon were interrelated. However we shall show that this theory is not based on sound evidence and his interpretation of literary sources cannot be accepted. During our survey we shall draw attention to the fact that apart from the invasions of Candrabhanu and his son's association with Ceylon there is no evidence to show that any rulers came from South-east Asia to gain control of Ceylon.

A few scholars have attempted to solve the problem of the invasions of Candrabhanu. Coedès\(^1\) was the first to identify Candrabhanu as a ruler of Ligor and argued against Krom's\(^2\) and Ferrand's\(^3\) view that Candrabhanu was connected with the Śrīvijaya kingdom. Nilakanta Sastri attempted to examine this question.


further in the light of South Indian inscriptions. Paranavitana, though he first shared the views of Coedès, later suggested that Candrabhanu could be identified with the ruler of Śrīvijaya. Recently A. Liyanagamage has examined the question of this invasion in detail but evaded criticizing Paranavitana's theory. In this study we shall try to bring all the evidence together and shall show the difficulty in accepting Paranavitana's view. Incorporating the account given in the Jinakālamālī we shall attempt to give as comprehensive an account as possible of the invasion.

Coedès was the first to draw the attention to the Jinakālamālī as a source for studying the religious contacts between Ceylon and Thailand. Further he showed the importance of the Sukhodaya inscriptions for such studies. Paranavitana, as early as 1932, mainly basing himself on Coedès' papers, wrote his article

3 Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, pp.74 ff.
'Religious Intercourse Between Ceylon and Siam in the 12th-13th centuries'. ¹ Further in the University History of Ceylon ² he made brief references to Ceylon's religious contacts with South-east Asia. Gunawardene in his doctoral thesis discussed the movements of Buddhist monks between Ceylon, Burma and the Malay Peninsula.³ In our study we shall attempt to give a detailed account of these relations in the light of the available sources.

In the two chapters on mutual influence on architecture and sculpture we have drawn material from the work done by previous writers such as Coedès, Dupont, Le May, Bell, Paranavitana, D'Anconà, Griswold and others and reference will be given in those chapters wherever it is necessary.

Sources.

Historical material giving a reliable account of the relations between Ceylon and South-east Asia is meagre. In most cases the historian is obliged to depend on scattered and often casual references in works mainly concerned with other topics. In both

Ceylonese and South-east Asian sources one notices that only the events that interested their respective authors were recorded and as a result certain events recorded by one side escaped the attention of the other. Hence students of history cannot obtain enough corroborative evidence from the other side to allow a comparative study. Many of the principal sources utilized in this work are well known to students of Ceylon and South-east Asian history and many scholars have written about them. Attention will therefore be drawn only to certain noteworthy features that help in understanding the nature and value for this study of the data obtained from them.

The Mahāvamsa and its continuation, known as the Cūlavamsa, are two of our sources. Much ink has flowed in discussing their authenticity and their value as sources of history. In the sixth century A.D. Mahānāma, a monk of the Mahāvihāra fraternity, wrote the Mahāvamsa using other historical traditions. This chronicle covers a period from the earliest times up to the end of the reign

---

of Mahāsena (A.D.247-301). We obtain little evidence relevant to our study from this chronicle.

The Cūlavamsa, which is in fact a continuation of the Mahāvamsa, provides us with more information. According to Geiger, verse 57 of chapter XXXVII to the end of chapter LXXIX comprises the first part of the Cūlavamsa. Sirima Wickramasinghe found that what Geiger called the first part actually consists of two parts written by two different authors. She demonstrated that although no division mark separating the two parts has been detected, the treatment of Parākramabāhu I is quite different from that of the previous rulers. According to tradition the whole Cūlavamsa from Chapter XXXVII to LXXIX was written by Thera Dhammakitti in the reign of Parākramabāhu II (A.D.1236-1270); Sirima Wickramasinghe has given good reasons to believe that in fact Dhammakitti wrote only the second part, dealing with the history of Ceylon from the end of the Anurādhapura period onwards.

This second part of the Cūlavamsa tells of the relations of Vijayabāhu I and Parākramabāhu I with South-east Asia. Although

---

1 This is in fact the first chapter of the standard edition of the Cūlavamsa, the earlier chapters forming the Mahāvamsa.
3 Sirima Wickramasinghe, 'The Age of Parākramabāhu I', chapter on sources.
the account of Vijayabāhu's contacts is very brief, Parākramabāhu I is the central figure of the second part, he is noticeably subject to exaggeration on the part of the author,\(^1\) for example where his relations with South India are concerned.\(^2\) Here the author 'does not give the story in its entirety but, as may be seen clearly from South Indian inscriptions, aims at being a propaganda for the glory of Parākramabāhu which glosses over the failure of the king's policy in this particular'.\(^3\) Evidence is also forthcoming to show how the author gave a one-sided picture of the invasion of Burma by Parākramabāhu I. However, the main theme of the account does have support of a contemporary inscription and, since this is the only detailed account available about this important event, the Culavamsa is a very important source for the study of the expedition. Though there is Burmese evidence for religious contacts with Ceylon, the Culavamsa is completely silent on them except for mentioning Vijayabāhu inviting monks from Burma to restore the Faith.

---

1 \(\text{Cv, tr. pt.1, Introduction, pp.iv ff.}\)


3 \(\text{Nilakanta Sastri, The Polonnaruva Period, p.33.}\)
The next part of the *Cūlavamsa*, the third part in Wickramasinghe's view, consists of the history of the Island from Vijayabahu II's reign until the end of the reign of Parākramabāhu IV. The date and author are not known, but Liyanagamage has convincingly shown that it was written during the reign of Parākramabāhu IV (A.D.1302-1326).¹

The importance of this section for our purposes lies in the account of the invasions of Māgha and Candrabhānu. If we accept Liyanagamage's date for the chronicle then these events were not far removed from the time of its compilation, which fact would increase the chance of authenticity in the record. However, this does not mean that the *Cūlavamsa* account has no limitations. That the account of the exploits of the central figure of this section, Parākramabāhu II, has been exaggerated is quite conspicuous, as for example, in the account of the defeat of Candrabhānu. Sometimes as the chronicler conveniently ignores certain events which in his opinion did damage to the glory of his hero. The silence about the Pāṇḍya invasions can only be understood in this light. However, certain events could have escaped the author's attention due to the loss of records during the invasion of Māgha.²

---

¹ Liyanagamage, op.cit., pp.7-8.
² Ibid., pp.9 ff.
The Pūjāvaliya, a Sinhalese work, also provides us with some material. Though it was written in order to justify the epithet Araham as applied to the Buddha, two out of its thirty-four chapters have been devoted to outlining the history of Ceylon from the earliest times to the end of the reign of Parākramabāhu II.¹

At the end of the last chapter it is said that the work was written by Buddhaputra Thera of the monastic college named Mayurapāda pirivena in the thirteenth regnal year of Parākramabāhu II, i.e. A.D. 1266.² The Pūjāvaliya account of Māgha and Candrabhānu is invaluable because it comes from a contemporary writer who perhaps himself witnessed the invasions of these leaders. The account is sketchy when compared to the details given in the Cūlavamsa, but nevertheless it contains important data missing in the latter. For instance, only the Pūjāvaliya has given the regnal year of Parākramabāhu II in which his son and nephew entered Polonnaruva after having defeated Candrabhānu. This has helped to date the defeat of Candrabhānu as well as to confirm the chronology of the Pāṇḍya invasions.

Another Pāli work which deals with the invasions of Māgha and Candrabhānu is the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa.³ As the name

¹ Pjv, ed. Suraweera (Colombo, 1961).  
² Ibid., pp. 141 and 144.  
³ Hvv, ed. C.E. Godakumbura (P.T.S., 1956).
suggests it is the history of a monastery known as Attanagalu-vihāra, situated in the modern Western Province of Ceylon. According to tradition, this is the place where King Sirisāṅghabodhi of Anurādhapura who had abdicated his throne, displayed the character of a Bodhisattva by offering his head to a wayfarer so that the latter could receive the price laid upon it by the new king.\(^1\)

The date and the name of the author are not mentioned anywhere, but in the beginning the writer says that he composed this work at the request of the Śaṅgharāja Anomadassi.\(^2\) This Śaṅgharāja was the chief incumbent of the Attanagalu-vihāra and the author was probably his student. The history of the monastery is given up to the reign of Parākramabāhu II, where it ends with an account of the contributions made by the king, from which it would appear that it was composed during his reign.\(^3\) Although the author was contemporaneous with the invasions mentioned, in order to glorify his patron he has exaggerated the power of the enemies defeated by Parākramabāhu II. Candrabhanu received similar treatment and it will be pointed out later how a modern scholar was thoroughly mislead by his vivid account.\(^4\)

\(^1\) Ibid.
\(^2\) Ibid., chap.1, v.3.
\(^3\) Ibid., p.x; Liyanagamage, op.cit., pp.16 ff.
\(^4\) See infra, pp.158 ff.
The Dambadeni-asna, or the story of Dambadeniya, is a short history of the reign of Parakramabahu II. The date and the author of this work are unknown. At the end of the book the names Parakramabahu, Bhuvanaikabahu, Vathimiraja and Parakramabahu are mentioned as father and son successively. However, nothing is mentioned about the last three rulers except their names and therefore Godakumbura seems to be right when he says that this is a later addition by a scribe. This Sinhalese work contains an account of the invasion of Candrabhanu, although the invader is mentioned only as the ruler of Tamaliṅgamu without his name being given. Exaggeration is quite conspicuous in the narration, and Liyanagamage has rightly warned his readers to utilise the data with a great deal of caution.

The Nikāyasamgrahaya is a history of Buddhism in India and Ceylon from the time of the Buddha to about the end of the fourteenth century, with special reference to the evils which

2 Ibid., p.39.
befell the sāsana and how it triumphed over all difficulties. The author of this work is Devarakkhita Jayabāhu Dhammakitti. It was written during the reign of Bhuvanaikabāhu V (A.D.1392-1408) of Gampola and the history of Buddhism in Ceylon is given up to this time. Vijayabāhu's purification of the Saṅgha with the help of monks from Burma, Parākramabāhu's relations with Burma, and the invasion of Māgha and Candrabhaṇu are all mentioned in this work. However the author does not give any information which is not available from other sources. Being a history of the sāsana one could expect the international activities of the Buddhist monks of Ceylon to be discussed, but unfortunately this Sinhalese work shares the silence of the other sources on such relations between Ceylon and South-east Asia after the reign of Vijayabāhu I.

The Rajavaliya¹ is a history of Ceylon from the time of the first king of the Island up to the reign of Vimaladharma Sūrya II (A.D.1687-1707) of Kandy. Although the date and the author are unknown, the contents show that it was written by two authors. Mudaliyar Gunasekera has drawn attention to references to Apage Budunge (our Buddha) and Apage svāmivū Yesus Kristus (our Lord Jesus Christ), which both appear in the text, and suggests

¹ Rjv, ed. Watuvatte Pemananda (Colombo, 1959). It is a Sinhalese work.
that is the work of a Buddhist and a Christian author.\footnote{Rjv, ed. B. Gunasekera (Colombo, 1953), Introduction.} If this is the work of two authors, a portion of it would have already been completed by the time the second author continued during or after the reign of Vimaladharma Sûrya.\footnote{Sirima Wickramasinghe, The Polonnaruva Period, p.171.}

Among the sources which come from South-east Asia, is the Sāsanavamsa, a Pali work written by a Burmese monk named Paññasāmi.\footnote{Sy, ed. M. Bode (P.T.S., 1897).}
The author was the tutor of King Meng-dun-Meng of Burma and wrote a number of religious books before he composed the Sāsanavamsa.\footnote{Sy, Eng tr. B.C. Law, p.172.}

At the end of this book, the author says that the chronicle was written at the request of monks of Ceylon and Burma and was completed on the 'full moon day of Migasara (November-December) in the year one thousand and twenty three (of the Kali Age)' i.e. A.D.1861.\footnote{Sy, Eng tr. B.C. Law, p.172.} The text gives an outline of Buddha's life followed by an account of the three Buddhist councils. A reference to the Buddhist missions sent at the end of the Third Buddhist Council is noteworthy, because Paññasāmi had identified five out of the nine places to which missions were sent as being in South-east Asia. They are Suvannabhūmi, Yonaka, Vanavāsi,
Aparanta and Mahārāṭṭha. 1 At the beginning of the text, in the table of contents, the author sets himself to discuss the history of the religion in Śīhala country, Suvaṇṇabhūmi, Yonaka, Vanavāśi, Aparanta, Kashmirā-Gandhāra, Mahimsaka, Mahārāṭṭha and Cīna country. However, in actual fact more than two-thirds of the book is devoted to the history of Aparanta, Burma proper, the author's own country. The author's knowledge of the history of Buddhism in this country seems to be thorough, and it is from this section that we get much of the data for religious contacts between Ceylon and Burma. The Śasanaṃsa provides a good deal of evidence for interdependent relations between the state and the sasana in Burma, especially from the reign of Anawrahta. 2 Furthermore, this work gives more than a hundred names of otherwise unknown religious books. Though the Śasanaṃsa is

1 He interprets Yonaka as Kamboja, Khemawara, Haribhuṇja and Ayuthya; Vanavāśi as Siri Khetta or Prome in Lower Burma; Aparanta as Maramma country or Burma proper; Mahārāṭṭha as a place near Syama country of Thailand; Suvaṇṇabhūmi is Rāmaṇḍa country or Lower Burma. However there is no evidence to identify these places, except Suvaṇṇabhūmi as places in South-east Asia. Sv, tr. Law, p.xvi notes 1-4, p.xvii, note 2.

2 Sv, tr. B.C. Law, p.xi; Sv, ed. C.S. Upasak, p.xxx.
a modern Pali work, the author's sources were much older and he has tried to incorporate all the information from a variety of sources.

The Hmannan or the Glass Palace Chronicle of the Kings of Burma was written in the nineteenth century A.D. This is a late work when compared to the Ceylonese chronicles but it was compiled from a variety of older sources such as chronicles, records and inscriptions. In A.D. 1829, King Bagyidaw appointed a committee of scholars, comprising learned monks, Brahmans and ministers, to compile a proper chronicle of the Burmese kings. The name of the chronicle was taken from the royal palace in the front chamber of which the work was undertaken.

Among the early chronicles utilized by the learned men, was the chronicle of U Kala which was a standard work until the compilation of the Hmannan. This, too, was a later work written in the reign of Taninganwe (A.D. 1714-33). There are three versions of the chronicle known as the Maha Yazawin Gyi

---

1 Among these sources were the Pali canon, commentaries, Ceylonese chronicles, the Kalyani Inscriptions, the Burmese chronicles and other historical traditions.
2 C.S. Upasak, Sv, p.xxx.
3 The Glass Palace Chronicle of the Kings of Burma, tr. Luce and Tin, p.ix.
(the great chronicle in twenty-one volumes), the Yazawin Lat
(middle or shorter chronicle in ten volumes), and the Yazawin Choke
(the brief chronicle in one volume).\(^1\) U Kala in his turn had
utilized material from old chronicles, accounts of temples and
other local traditions.\(^2\) Although mostly following U Kala,
sometimes the compilers of the Hmannan disagreed and inserted
lengthy and learned disquisitions.\(^3\)

Since the authors of the Hmannan used the material from earlier
chronicles, especially from U Kala's work, it is generally regarded
as the standard chronicle.\(^4\) Though the Hmannan contains folk-tales
and legends accepted as history, its account after the eleventh
century becomes more authentic.\(^5\) In this chronicle there is evidence
for relations between Ceylon and Burma, but nothing is mentioned of
the invasion of Burma by Parakramabahu I. Perhaps this was not
mentioned in the original material used by the chroniclers or else
they thought that it was not important from their point of view.
Such silence on the part of the chroniclers of Ceylon and

\(^1\) Ibid., p.52.
\(^2\) U Tet Htoot, op.cit., pp.52-53.
\(^3\) Ibid., p.54; Glass Palace Chronicle of the Kings of Burma, p.ix.
\(^5\) Ibid., p.343.
Burma on certain events that did not interest them presents the student of history with a great problem.

The *Jinakālamāli* is a Pāli work written by Ratanapāṇṇa in Northern Thailand in A.D. 1516 according to its colophon.\(^1\) First the author narrates the aspiration of the Bodhisattva to become a Buddha and then the life of Buddha until his parinirvāṇa is discussed. Then the history of Buddhism in India, its introduction to Ceylon and the subsequent history of the Faith in the Island are dealt with. The history of Northern Thailand, which comes afterwards, is the most interesting and important section for our study. An account of the religious contact between Ceylon and Thailand is given in this section and this is invaluable in view of the silence of Ceylonese sources about such relations. The bringing of the Buddha image from Ceylon and the establishment of the Sinhalese fraternity of monks in Thailand is narrated in detail in the last part of the work. We shall show the importance of this work for the study of the invasion of Candrabhānu. The author himself belonged to the Sinhalese fraternity and was keen to show the close religious contacts between Ceylon and Thailand.

The *Sihînga-Buddharûpanidāna* is another Pâli work, written by Bodhiramsi, which narrates the history of the Sinhalese Buddha image which was brought to Thailand in the thirteenth century. It is believed to have been written in the fifteenth century A.D. The story of this Buddha image is dealt with in detail, although the main outline of the story is similar to the account found in the *Jinakâlamalî*. Since the work was written before *Jinakâlamalî*, the author of the latter would have used it as one of his sources.

Apart from the literary sources a considerable amount of archaeological material, too, has been utilized for this study. Inscriptions from both Ceylon and South-east Asia are useful in confirming, supplementing or checking the accounts given in the chronicles and other literary sources.

The purpose of the Devanagala inscription, dated in the twelfth year of Parâkramabâhu I (A.D.1065), was to register the grant of certain lands by the king to the general Kit Nuvaragala for his services in the expedition against Burma. This inscription not only confirms the Cûlavâmsa account, but also enables the date of the event and the name of the Burmese king who reigned at that

---


time to be ascertained. In addition it supplies some information about the war itself, its causes and results.

The Kaliṅga rulers issued a number of inscriptions, many of them giving the genealogy of the dynasty. Niśṣamkamalla's inscriptions, especially, have references to international relations. Burma and Cambodia are mentioned among the countries with which the ruler had friendly contacts, although due to lack of details they are not very helpful in determining the nature of such relations. None of the inscriptions of the Kaliṅga rulers support the Malayan origin of the Kaliṅga dynasty suggested by Paranavitana.

The Jāvaka invasions of Ceylon would have still remained a mystery without the Chaiya inscription, and it was with the help of this record that Coedès identified the Candrabhanu mentioned in the Ceylonese chronicles as a ruler of the Malay Peninsula. For understanding the problems connected with these invasions, the Pāṇḍya inscriptions are invaluable. A number of inscriptions dated in the reign of Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya and Jaṭāvarman Vīra Pāṇḍya provide us with information about the Pāṇḍya invasions of Ceylon and the Pāṇḍya relations with the Jāvaka invaders. The value of the records as sources increases when we consider the

1 Ibid., pp. 317 ff.
2 References to these inscriptions will be given in the main body of the thesis.
understandable silence of the Ceylonese sources about the Pāṇḍya invasions.¹

The Kalyāṇī inscriptions are the most important sources on religious contacts between Ceylon and Burma.² Written in Pāli and Talaing, these inscriptions were set up by King Dhammazedi of Pegu, who re-established Theravāda Buddhism at the end of the fifteenth century A.D. with the help of the monks who had received higher ordination in Ceylon. In fact, the very purpose for which these inscriptions were erected was to record this pious deed of the king. The principal inscription was engraved in or after the year 841 of the Burmese Common Era (A.D. 1479), which is the last date mentioned in the inscription. These inscriptions are recorded on both sides of ten stone slabs, three having the Pāli version and the rest containing the Talaing translation. The records are important because they are some of the oldest available sources about the history of Buddhism in Burma. All the existing chronicles were written long after the fifteenth century and the chroniclers also used these inscriptions as some of their sources.

¹ Nilakanta Sastri, 'Śrīvijaya, Candrabhānu and Vīra Pāṇḍya', loc.cit.; 'The Ceylon Expedition of Jaṭāvarman Vīra Pāṇḍya', loc.cit.
² Kalyāṇī Inscriptions, IA, Vol.XXII (1893), pp.11-17; 29-53; 85-9;150-9; 206-13; 236-43.
They contain the history of Buddhism in Burma from the time of its introduction to Suvannabhumi by Soṇa and Uttara Theras.

For our purpose they provide a detailed account of the religious contacts between Ceylon and Burma. Since the purpose was to record the re-establishment of the Faith with the help of the monks ordained in Ceylon, the inscriptions contain an account of the earlier relations between these two lands. The detailed account of the mission sent by Dhammazedi to Ceylon is particularly important because of its contemporary nature.

The inscriptions from Thailand are very useful for the study of religious contacts with Ceylon, especially those belonging to the reign of King Lū Tai (A.D.1347-1370). The Khmer inscription of Wat Jai Sukhodaya, dated Śaka 1269 (A.D.1347), gives an account of a Sinhalese monk invited to Sukhodaya and his warm welcome there.¹ The Thai and Pāli inscriptions belonging to Lū Tai's reign supplement the data in the Khmer inscription.² Another Thai inscription dated Śaka 1279 (A.D.1357), found at Wat Śrī Jum in Sukhodaya, records a bringing of a seedling from the sacred Bo-tree in Ceylon.³ A Pāli

---

inscription written in Thai characters, found at Wat Vangnā in Bangkok dated 1970 of the Buddhist Era (A.D.1426-27), shows how deeply the footprint of the Buddha on the Sumanakūṭapabbata in Ceylon was venerated in Thailand.¹ Thus the inscriptions from Thailand provide us with considerable data for our study.

Ancient monuments and sculpture from both Ceylon and South-east Asia are helpful, in that a comparative study of the art and architecture of those two regions shows how far each was influenced by the other.

CHAPTER I

Political Relations of Vijayabahu I and Parakramabahu I with Burma and Cambodia.

Although there is evidence of cultural relations between Ceylon and South-east Asia from the early centuries of the Christian Era, there are no data for political contacts between these two regions prior to the eleventh century A.D. Even after that date political relations are not well documented, and the accounts in the Ceylonese sources are so meagre that a number of problems arise when one analyses them carefully. Sometimes the narration is very brief, being limited to one or two sentences, and sometimes it is one-sided. On the other hand, South-east Asian sources have taken very little or no interest in recording such affairs, and thus, when one examines the political relations of Vijayabahu I (A.D.1055-1110) and Parakramabahu I (A.D.1153-1186) with Burma and Cambodia, one is inevitably faced with the problem of the lack of material. Therefore one is justified in making assumptions, tentative suggestions and hypotheses in the light of the scanty data available.
When the South Indian rulers were building empires they often tried to incorporate Ceylon as a part of their realms. This was partly due to the proximity of the Island to the mainland and its strategic importance, and partly to the attraction of its natural resources. The Colas followed this policy, and in fact they needed the Island more than any other South Indian empire, since they were aiming at gaining control over the maritime trade between East and West. Hence Ceylon became a part of the Cola empire as a result of the expeditions of Rājarāja and Rājendra Cola in A.D. 981 and 1017 respectively.

While Polonnaruva was under the Cola viceroy, in the remote region of Rohaṇa, the Sinhalese princes were organising themselves to liberate Ceylon from the Cola yoke. A state of disunity prevailed among these princes until a war-lord, Kitti by name, a descendant of the royal family, gained control over the Malaya

---


region and the Rohaṇa kingdom which he united in about A.D.1061. Kitti became the ruler of this new kingdom, assuming the royal name Vijayabāhu I, and made preparations for the final expulsion of the Colās.

It was during this struggle of Vijayabāhu against the Colās that we first hear of political contacts between Ceylon and Burma, then known to the Sinhalese as Rāmaṇṇa. Before the expelling of the enemy, Vijayabāhu I had to spend much of his time and resources on preliminary preparations. His newly founded kingdom did not have the necessary resources for the task and therefore, according to the Culavamsa, he sought help from the king of Rāmaṇṇa for his worthy cause.

Why did Vijayabāhu select Burma as his ally against the Colās? Previously, when the rulers of Ceylon had needed military aid they had often turned to South India for help. But Vijayabāhu's

---

1 Basham, op.cit., pp.16-19; UHC, Vol.I, pt.2, pp.417 ff; Wijetunga, op.cit. These points have been dealt with at length in this doctoral thesis.
3 Cv, LVIII, 8-10.
struggle was against a South Indian empire and, moreover, one that was predominant in the south during the early decades of the eleventh century. Cola military strength was much superior to that of any other contemporary ruler in South India and therefore Vijayabahu knew very well it would be impossible to get any help from that region. Even if the other South Indian kingdoms had been ready to help the Sinhalese ruler, there would have been practical difficulties in the way of sending troops, as the Colas were dominant on both land and sea.

Burma, on the other hand, was a growing political power during the eleventh century A.D. Anawrahta (A.D.1044-1070) not only captured Thaton, or Lower Burma, but also made extensive conquests in the Malay Peninsula. According to the Burmese chronicles, when a Khmer invasion came to Pegu in the middle of the eleventh century, Anawrahta's help was sought and an army under his general Kyanzittha defeated the enemy. The capture of Thaton resulted in the submission of the whole of the Irrawaddy delta thus 'opening a window on the sea for the Burmese' in the

---

north. Though the Burmese chronicles are silent about Anawrahta's conquests south of Thaton, the archaeological evidence shows that not only Anawrahta, but also his son Saw Lu, had control over the northern part of the Malay Peninsula up to Mergui. These rulers have left their seals, in the form of Buddhist votive tablets with their signatures, in a wide region from Bhamo in the north to Tenasserim in the south. Recently one of Anawrahta's seals was recovered in Mergui. Anawrahta also had some political influence even in the Menam valley. To the west, the north of Arakan came under his sway and he seems to have pushed on to Chittagong.

All this evidence shows that Burma was really powerful under Anawrahta, and Vijayabahu I would have been informed of this. According to Ceylonese sources some of the Buddhist monks who

---

1 Coedès, The Indianized States, p.150.
2 Ibid., p.150; Luce, 'Some Old References to the South of Burma and Ceylon', op.cit., pp.270-71; Luce, 'The Career of Htilaing (Kyanzittha)', op.cit., p.59.
3 Luce, 'Some Old References to the South of Burma and Ceylon', op.cit., p.271.
5 Harvey, History of Burma, pp.29-30; Coedès, The Indianized States, p.150.
left Ceylon because of the Cola occupation went to the country of Rāmañña.¹ These Buddhist monks too were eager to see the Island freed from the foreign rule, and they could easily have informed their brethren in the mother country about the political power and the wealth of the Burmese ruler. Having come to know all this, Vijayabāhu sent envoys seeking help for the great task which he had taken upon himself.

According to the Culavamsa, these envoys were sent to the country of Rāmañña with costly gifts, and shiploads of goods were sent in return. The king was able to win over his soldiers by distributing these goods.² This passage in the Culavamsa has been differently interpreted by various historians. Nilakanta Sastri is of the opinion that Vijayabāhu did not get what he expected. According to him 'the ruler of Burma ... had evidently no inclination to entangle himself in the wars of a distant land. The mission sent by Vijayabāhu got him no additional military strength and virtually resolved itself into a trade or courtesy enterprise'.³

² Cv, LVIII, 8-10.
³ Nilakanta Sastri, 'Vijayabāhu I, the Liberator of Lāṅka', op.cit., p.49.
Though the king of Burma had no 'inclination to entangle himself in the wars of a distant land', he had reason to respond to Vijayabahu's request for help against the Coḷas. It appears that, from his influence, which extended beyond the limit of Anawrahta's actual conquests as far as the Isthmus of Kra, the king of Burma was trying to control the route through the Isthmus to the east. This land route, which connects the Indian Ocean with the Gulf of Siam, was very important in those days, especially as the kingdom of Śrīvijaya controlled the sea route through the straits.¹ Earlier, Śrīvijaya had more or less controlled this land route as well, and in fact - according to Wolters - its very emergence as a maritime empire was due to these trade routes.² Although the Coḷas failed to gain political supremacy over regions belonging to the Śrīvijaya empire, they tried to break its monopoly of trade in the Malay Peninsula and the nearby islands by invading the important trading centres of this empire.³ However, this aim was not fully successful as far

¹ For this land route see Quaritch Wales, 'A Newly Explored Route of Ancient Indian Expansion, IAL, Vol.IX (1935), pp.1-35.
² Wolters, Early Indonesian Commerce, pp.229 ff.
as the sea route through the straits was concerned because we
know that the rulers of Srīvijaya continued to hold full power
over that region even after the Coḷa invasion.¹ However, the
Coḷa invasion weakened the authority of the Srīvijaya empire
in the Malay Peninsula, and archaeological evidence in Takuapa
and Kedah shows that the Coḷas were actively participating in
this eastern trade through the Isthmus of Kra.² The powerful
navy of the Coḷas would have prevented others from making much
profit from this route and it is not impossible that they levied
taxes on all merchants making use of it. In order to derive any
benefit from his newly conquered territory, therefore, Anawrahta
would have endeavoured to reduce the Coḷa naval activities in
this part of the Indian Ocean. Ceylon, due to her strategic
situation, was a centre of maritime activity, and as such useful
to the Coḷas in their eastern trade. Therefore, if Ceylon
regained her independence, one of the key points of the Coḷas
could be lost.

Furthermore Burma too suffered from an invasion by Raḷendraka
Coḷa. According to the inscriptions of this ruler,

¹ Nilakanta Sastri, History of Srīvijaya, pp.66 ff.
² A. Lamb, 'Miscellaneous Papers on Early Hindu and Buddhist
Settlements in Northern Malaya and Southern Thailand',
Maḩappalām was one of the places invaded by him in A.D. 1025. ¹ Coedès identified this as a place on the coast of Pegu, in the light of a reference to Papphāla in the Ceylonese chronicle, and Nilakanta Sastri agreed with him. ² Thus Cola influence was felt in these southern provinces of Burma, and Anawrahta would have wanted to free his kingdom of any foreign influence.

The fact that Theravāda Buddhism was the common Faith of Burma and Ceylon, would have been another reason for helping Vijayabāhu against the Colas. Anawrahta would have been informed by the Sinhalese monks who fled to Burma for protection of the damage caused by the invaders' occupation of Ceylon and they probably appealed to him for help. Thus the king of Burma had every reason — commercial, political and religious — to aid Vijayabāhu in his difficult position.

There is no doubt about Vijayabāhu receiving economic aid from Anawrahta, for the Culavamsa says that, following Vijayabāhu's request, ships arrived in Ceylon laden with camphor, sandalwood and other valuable goods. ³ This would have eased

---

¹ Nilakanta Sastri, The Colas, p. 216; Nilakanta Sastri, History of Śrīvijaya, pp. 79 ff.
³ Cv, LVIII, 8-10.
Vijayabahu's situation, as he was confined to Rohana, where his resources were severely strained due to the Cola inroads, and probably also to the pressure of population caused by the refugees who had fled from the Cola occupation of the north of the Island.\(^1\) Luce's opinion is that Anawrahta had already conquered the Malay region when he received the envoys of Vijayabahu, and that the various commodities he sent were mostly Malayan products such as camphor and sandalwood.\(^2\) Distribution of these luxury goods would have greatly helped the ruler to recruit soldiers for his army.

The evidence provided by the *Cūlavamsa* does not make clear whether Vijayabahu received any military support from the Burmese ruler. Luce has drawn attention to a passage in the Burmese chronicles in connection with Kyanzittha (A.D.1086-1112), who was also a contemporary of Vijayabahu I, which has some bearing on the latter's relations with Burma. The reference is as follows:

---

1. Sirima Wickramasinghe, 'Ceylon's Relations with South-east Asia, with Special Reference to Burma', op.cit., p.42.
2. Luce, 'Some Old References to the South of Burma and Ceylon', op.cit., p.271.
At the time of the king's anointing [A.D.1086] the king's generals brought him Tamil-Indian prisoners of war, saying "We have conquered the Indian country with Thandaung ("Iron Mountain") and Nga-thôn-pinlè ("Sea of Na Sum?"). And he made the Indians live in quarters at Singu.

Luce interprets this passage as follows:

The royal bodyguard of the kings of Ceylon consisted largely of Tamil mercenaries, the Velaiikkara regiment. In 1085, when they were ordered to invade Tamil territory and attack their kinsmen, they mutinied, burnt the royal palace, and drove the king out of his capital. It was only after heavy fighting, that the mutiny was crushed. The Tamil-Grantha inscription ..., records their vow of loyalty hereafter. Could Aniruddha have supplied his friend Vijayabāhu I with a token force to join this royal bodyguard? Could it have refused to join the Tamils in their mutiny, and take active part in the crushing of it?

The evidence is too meagre for a definite conclusion to be reached, but it is not impossible that this defeat of the Indians could have happened in Burma itself. There would have been Cola settlements in Southern Burma as a result of Rājendra's invasion and Kyanzittha's generals may have defeated them, or perhaps some other Indians who had settled there even earlier. On the other hand, it is also possible to interpret this passage in another way in the light of the Čulavamsa account. It could

1 Glass Palace Chronicle of the Kings of Burma, p.106.
2 Luce, 'Some Old References to the South of Burma and Ceylon', op.cit., p.247; Luce, The Career of Htilaing Min (Kyanzittha), op.cit., p.67, note 4.
have been that when King Anawrahta sent ships laden with commodities, he also sent some troops to Vijayabahu. After the Cola expulsion they may have spent some time in Ceylon, returning to Burma with some Tamil prisoners of war just before the coronation of Kyanzittha. However, there is no other evidence to support such a hypothesis, and therefore at present we cannot be sure whether Vijayabahu received any military help from Anawrahta.

In addition to the Culavamsa account which would lead us to believe that the king of Ceylon received some help from Burma in expelling the Colas, there is contemporary evidence pointing to close religious contacts between the two countries during Vijayabahu's time, and this will be dealt with later.

After the expulsion of the Colas, Vijayabahu united the Island under one banner, but this unity did not last long, and then followed a period of anarchy and civil war in Ceylon. After the death of Vijayabahu two factions arose, one led by the uparaja Jayabahu, Vijayabahu's younger brother, and the other by the Adipada Vikramabahu, Vijayabahu's elder son.¹ Thus once again a series of civil wars started and a number

¹ Cv, LXI-LXXI.
of petty kingdoms emerged. In the Culavamsa there is no mention of Ceylon having had relations with the countries of South-east Asia during this troubled period until the accession of Parakramabahu I. But the Culavamsa account of the invasion of Burma by Parakramabahu leads us to believe that friendly relations were maintained even during this politically unsettled period. According to the Culavamsa:

The rulers of the island of Lanka and the monarchs of Ramanna were both in like manner true disciples of the Sugata [Buddha]. Hence all former monarchs in both countries in deeply-rooted trust, filled with friendly feeling were wont to send each other many costly gifts and in this way for a long time to maintain intercourse without dissension. Also with King Parakramabahu I the monarch of Ramanna kept up friendly relations even as former rulers who had for a long time held firmly to him.

We are not certain whether the author of the chronicle refers here to the relations between Ceylon and Burma during the reign of Vijayabahu I, which he has already mentioned, or to the continuation of such contacts by the rulers in the period between the death of Vijayabahu and the accession of Parakramabahu I (A.D.1110-1153). Hence the monks Vijayabahu invited from Burma would have maintained close relations with

---

1 Basham, 'The Background to the Rise of Parakramabahu I', op.cit., p.20.
2 Cv, LXXVI, 12-14.
Burma even after establishing themselves in Ceylon, and though
the rulers were involved in local politics, they would have
helped the monks in this respect and through them maintained
normal relations with the kings of Burma. That may be why the
Cūlavamsa says that friendly relations were maintained by all
monarchs until the reign of Parākramabāhu I. Unfortunately
the Burmese chronicles do not throw any light on such problems.

Parākramabāhu I, after a series of civil wars with the
other rulers of Ceylon, was able to bring the Island under
one flag once again, and he ascended the throne at Polonnaruva
in A.D. 1153.¹ Peace and order were restored and the economy
of his kingdom was strengthened by the promotion of
agriculture, irrigation and both internal and foreign trade.
His long reign of thirty-three years has been called the
Augustan age of Ceylonese history² and this prosperous reign
permitted him to pursue an active and ambitious foreign policy.

¹ Ibid., LXVII-LXXI; UHC, Vol. 1, pt. 2, pp. 438-460.
² G.P. Malalasekera, The Pali Literature of Ceylon, pp. 175-76;
  B.C. Law, 'The Life of King Parākramabāhu I', The Polonnaruva
  Period, p. 23.
According to the Cūlavamsa, before Parākramabāhu I intervened in South Indian politics he had led an expedition against Burma. The main theme of the Cūlavamsa account is supported by a contemporary inscription at Devanagala in the Kegalla District. According to the Cūlavamsa, when he became the ruler of Ceylon, Parākramabāhu kept up the friendly relations with Burma that had been maintained by the previous rulers, and exchanged costly gifts. From the long list of causes which led to the eventual break-up of the friendship between the two countries, it appears that both rulers maintained envoys in the other's country. The Sinhalese envoy at the Burmese court received maintenance from the current ruler of Burma. Similarly, the Burmese envoy in Ceylon, called Tapassin according to the Cūlavamsa, enjoyed the same privileges, because the Ceylonese chronicle says that the king of Ceylon conferred upon him every distinction.

1 Cv, LXXVI, 10-75.
2 Cv, LXXVI, 16.
3 Ibid., 23-24.
According to the Burmese chronicle *Hmannan*, Alaungsithu (A.D.1112-1167), the ruler of Burma contemporary with Parākramabāhu I, is said to have visited Ceylon. He married a daughter of the Sinhalese ruler and returned to Burma with an image of Maha Kassapa Thera, which was highly venerated in Ceylon.  

1 This Burmese chronicle goes on to say that the Burmese king appointed his representative in Ceylon, most probably with the rank of an ambassador, who later was found to be corrupt.  

2 Although the visit of the Burmese king to Ceylon and his marriage to a Sinhalese princess find no support in any of the Ceylonese sources, both Burmese and Ceylonese sources agree on the appointment of a Burmese envoy to Ceylon.  

3 It is not clear what the function of these envoys was, though the summoning of the Sinhalese envoys and forcing them to sign a statement, as discussed below, suggests that they had the power to act as the representatives of their countries. They could also have worked as trade commissioners in helping to promote trade between the two countries.

---

2 Ibid.
3 Sirima Wickramasinghe, *'Ceylon's Relations with South-east Asia, with Special Reference to Burma'* , op.cit., p.51.
4 Harvey, *History of Burma*, p.57.
The *Cūlavamsa* says that after his return from Ceylon, the Burmese envoy reported to his master something which led to the eventual ending of the friendship between the two rulers.¹ But no details are given and it is not easy to determine or imagine what information the envoy could have conveyed to the Burmese king. According to the Ceylonese chronicle, the Burmese king caught sight of a letter addressed to himself in the hands of the Sinhalese envoys and, alleging that they were envoys sent to Cambodia, seized them.² Later the Burmese captured a princess sent to Cambodia by Parākramabāhu.³ Thus it seems that from the envoy's report the King of Burma suspected the Sinhalese envoys of having contact with the rival king of Cambodia. From the reference to the princess, it does indeed appear that Parākramabāhu I had close contacts with Cambodia, though we do not have much evidence to prove it. A mission may have been a reply to the request of the king of Cambodia.⁴ If there

¹ *Cv*, LXXVI, 14.
² Ibid., LXXVI, 21-22.
³ Ibid., LXXVI, 35.
⁴ Dharanindravarman II (A.D.1150-1160) and Yaśovarman II (A.D.1160-1166) were the contemporaries of Parākramabāhu I in Cambodia, before the latter's invasion of Burma. If a mission came from any of these rulers, the date is uncertain.
had been a Cambodian mission of that sort, it may have come to Ceylon when the Burmese envoy was there and he may have come to know the aim of the mission and Parākramabāhu's response to it, and reported to his master about Parākramabāhu's new ally. If the Burmese left the Island while the preparations were being made for Parākramabāhu's mission, including a Sinhalese princess for the Cambodian ruler, the Burmese would have expected the Sinhalese envoys to pass through the land route across the Isthmus en route for Cambodia. That was why they suspected that even though these Sinhalese envoys were carrying a letter addressed to the Burmese king himself, they were in fact being sent to Cambodia.

Though we have no records of direct contacts between Burma and the kingdom of Cambodia at this time (the middle of the twelfth century), it appears that the rapid expansion of Cambodia under Suryavarman II aroused the suspicion of the King of Burma. The History of the Sung dynasty states that during Suryavarman II's reign, 'Chenla (Cambodia) was bordered by the southern frontiers of Chang-ch'eng (Champa) in the north, by the sea to the east, by P'u-kan (the kingdom of Pagan) in the west, and by Chia-lo-hsi (Grahi, in the region of Chaiya and the Bay of Bandon on the east coast of the
Malay Peninsula) in the South.¹ Thus Cambodia was expanding towards the west, and in fact most of Suryavarman's inscriptions have been found in what is now Thailand and Laos.² The local chronicles of this region support this suggestion.³ Thus King Suryavarman II was operating quite close to the kingdom of Pagan and probably the King of Burma saw how this territory became a prey to him, and feared that the next victim would be the Burmese kingdom itself.

Furthermore, the Cambodian rulers were in close contact with Grahi, the narrow region of the Malay Peninsula. In fact, it is believed that the dynasty of Suryavarman came from this region.⁴ Cambodian control of this Isthmian region of the Malay Peninsula would have affected Burmese trade. The interest taken by the Burmese ruler Alaungsithu in commercial activities is proved by the statement in the Hmannan that he standardized all weights and measures.⁵ Furthermore, his frequent journeys to Malaya would have really been to the

¹ Ma Tuan-lin, Ethnographie des peuples étrangères à la Chinois ..., ouvrage composé du xiii siècle (1883), pp.485-88; Coedès, The Indianized States, pp.161-62.
⁵ Glass Palace Chronicle, p.113.
portage routes, 'and they were made to ensure that the Burmese control over them remained unimpaired.' He made sure that Tenasserim was under his full control, mainly because of the volume of trade carried on through that region.¹ There may have been commercial reasons for Parākramabāhu wanting closer relations with Cambodia, but the King of Burma would not have tolerated Ceylon, one of his strongest friends, turning towards Cambodia, which was a threat to Burma's political and economic prospects.

According to the Culavamsa, the king of Burma acted immediately and created many difficulties for the Ceylonese merchants in Burma. He issued orders which seriously affected Ceylon's elephant trade with Burma. He is said to have stopped selling elephants to foreign countries², while at the same time increasing the prices of elephants from a hundred or thousand silver nikkhalas to two or three thousand.³ He also did away with the old custom of presenting an elephant to every vessel conveying gifts.⁴ Further he captured the elephants, money

¹ Htin Aung, A History of Burma, p. 45.
² Cv, LXXVI, 17.
³ Ibid., 18–19.
⁴ Ibid., 20.
and vessels of Sinhalese envoys. In addition he seized the gifts and goods which the ruler of Ceylon had sent to buy elephants, promising that he would give elephants and silver money in return.

From this account in the Culavamsa it appears that the elephant trade between Ceylon and Burma was important at that time and that most of the restrictions made by the Burmese ruler concerned that trade. However, the chronicler is not clear when he says that after stopping the sale of elephants to foreign countries, the Burmese King greatly increased their price. If he had in fact stopped these sales, there would have been no question of any increase in their price. Geiger thinks that the king of Burma stopped free trade in elephants and put in its place a royal monopoly which resulted in an enormous rise in prices. The king may have completely forbidden the sale of elephants as a temporary measure and then allowed it only as a royal monopoly.

---

1 Ibid., 24-25.
2 Ibid., 33-34.
3 Sirima Wickramasinghe, 'Ceylon's Relations with South-east Asia, with Special Reference to Burma', op.cit., p.44.
4 Geiger, Cy, tr. p.65, note 5.
Ceylon's forests had been rich in elephants\(^1\) from very early times, and the Island was well known to foreigners for its elephants.\(^2\) Therefore it is surprising that Ceylon imported elephants during the twelfth century A.D. Megasthenes says that in the third century B.C. Ceylon exported elephants.\(^3\) Barbosa, in the seventeenth century, states that the sale of elephants was a royal monopoly.\(^4\) Sirima Wickramasinghe suggests that when more land was opened up, Ceylon ran short of elephants until the growth of jungles, following the decline of Polonnaruva, meant that the elephants once more became plentiful. This would explain why elephants were imported into Ceylon from Burma to meet this shortage.\(^5\) C.W. Nicholas's opinion is that Ceylon exported elephants which were much prized for their intelligence and docility, but they produced the lowest rate of tuskers.

---


\(^{4}\) *The Book of Duarte Barbosa*, p.115.

\(^{5}\) Sirima Wickramasinghe, 'The Age of Parākramabāhu I', p.204, note 3.
Therefore the only object of importing elephants to Ceylon was to secure tusked animals.¹

It is also possible to explain this importation of elephants into Ceylon in a different manner. The only other writer who says that Ceylon imported elephants is Cosmas², who wrote in the sixth century A.D. From his account it appears that Ceylon was a centre of maritime trade during this time. He says:

The island being, as it is, in a central position, is much frequented by ships from all parts of India and from Persia and Ethiopia, and it likewise sends out many of its own. And from remotest countries, I mean Tzinista and other trading places, it receives silk, aloes, cloves, sandalwood and other products, and then again are passed on to marts on this side...³

Thus Ceylon was an emporium for foreign merchants in the sixth century. They imported various commodities from eastern countries and exported them to the western world. Therefore the elephants brought by the Sinhalese would have been for re-exportation, by merchants coming from the west.

³ Ibid.,pp.365-66.
During the reign of Parākramabāhu I also, Ceylon enjoyed the same importance in foreign trade and therefore, though the Island had elephants to export, the demand may have been so high that Ceylon had to import animals from the other countries to meet it. In later days one of the chief exports to South India was elephants.¹ According to Abdur Razzak, who wrote in about the middle of the fifteenth century, elephants were exported to India from Ceylon.² In the sixteenth century, Barbosa says that elephants from Ceylon were sold to the merchants of Coramandel, Narsingua, Malabar, Danquem and Cambaia.³ The same state of affairs may have prevailed during the reign of Parākramabāhu I, and to meet the demand Ceylonese merchants would have imported some from Burma. In this connection there is a contemporary inscription which has some relevance. This inscription, which was issued by Parākramabāhu I in the latter half of the twelfth century A.D. and found at Nainativu (modern Nāgadīpa) in the Jaffna district, says that if vessels which bring elephants and

³ The Book of Duarte Barbosa, p.113.
horses to Ceylon get wrecked, a fourth share of the cargo should be taken by the treasury. Thus it is clear that elephants were imported to Ceylon and the king took a special interest in this trade.

There is yet another suggested explanation for the restrictions made by the Burmese ruler on the elephant trade. According to Ma Tuan-lin, during the reign of Suryavarman II Cambodia had about 200,000 elephants in her army. Though this number is an exaggeration, it appears that the Cambodian king did have a very large number of elephants, and the Burmese ruler, who had heard of the strength of the Cambodian army, would have forbidden the export of elephants because they were needed for his own army in case of a war with Cambodia. On the other hand, although the jungles of Cambodia and the adjoining region under her sway would have supplied most of the elephants, Cambodia may also have imported them. If this was so, it is possible that the Sinhalese merchants provided some of them, since Cambodia was unable to get them directly from Burma. If the king of Burma came to know that this was so, they may have

---

2 Ma Tuan-lin, op.cit., p.487.
3 Briggs, The Ancient Khmer Empire, p.189.
caused him to take action immediately and impose all sorts of restrictions on the elephant trade.

Apart from these restrictions on trade, the Burmese king is said to have maltreated the Ceylonese envoys on several occasions. When the Burmese king made the allegation that the envoys carrying a letter addressed to him by the king of Ceylon were, in fact, being sent to Cambodia, all their belongings were taken from them and they were thrown into a fortress in what the text calls 'the Malaya country'. The *Cūlavamsa* says that the Burmese king took all the money, elephants and vessels belonging to the Ceylonese envoys, had blocks of wood fastened to their feet, causing them great pain, and employed them in the work of sprinkling water. Finally he summoned them and forced them to sign a declaration saying that thereafter no vessel from Ceylon should be sent to his country, and if messengers were sent again, no blame of any kind would attach to him if he put them to death. He refused to let the envoys return until they had appended their signatures to the declaration. In addition to this incident, the Buddhist teacher Vāgissara and

---


another scholar, Dhammakitti, were sent back to Ceylon in a leaky vessel.¹ On another occasion the king of Burma took all the goods and gifts brought by some Sinhalese merchants, promising them elephants and money in return but not keeping his promise.²

Thus though the chronicler gives several instances of how the Sinhalese were maltreated by the Burmese king, it appears that he was rather hazy about these incidents. A further instance is given of the Burmese king preventing an Indian prince from landing in Burma as among the causes of hostility³, but what the chronicler meant is not clear. The narrative appears to have no direct relevance to the main story, and it may have been included only in order to show the evil ways of the Burmese king.⁴ Furthermore, it appears as if the chronicler gives different versions of the same incident as different incidents.⁵

In any case it seems that the main causes of the hostilities were the enforcement of restrictions on trade and the maltreatment

¹ Ibid., 32.
² Ibid., 33-34.
³ Ibid., 26-27.
⁵ Sirima Wickramasinghe, 'Ceylon's Relations with South-east Asia, with Special Reference to Burma', op.cit., p.45.
of the envoys. The *Cūlavamsa* account is an extremely one-sided story.\(^1\) There may well have been serious offences on the part of the Ceylonese also that led the king of Burma to take such steps. Either the chronicler was unaware of these facts or he wanted to defend the Ceylonese. Unfortunately we do not have the Burmese side of the story. When the king stopped the free trade in elephants, the Sinhalese merchants would have perhaps smuggled them and thus carried on illicit trade.\(^2\) Furthermore the Sinhalese king would have offended the Burmese ruler, who was losing both politically and economically by the opening of Sinhalese diplomatic and commercial relations with Cambodia. In defending the Burmese chronicles for not recording this episode, Duroiselle says that the king of Pagan was not aware of what was happening in the maritime provinces and all the treacherous activities against the Ceylonese were carried out by a local ruler.\(^3\) However, the fact remains that during this period Lower Burma and Pagan were united, with the king of Pagan trying to gain complete control of the maritime region, mainly because of its overseas trade. The sources give us

\(^1\) Ibid.


\(^3\) *RSASB* (1920), p.19.
every reason to believe that the provincial rulers carried out orders which were evidently issued by the king, but it is quite possible that they were more ruthless than the Pagan ruler demanded.

From the *Culavamsa* account it is clear that the Burmese restrictions badly affected Ceylon's foreign trade, for which the contacts with the countries of the east were as important as those with India and the western world. The South-east Asian countries and China provided many luxury commodities for the world market, and Ceylon, due to her geographical situation, had a considerable share in this maritime trade.¹ The Śrīvijaya empire was so placed as to be able to obstruct any ship from the west trading with China. The Colas struggled to break the Śrīvijaya monopoly and to gain control of these maritime trade routes, and they were able to free the Isthmian passage from Śrīvijayan control. From the finds of Takuapa, it appears that after Rajendra's expedition the Colas took an active part in trade, using the overland route joining the Indian Ocean and the Gulf of Siam.² The account given by Chau Ju-kua shows that in the thirteenth century Śrīvijaya was still controlling the

² Lamb, 'Miscellaneous...', op.cit., p.67, note 2.
routes through the straits, however. Thus even in the thirteenth century ships passing through the straits had to pay heavy duties to the Mahārāja of Srīvijaya.

Foreign merchants had established trading posts in Ceylon centuries before the reign of Parākramabāhu. According to Idrisi, the Arab geographer who wrote in A.D. 1154, ships from foreign countries frequented the shores of Ceylon. He mentions among Ceylon's exports, silk and a profusion of perfumes. These are not products of Ceylon and would have been imported and then transshipped. From the account of the Burmese war and the Sinhalese king's invasion of South India given in the Cūlavamsa, it appears that he had a fleet, and thus he may himself have actively participated in this trade. Thus one of the reasons why he was interested in appointing envoys to Burma may have been so that they could look after such trading activities among their other duties. Parākramabāhu's interest in the foreign trade is well attested by the Nainativu Tamil inscription issued by him. It says:

1 Hirth and Rockhill, Chau Ju-kua, pp.60-62.
2 Al-Idrisī, India and the Neighbouring Territories, tr. S. Maqbul Ahmad, pp.28-29.
3 Harvey, History of Burma, p.57.
... that foreigners should come and stay at Üratturai, that they should be protected, and that foreigners from many ports should come and gather in our ports; as we like elephants and horses, if the vessels which bring elephants and horses unto us get wrecked, a fourth (share of the cargo) should be taken by the treasury and the (other) three parts should be left to the owner; and, if vessels (laden) with merchandise get wrecked an exact half should be taken by the treasury and (the other) exact half should be left to the owner. This regulation shall be (enforced) as long as the sun and moon last.

Because of the power of the Srivijaya empire and the heavy duties levied on foreign ships, the Sinhalese merchants would have preferred to use the overland route which was then under the influence of the Burmese ruler. The ruler of Ceylon would have encouraged them in this and would also have wanted to come to a trade agreement with Cambodia.

From the Chinese sources it appears that Cambodia too was interested in foreign trade, especially with China. Early in the reign of King Suryavarman II, diplomatic relations with China, which had been interrupted, it seems, for several reigns, were resumed. Ma Tuan-lin says that in A.D.1116, 1117 and 1120 missions arrived in China from Chenla (Cambodia). He adds that difficulties relating to trade were examined and regulated during the period between A.D.1131 and 1147. ² Thus Cambodia had engaged

2 Ma Tuan-lin, op.cit., pp.485-488; Coedès, The Indianized States, pp.159 and 162.
in active trade with the empire of China for a considerable period and the king of Ceylon may have sent his envoys with a view to participating in it. The Ceylonese merchants would have taken commodities up to the Isthmus by sea and thence by land to Cambodia. Cambodian merchants then took on to China both the products of their own country and the merchandise brought by Ceylonese and other merchants. In return the Ceylonese merchants would have received Chinese and South-east Asian goods, and this may have been one means by which Chinese products like silk and perfumes reached Ceylon.

According to Paranavitana, in order to prevent Parākramabāhu I maintaining contact with the kingdom of Cambodia, the Maharaja of Śrīvijaya won over the Burmese monarch to his side and blocked the route to Cambodia, the traditional enemy of Śrīvijaya. But during this period there is no evidence whatsoever of contacts between Burma and Śrīvijaya. Therefore we must assume that it was the king of Burma who wanted to prevent Parākramabāhu from having contact with the kingdom of Cambodia and that Parākramabāhu had no alternative but to lead an expedition against Burma to force the Lord of the White Elephants to give him the facilities that he required.

Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, p.69.
Parākramabāhu I summoned his ministers and declared that the king of Burma must either be captured or slain. The Cūlavamsa account says that a Damilādhikārin named Ādicca took on the task 'as it was not important enough to be undertaken by higher officers'. The king accepted his suggestion and placed all the troop leaders under his command. It is not clear whether these words of the chronicle represent actual facts or merely imply that the chronicler wanted to show that Parākramabāhu did not take his expedition too seriously. But from the extent of the preparations for the invasion mentioned in the account, it appears that they were planning for a large-scale war. The coast became a workshop for building ships and making other equipment. In addition to armour and normal weapons of war, the troops were equipped with special arrows for use against war elephants. The ships were provisioned for as long as a year, and nurses, physicians and medicines were provided. It took about five months to complete the necessary arrangements before the

1 Adhikārin was a military officer with a title similar to commander. The Damilādhikārin must be the commander of the Veḷakkāra or the Tamil forces who were in the service of the Sinhalese rulers. For Adhikārin see Geiger, Culture of Ceylon in Mediaeval Times, p.150; for Veḷakkāra see Geiger, 'Army and War in Mediaeval Ceylon', The Polonnaruva Period, pp.153-68.

2 For armour and weapons see Geiger, 'Army and War in Mediaeval Ceylon', loc.cit.
ships assembled in Pallavavañka. After making all necessary preparations the fleet set sail.

In spite of the careful preparations, an adverse wind prevented the operation from working to plan. The Culavamsa says that some of the ships were driven off-course by the wind and ended up on foreign shores. One ship arrived at Crows' island, where the soldiers fought a battle and captured several of the inhabitants whom they brought back to Ceylon. Ultimately only six ships reached Burma, of which five arrived at Kusumi and one at Papphālama. The soldiers under the command of Nagaragiri Kitti who landed at Kusumi defeated the Rāmaṇa army, and destroyed many trees and burnt many villages. The forces which landed at Papphālama fought a fearful battle there under the command of the Damilādhikārīn and plunged the country of Rāmaṇa into utter confusion. Then, says the Culavamsa, the Sinhalese burst into Ukkama, slew the monarch, and subdued the land of Rāmaṇa, after which the two leaders mounted a white

2 Cv, LXXVI, 45-56.
3 Kakadīpa. Geiger thinks that it is one of the Andaman Islands. Cv, tr., LXXVI, 57, p.65, note 6.
4 Cv, LXXVI, 59-62.
elephant and rode round the city proclaiming the supremacy of the Sinhalese.  

The people of Rāmaṇa met together and decided to give any number of elephants to the Sinhalese king annually. They sent messengers with letters to Buddhist monks of Ceylon, through whose intervention a treaty was made and the old friendship was resumed.

Though the Culavamsa states that only six ships reached Burma, the description of the battle implies that a very large army was involved. The chronicler does not explain how a few twelfth century ships could transport enough men to ravage half of Burma. However, if we are to believe the Chinese evidence, in the middle of the T'ang period the Ceylonese ships were said to be the largest foreign ships known to the Chinese. According to this description, these large ships were about 200 feet long and could hold six to seven hundred men. Therefore the ships which succeeded in reaching Burma might have transported at least a few thousand soldiers. But even such numbers would not have

1 Ibid., 63-68.
2 Ibid., 69-75.
3 Harvey, History of Burma, p.328.
been sufficient for conducting a large scale war and it is quite probable that the chronicle has exaggerated the expedition, which seems to have been only a successful raid on some of the ports of Lower Burma.  

Kusumi has been identified as Bassein, and it is mentioned in the Devanagala inscription as the place attacked by Kit Nuvaragala. Papphalama, where the Damilādhikārin landed, has been identified as Pappālam, one of the places attacked by Rajendra Cola in South-east Asia. Coedès considers it to be a place on the coast of Pegu. The third place Ukkama, where the king of Rāmaṇa is said to have been killed, has not yet been identified conclusively. Sirima Wickramasinghe suggests that it was Martaban, also known in early days as Muhtma or Muttama. If this identification is accepted all the three places captured by the Ceylonese soldiers were important ports in Lower Burma. The aim of the Ceylonese expedition was to lift the trade barriers imposed by the Burmese ruler, and therefore it is quite natural for the Ceylonese army to have attacked these ports.

1 Sirima Wickramasinghe, 'Ceylon's Relations with South-east Asia, with Special Reference to Burma', op.cit., pp.48-49.
2 Harvey, History of Burma, p.57.
3 EZ, Vol.III, no.34, pp.312 ff.
4 See supra pp.37-38.
5 Sirima Wickramasinghe, 'Ceylon's Relations with South-east Asia, with Special Reference to Burma', op.cit., p.48.
During the Pagan period Lower Burma was under provincial rulers subject to the king of Pagan. The provincial ruler would have had a small army for security purposes and such a force would not have been powerful enough to resist the attack of the Ceylonese army, which may be why they surrendered after the loss of their ruler. Though the king of Ceylon wanted to capture or kill the Burmese ruler of Arimaddana (Pagan) the loss of the ships blown off course meant that the army was not powerful enough to proceed further. But it was strong enough to subdue the provincial government of Lower Burma before it had time to get help from Pagan owing to the difficulties of communication in those days. Therefore the provincial government had no alternative but to come to an agreement with the Ceylonese commanders to be approved by the central government later. About this time the threat from the Khmer empire eased, since the successors of Suryavarman II were weak and Cambodia itself had to face attacks by the Chams on the opposite frontier, and this too would have helped to bring about a peaceful settlement. It is not clear why the people of Ramañña decided to send their messengers with a letter to the Buddhist monks in Ceylon and not directly to the king. It is probable that the Buddhist monks in Lower Burma,

1 Htin Aung, A History of Burma, p.45.
2 Coedès, The Indianized States, pp.163-64.
who had close contacts with Ceylon, took an active part in bringing about a settlement. Therefore Buddhist monks who were waiting to go on a pilgrimage to the holy island of Ceylon, were included in the mission to convey a message to the Sinhalese ruler. Upon their arrival in the Island they would have been met by their brethren and gone with them to meet Parākramabāhu and conveyed the message of peace.¹

The success of the Ceylonese raid is confirmed by the contemporary inscription at Devanagala.² The Ra,"avaliya too, says that Parākramabāhu levied tribute from Aramaṇa or Burma.³

According to the Devanagala inscription, Parākramabāhu granted land to Kit Nuvaragala for the services he had rendered in this Burmese war. Luce states that as a result of this campaign, Parākramabāhu I gained control over the Isthmian route,⁴ but there is no evidence of any such political control. Thereafter

---
¹ In A.D.1180 a group of monks headed by Uttarajīva came to Ceylon on a pilgrimage and Coedes tried to link this and the mission that went to Ceylon at the end of Parākramabāhu's invasion of Burma. This was due to the incorrect date given to that invasion i.e. 1180 which actually took place about ten or eleven years earlier than the arrival of Uttarajīva in Ceylon. Coedes, The Indianized States, pp.177-78. For details of Uttarajīva's pilgrimage see infra pp.238 ff.
² Ez, Vol.III, no.34, pp.312 ff. Kit Nuvaragala mentioned in this inscription must be the same person mentioned in the Cūlavamsa as Nagaragiri Kittī, who attacked Kusumi.
⁴ Luce, 'Some Old References to the South of Burma and Ceylon', op.cit., p.276.
free passage would have been allowed to the Ceylonese merchants and the trade barriers would have been lifted. After the Burmese war of Parākramabāhu I had ended in this way, cultural contacts between the two countries were resumed.

The date of the expedition can be roughly fixed on the evidence of the Devanagala inscription, which is dated in the twelfth regnal year of Parākramabāhu. Writers such as Duroiselle and Harvey, taking A.D. 1164 as Parākramabāhu's date of accession without knowing of the existence of this inscription, fixed A.D. 1180 as the date of the invasion. Coedès too accepted this and he suggested in addition that the visit of some Buddhist monks to Ceylon recorded in the Burmese sources could be connected with the agreement reached at the end of the invasion.

But the accession of Parākramabāhu I to the throne has now been fixed conclusively from epigraphical evidence and the chronicles as A.D. 1153. The Devanagala inscription was issued after the invasion was over, therefore it must have taken place early in or before Parākramabāhu's twelfth year or A.D. 1165. There is mention of 'five months' in the inscription, though it is not

---

1 EZ, Vol. III, no. 34, p. 324.
2 Duroiselle, op. cit., p. 20; Harvey, History of Burma, p. 57.
3 See supra p. 67, note 1.
clear in what connection, due to its illegibility. Since this comes after the mention of the sending of a thousand ships and the sacking of Kusumi by Kit Nuvaragala the five months referred to here may be the length of time the operation lasted. Hence if the inscription was issued at the beginning of the twelfth year of Parākramabāhu I's reign, the invasion would have taken place at the end of his eleventh year, and if the record was issued at the end of his twelfth regnal year, the expedition would have been sent at the beginning of the same year. Thus we arrive at the end of A.D.1164 or the beginning of 1165 as the date of Parākramabāhu's invasion of Burma.

According to the inscription, hostilities broke out during the reign of King Bhuvanaditya of Burma.¹ This seems to be used as a title rather than a name in the Burmese chronicles. More than one king bore this title during the Pagan period, but in editing the inscription, Paranavitana has shown that this title was attached to Alaungsithu in particular in the Burmese tradition. Therefore, as the chronology agrees with this, it may be concluded that the invasion took place during the reign of that monarch. The silence of the Burmese chronicles on the expedition may be due either to the fact that Alaungsithu had no direct connection with it, or to the loss of

¹ EZ, Vol.III, no.34, p.325.
early documents, as Duroiselle suggested. On the other hand, the invasion did not add to the glory of the kings of Burma and this fact may have caused them to ignore the incident.

The foregoing discussion shows that we first learn of Ceylon having political relations with Burma during the reign of Vijayabahu I, when he was struggling against the Coḷas. Following on previous close religious contacts, Vijayabahu succeeded in obtaining some help against his Coḷa enemy from Anawrahta, his contemporary in Burma. From the death of Vijayabahu I until the accession of Parākramabāhu I, there is no direct evidence of the continuance of such contacts, although the Culavamsa says that the former relations with Burma were maintained even during this period. Parākramabāhu I, who was interested in participating in the maritime trade in the Indian Ocean, made friendly overtures to Cambodia, which was a powerful kingdom in South-east Asia in the eleventh century. Alaungsithu, due to a similar interest in the maritime trade, and through fear of Cambodian aggression, did not approve of Parākramabāhu's foreign policy towards the Khmers, which therefore resulted in the relations between Burma and Ceylon becoming strained and hostile. To lift the barriers imposed by the Burmese ruler on

---

1 Duroiselle, op.cit., pp.17-20.
Ceylon's commercial activities in South-east Asia, the Sinhalese king was forced to invade certain ports in Lower Burma, but once this disagreement was settled friendly relations between the two countries were once more restored.
CHAPTER II

The Kāliṅga Dynasty and the theory of its South-east Asian origin

The Cūlavamsa and the inscriptions of the Kāliṅga rulers, describe the immediate successors of Parākramabāhu I as belonging to the Kāliṅga dynasty. They ruled from Polonnaruva for about fifty years between A.D.1184-1235 and this has been called the period of the Kāliṅga kings.¹ The Kāliṅga mentioned in these literary and epigraphical sources was until recently believed to be the well-known Kāliṅga region in India, which had had close contacts with the Island from the beginning of her history. But recently Paranavitana, who had earlier himself shared the traditional view,² departed from it and identified this Kāliṅga, when mentioned in Ceylonese sources from the tenth century onwards,

² Paranavitana, 'The Kāliṅga Dynasty of Ceylon', loc.cit.
as a kingdom of that name in South-east Asia. In this connection he says:

The country named Kāliṅga in this context means, not Kāliṅga on the Indian Continent, but the Śrīvijaya empire of Malaysia, a vast Buddhist realm extending over the Malay Peninsula and the islands of the East Indies....

If this theory is accepted, Ceylon had close political relations with South-east Asia during the medieval period, even closer than with the Indian Sub-continent, and it has to be accepted that South-east Asian Kingdoms played a vital role in its history. Therefore it is necessary to examine Paranavitana's theory in detail and see whether the Kāliṅga mentioned in Ceylonese sources can be taken as a kingdom in South-east Asia.

Kāliṅga is mentioned in Ceylonese sources from very early times. According to the tradition preserved in the *Mahāvamsa*, Vijaya, the first king of Ceylon, is said to have had connections with Kāliṅga. Historians believe that the

---

2 Nicholas and Paranavitana, op.cit. p.237.
3 *Mv*, VI, 1.
recol**lection of the Aryan colonization of Ceylon is preserved in the **Vijaya traditions.** If this is so, the mention of Kaliṅga records an early wave of immigrants from that part of India to Ceylon. Again during the reign of King Sirimeghavanṇa (A.D.352-79) we hear once more about Kaliṅga from the Cūlavamsa. The king of Kaliṅga, owing to the unsettled political conditions in his own kingdom, sent his daughter Hemamāla with the Tooth Relic of the Buddha to the ruler of Ceylon for its protection. Now Ceylon came into political contact with Kaliṅga for the first time when a king of the latter was defeated by enemies and took refuge in Ceylon. This friendship seems to have been further strengthened in later years by matrimonial alliances. Mahinda IV (A.D.956-972) was the first Sinhalese king to contract such an alliance with Kaliṅga, and he was followed by a number of Sinhalese rulers. After the expulsion of the

2 Cū, XXXVII, 92.
3 Ibid.; Dulaḍa-sirita, ed.Sorata, pp.28-34; Pjv, ed.Suraweera, p.97.
4 Cū, XLII, 44.
6 Cū, LIV, 9.
Coḷas from Ceylon, Vijayabāhu I had a consort named Tilokasundarī brought over from the Kaliṅga kingdom.1 This was more or less a political alliance, because Kaliṅga too had been invaded by Kulottuṅga Coḷa, and common enmity towards the Coḷas would have drawn together the Sinhalese and the Kaliṅgas.2 Madhukāṇṇava, Bhimarāja and Balakkāra, all kinsmen of Tilokasundarī, are said to have settled in Ceylon.3

These matrimonial alliances eventually led to the establishment of a Kaliṅga dynasty in Ceylon. Parākramabāhu I, who had no son to succeed him, invited a Kaliṅga prince to take over the throne on his death.4 This Vijayabāhu II (A.D.1186-1187), was the first ruler of Ceylon to come directly from Kaliṅga. The Kaliṅga dynasty starts with his reign and ends with that of Māgha, who invaded the island in A.D.1215. Niśāṇkamalla, Vikramabāhu II, Coḷagaṅga, Sāhasamalla and Māgha belong to this line.5 In their

1 Ibid, LIX, 29-30.
3 Cv, LIX, 46-47.
inscriptions some of them referred to themselves as belonging to the Kaliṅgavamsa.¹

According to Paranavitana's theory Ceylonese chronicles and literary works refer to Kaliṅga from very early times until Māgha's invasion, and even after that, without any distinction between Kaliṅga in India and the Kaliṅga that was in South-east Asia. The chroniclers knew the history of the Island better than any of their contemporaries, and if there had been any difference between the Kaliṅga of the early history and that of the mediaeval period, they would have indicated this in their chronicles. But their work gives no clue of such a distinction, and therefore it is necessary to examine Paranavitana's interpretation very closely.

Ceylon for the first time was invaded by a South-east Asian ruler, named Candrabhanū, in the reign of Parākramabāhu II (A.D.1236-70). In Ceylonese chronicles and other literary sources this invasion is mentioned as undertaken by a Jāvaka ruler.² Paranavitana, discussing

¹ EZ. Vol.II, no.36, pp.219-29.
² See infra, Chapter III, 'The invasions of Candrabhānu', pp. 155 ff.
this invasion of the Jāvaka ruler Candrabhānu says:

According to Ceylon history as at present accepted, the invasions of the Island by Candrabhānu of Tambralīṅga were not related to any event which took place before or after them, and it was only in this period that the Malay people influenced the course of the political history of Ceylon. But, if a certain detail with regard to Candrabhānu's attack on Ceylon, given in the Rājaivalī, is properly understood,...it would appear that Candrabhānu's attempt to secure the sovereignty of Ceylon for himself was the result of a long historical process, and that the people from Malaysia had played a very important part in the history of this Island. ¹

Paranavitana then analyses the data of the chronicles and other literary sources about Candrabhānu and Kaliṅga Māgha in order to see some link between this Jāvaka invasion and the Kaliṅga dynasty of Ceylon. His conclusion is that both Candrabhānu and the Kaliṅga rulers hailed from the same place, that is from Malaysia.

The Čulavamsa, Ceylon's main chronicle for the period, says that the bulk of the soldiers who invaded Ceylon under Candrabhānu were Jāvakas.² In the account of Māgha's invasion, the army with which Māgha came to the Island is given by the chronicler as consisting of Keraḷas.³ The

¹ Paranavitana. Ceylon and Malaysia, p.81
² Cv, LXXXIII, 36-39.
³ Ibid.,LXXX, 58ff.
Rājāvaliya, an eighteenth century work recording the invasion of Candrabhanu, says that he came with an army of Malalas. In the same chronicle, Māgha's soldiers too are referred to as Malalas. On the basis of this, Paranavitana says that Māgha and Candrabhanu both invaded Ceylon with armies made up of the same type of people.

The author of the Pūjāvaliya, who as we have seen was contemporary with the incidents referred to says that Māgha invaded with 24,000 Malalas. But when he records the invasion of Candrabhanu, it is said that Candrabhanu came commanding an army of Jāvakas. The author knew well that they were different people, for he says that Parākramabāhu II had to fight a Malala yuddha, a Dravida yuddha and a Jāvaka yuddha.

Paranavitana, using the Pūjāvaliya account of Māgha's invasion and the Rājāvaliya account of both invasions, came to the conclusion that Māgha and Candrabhanu both invaded

1 Rjv, ed.Gunasekera, pp.44-45.
2 Paranavitana, JCBRAS, NS, Vol.VII, pt.1, pp.6 ff; Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, pp.82ff.
3 Pjv, ed.Suraweera, p.108.
4 Ibid., p.117.
5 Ibid.
the Island with an army of Malalas. However, he did not take
into consideration the statement in the Pujavaliya that
Candrabhānu came with an army of Jāvakas or the Čulavamsa
account of Māgha and Candrabhānu.

It is clear that, except for the Rājavaliya all the
chronicles and literary works agree that the Jāvakas and
Malalas were two different peoples. The Pujavaliya places
the Jāvakas and the Malalas among the enemies with whom
Parākramabāhu II fought, and it is quite clear that they
were not the same people, otherwise he would mention only
the Jāvakas and Draviḍas or the Malalas and Draviḍas, but
not all three - Malalas, Draviḍas and Jāvakas - in a context
which indicates that they were three different peoples. Thus
whoever the Malalas may have been, they were definitely not
Jāvakas. Thus on this basis it is not possible to say that
both Māgha and Candrabhānu hailed from the same place.

Paranavitana next seeks evidence from Ceylonese sources
in order to identify the Malala with the people of the Malay
Peninsula. Though he equates the Malala with the Jāvaka, he
does not find any evidence either from the Pujavaliya or the
Rājavaliya which identifies the Malalas with the Malays.

Paranavitana, JCBRAS, NS, Vol.VII, pp.6ff; Paranavitana,
Ceylon and Malaysia, pp.82ff.
Therefore he turns to the Kāvyāśekharaya, a fifteenth-century literary work, the magnum opus of Śrī Rāhula, in which the Malala king was listed among the rulers of different countries who came bearing the characteristic products of their lands to see the Bodhisattva, who was then incarnated as a wise Brahmin, born in Banaras. According to this description, the Malala king brought with him cardamoms, Malayan betel-leaves, pepper, nutmeg, cubebs and precious stones. On the strength of the word Mala-bulat (betel-leaves of Malaya) Paranavitana identifies Malala with Malaya, and even explains the phonetic changes from Malaya to Malala, giving examples. Then he says that Malaya can be taken as Malabar as well as the Malay Peninsula. In order to suit his thesis, Paranavitana prefers to take Malala here as the Malay Peninsula on the basis of its products, although he admits that, except for cubebs, all the products mentioned were grown in both places. For his main argument Paranavitana refers to references taken by Nilakanta Sastri from the early Tamil text Silappadikāram and its commentaries,

2 Ibid., canto, X, v.119.
to the effect that cubebs (Takkola) were among the commodities imported to South India from the Malay Peninsula. He says:

It is, therefore justifiable to take the Malalas as people of the Malay Peninsula, even though there is evidence in the historical writings of Ceylon, which, on its face value, seems to support their identification with the inhabitants of Malabar.

Thus on the basis of a single word mentioned in the Kāvyāśekharaya, Paranavitana is content to identify the Malalas as the Malay people.

Cubebs were a well-known product of the Malay Peninsula and the islands adjoining it during this period, as they still are in modern times. But evidence is not wanting that cubebs were grown in Malabar during the period when the Kāvyāśekharaya was written (A.D.1449). Valentyn (A.D.1675) mentions cubebs as a product of Malabar. Garcia (A.D.1566) does likewise. In A.D.1504, only 55 years after the Kāvyāśekharaya was written, we have details of three cargoes from Malabar that arrived in Lisbon; these included 10,000 cantars of pepper, 500 cantars of pepper, 500 cantars of pepper.

2 Paranavitana, JCBRAS, NS, Vol.VII, pt.1, pp.7-8; Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, p.83.
4 Yule, loc.cit.
cinnamon, 450 cantars of cloves, 130 cantars of ginger, and 191 cantars of cubebs.\(^1\) Certain manuscripts of the travels of Marco Polo state that in Malabar there is a vast abundance of pepper, ginger, cinnamon, cubebs and Indian nuts.\(^2\) Thus it is clear from this account that as early as the thirteenth century cubebs were growing in Malabar. On the other hand the sandalwood and aloewood mentioned in the Tamil commentary as imported from the Malay Peninsula are well known products of India.

K.W. Goonewardene, supporting Paranavitana's identification, says that not only cubebs but nutmeg also was to be found in Malaysia, according to sixteenth and seventeenth-century Portuguese and Dutch writings.\(^3\) But there is evidence for nutmeg being grown in India. The History of the Sung Dynasty mentions nutmeg, cloves, camphor and sandalwood among the products of the Cola country.\(^4\)

---

\(^1\) Buchanan, Mysore, II, p.31, III, p.193 cited by Yule, loc.cit.
\(^2\) Yule, loc.cit.
Another point to be noted in connection with cubebs, is the mention of them in the *Kāvyaśekharaya* among the gifts brought by the Madra king.¹ This shows that the author of the *Kāvyaśekharaya* had no clear idea of what was produced where, as cubebs are certainly not grown in the Madra country, which is in north-west Panjab. Then, although the author of the *Kāvyaśekharaya* does not follow territorial order strictly, the mention of the Malala immediately after the Pāṇḍya king also favours the identification of Malala with the Malabar region.² Thus in this respect Paranavitana is not successful in providing adequate evidence for identifying Malala with the Malay Peninsula.

For his identification of Malala, Paranavitana gives some references from the *Kokila-sandesaya* and its old paraphrase (*Sanne*). The author of this fifteenth-century *Sandesaya*, describing the city of Yapapatuna (Jaffna) during its occupation by the forces of King Parākramabāhu VI in the

¹ *Kāvyaśekharaya*, canto, X, 114.
² Ibid., 118.
middle of the fifteenth century, says that soldiers of Tamil, Malala, Doluvara and Sinhalese nationality were to be seen in its streets. The Malala in the Sandesaya is glossed as Malayura in the old Sanne of the poem, written in A.D.1773. Paranavitana says:

...if at that date the author of the Sanne furnished this information about the Malalas from his own awareness of who they were, and whence they came, it would indicate that the Malala people had dealings with Ceylon even so late as that. But it is more likely that, as is the usual practice of annotators, the author of the Sanne had copied this gloss from an earlier writer dating back to a period during which there was intercourse between Ceylon and the land of the Malalas.

Thus, according to Paranavitana, the Malaya and the Malayura mentioned in these works can be identified with the Malay Peninsula.

The term Malayurais derived from Malai-ūr, which means a hill town. In Malayalam it means a town, village or locality situated in the hills. According to Joseph Minattur, Malayūr

3 Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, pp.83-84.
is almost identical in meaning with Malabar.¹ Lassen explains that the bar of Malabar is derived from vāra, meaning region. Thus Malayavāra means a region of Malaya.² Therefore there is also the possibility that Malayura is derived from Malayavāra. Thus Malayura is virtually identical in meaning with Malabar and hence the author of the Sanne glosses Malala with Malayura to denote Malabar.

On the other hand, since the Sanne was composed at the end of the eighteenth century, even if its author meant Malayura as the Malay Peninsula, it is not legitimate to use this more recent evidence to identify the Malala mentioned in thirteenth and fifteenth century literary works. For by the eighteenth century there definitely were Malays in Ceylon, according to Portuguese and Dutch accounts. They would have been known among the Ceylonese as Malalas.

Contacts between Ceylon and Indonesia had been made much closer by Portuguese and later by Dutch control over parts of both. When Malacca was under Portuguese rule it was invaded by the former Sultan of Malacca in A.D. 1523. It would appear that Alphonso de Sosa arrived just when the Portuguese in

¹ Ibid., 28.
² Cited by Caldwell, A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian or South Indian Family of Languages, pp. 23-4.
Malacca were in great danger, relieved the city, captured all the enemy ships and took so many prisoners that every Portuguese could have six slaves.¹ These slaves were brought to Ceylon to a spot near Colombo which was afterwards called Slave Island.² Thus during the Portuguese period Malays were brought from Malaya to Ceylon. The Dutch, too, followed the same policy, and banished some of the rebellious Javanese princes and their subjects to Ceylon. In A.D.1722, some Javanese princes and commoners who had rebelled against the Dutch were banished to Ceylon from Java.³ In 1733 more rebels were banished.⁴ The dead body of a banished Javanese prince was taken to Java from Ceylon in A.D.1753.⁵ Malays were present at the storming of Galle by the Dutch in A.D.1640, at the storming of the bastion of Joan during the seizure of Colombo in 1655, and at the capture of Jaffna in A.D. 1658.⁶ In A.D.1660 the Dutch

³ Crawfurd,loc.cit.
⁴ Ibid.,p.546.
⁵ Ibid.,p.554.
granted lands in Ceylon to some Javanese who had become Christians. In 1681 there is reference to a grant of 'land and house' being made to some Javanese. In 1795 in Trincomalee most of the British casualties were caused by Malays in the service of the Dutch. Before the Dutch capitulation in 1796 there were eleven companies of Malay troops in Colombo with nearly 800 soldiers commanded by their own officers. Many more were in the garrisons of Batticaloa, Trincomalee, Galle and Matara. After the Dutch were ousted many of these Malays entered the British service.

All this testimony shows that from the sixteenth century onwards, after the arrival of the Portuguese, there were Malays in Ceylon. Thus when the Sanne of the Kokila-sandesaya was composed there were already a number of Javanese and Malays in the Island. 'Malala' may by then have been regularly used by the Sinhalese as a name for the Malays, though we do not find any definite evidence of this in contemporary literature. Therefore it is possible that the author of the Sanne gave Malayura as a synonym of Malala in the Kokila-sandesaya from

1 Ibid.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
his knowledge of the contemporary language. This may also have been the reason for the author of the *Rājāvaliya* using *Malala* for Javanese, to denote the soldiers brought by Candrabhānu, where the word 'Jāvaka' is used in other chronicles and literary works. Thus even if the *Sanne* did use the term 'Malala' in the sense of 'Malay' there is no justification for using this reference to identify the term 'Malala' in the earlier chronicles and other literary works.

Paranavitana has drawn attention to some toponyms around Hambantota in order to justify his thesis that the Malalas with whom Māgha invaded Ceylon were Malays. He gives such names as Malala-levaya, Malala-oya, Uḍa-Malala, Palle-Malala and Hambantota and thinks that these place names originated in the thirteenth century as a result of Māgha's activities.¹

Hambantota is the principal Malay settlement in Ceylon even at the present day. We have already seen the association of Malays with southern Ceylon dating from the time of the Portuguese, and also the possibility of using 'Malala' to denote Malays.² Hence it is quite possible that these Malala toponyms originated from this later association of Malays and Javanese with this part of the Island. Not one of them is

² See supra, pp.85 ff.
mentioned in any of the old literary or epigraphical sources, suggesting that they do not have a history going back to the thirteenth century. Moreover we must remember that South Indian mercenaries used to go to and fro from the ports of the southern parts of the Island. Even if these toponyms do go back to our period, since the term Malala was then in use for the people of Malabar, it may well be that they originated from their association with Malabar.

The name Hambantota could have originated as a result of this port being used by Candrabhanu's ships, because later we shall show that he landed in the south of Ceylon, where Hambantota is situated.¹ The first element in this name Hambantota is equivalent to sampan, a Malay word meaning a ship, given a Sinhalese character by the typical substitution of h for s. As there is evidence to show that Indonesian ships visited Indian and Ceylonese ports and even reached as far as Madagascar,² the name Hambantota may merely have come into being because it was a regular port of call for Malay and Indonesian vessels. In reconstructing obscure aspects of history the evidence of toponyms is sometimes very useful,

¹ See infra, pp.168-70.
² Wolters, Early Indonesian Commerce, p.154
but it is rarely conclusive without other evidence. We cannot deduce from these toponyms alone that Magha's soldiers were of Malayan origin.

The use of the word Malala for Malabar as late as the eighteenth century is indirectly attested by the *Malala-kathāva* which is written in mixed Sinhalese prose and verse.¹ It tells us that during King Bhuvanaikabāhu's reign seven Malalas of the Mallava country, due to a hostile king who did not allow them to practise the art of war in their country, decided to come to the Simhala island. On their way these Malalas are said to have landed at Bodhimanḍalaya, Madurāpura, Mailapura and Ayiyottipatālama² before they reached Ceylon. At Ayiyottipatālama they met some Tamil chettis. The account of these princes given in the *Malala-kathāva* only indicates that the writers had no clear idea of the home of the Malalas. In this text, the Malala princes speak of the matrimonial links they had with the Pāṇḍya country, and this would strengthen the possibility that they were South Indians. The authors

² Ibid.
wrote their account of the journey of the Malalas according to their own faulty knowledge of geography. They knew of the Mallas in the Himalaya foothills from the Buddhist scriptures, and of Malabar because its inhabitants had had close relations with the Island, and both these names resemble Malala. The Ayiyottipat̄talama and Bodhimaṇḍalaya crept into the Malala-kathāva thanks to the authors' knowledge of the Mallas mentioned in the Buddhist scriptures. The other places mentioned in the text were in South India and the mention of them, as well as of Tamils, Pāṇḍyas and Chēṭṭiars, shows that the main theme has connections with the South Indian region of Malabar and that therefore the Malala mentioned here meant Malabar.

From the context of the accounts of Maṅgha's invasion given in the Raṅjavaliya and Puṅjavaliya, it is clear that the authors used Malala to denote Malabars or Keralas. The Raṅjavaliya says that Maṅgha put the country into confusion with the aid of the Tamils (Deṃalas). At the same time he made the villages of the Sinhalese into dwellings for the Tamils (gamak pāsā Deṃalun iṅduvā). The Puṅjavaliya, which refers to the soldiers who followed Maṅgha as Malalas, in its account of the damage caused by Maṅgha and his troops always uses the

---

1 Rjv, ed. Pemananda, p.69.
word Demala (Tamils) for the latter. Thus both these sources show that the term 'Malala' used in connection with Magha meant South Indian troops.

In all the sources Magha is referred to as an invader from Kaliṅga. The sources meant here the well-known Kaliṅga, the present Orissa in India. However, Paranavitana's new theory identifies this Kaliṅga as a place in South-east Asia, sometimes in the Malay Peninsula and sometimes in Java and in Sumatra. Together with some other writers he believes that the Kaliṅga region in India played a vital role in the colonization of South-east Asia, where consequently there were kingdoms of that name. Therefore we have to examine whether there was indeed in that region a kingdom or kingdoms called Kaliṅga with which Ceylon had close relations from the tenth century onwards.

The Chinese sources refer to a kingdom known as Ho-ling in South-east Asia between the seventh and ninth century A.D.

---

1 Pjv, ed. Suraweera, p.108.
2 Cv, LXXX, 58-9; Pjv, ed. Suraweera, p.108; Rjv, ed. Pemananda, p.69.
According to Paranavitana this was the kingdom referred to in the Ceylonese sources as Kāliṅga, and it was in the Malay Peninsula.¹ Most of the early writers on Ho-ling agreed that this name was the Chinese transcription of Kāliṅga, though they had diverse opinions about its location. It was W.F. Mayers who first drew attention to the possibility of Ho-ling being a Chinese transcription of Kāliṅga.² Since then, until recently, almost all the scholars who wrote on the subject contented themselves with investigating the causes which led the Kāliṅgas to take a leading part in Hindu colonization without questioning that Ho-ling was indeed Kāliṅga.³ Some scholars thought that Harṣavardhana's campaigns in eastern India and the invasions of Pulakesin II led to a mass migration of Kāliṅgas to Java

¹ Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, p.102
and that they brought the name of their motherland to the new colony. Some thought that the Sañjaya family of Java came from southern Kaliṅga, and were of the opinion that it was they who gave the name Kaliṅga to the new kingdom.

Thus almost all the writers who wrote on Ho-ling have accepted it as the Chinese transcription of Kaliṅga. In the light of this name they were tempted to see extensive Kaliṅgan activities in South-east Asia during the early centuries A.D., and they were of the opinion that the South-east Asian kingdom was named mainly because of the influx of Kaliṅgas who migrated to the Malay Peninsula and Indonesia. Their situation on the coast, with natural harbours frequently visited by foreign ships, would undoubtedly have encouraged the Kaliṅgas, like other Indians, to make experimental voyages which landed them in these South-east Asian countries. Realising the opportunities offered by these distant lands, some of them could have settled down on these islands. However, Ho-ling cannot be taken as evidence for the presence of Kaliṅgas in that part of the world.

Recently some scholars have realised how uncritically Ho-ling has been assumed to be a Chinese transcription of

1 Krom, JGIS, Vol. XVI, pp.49-50.
2 Majumdar, Suvarṇadvīpa, pt.1, p.112; Moens, op.cit., p.73.
Kalinga. Gerini, though he did not stress the point, said 'nor do I think that the term Ho-ling stands, as most sinologists have suggested, for a word Kling, or Kalinga introduced by immigrants or colonists from the east coast of India.' Another sinologist, L.C. Damais, explained the difficulties one has to face when transcribing Ho-ling as Kalinga. As an example, he has given some references to the Kalinga in India from Chinese literature, and shown the different way in which it has been transcribed into Chinese. With the aid of references in Javanese inscriptions, he has presented powerful reasons for identifying Ho-ling with an old Javanese toponym Walaing. Wolters describes Damais' important identification as follows:

Ho-ling has been placed on the Malay Peninsula, in Borneo, in Sumatra, and in Java. The usual and acceptable choice has been Java, and for many years the word has been uncritically derived from Kalinga, a kingdom in eastern India from which fabulous migrants were believed to have come to Java in early times, but the weaknesses of this identification have recently been exposed.

---

1 G.F. Gerini, Researches on Ptolemy's Geography of Eastern Asia, p.509.
3 Wolters, Early Indonesian Commerce, p.213
Another scholar, Iwamoto, says that the view that 'there was in Java a Kāliṅga kingdom dominated by immigrants of Kaliṅga from the seventh to ninth century was only a mirage or a castle built in the air.'¹ Thus with these new discoveries Kaliṅga will disappear from the legends of South-east Asia,² which are based solely on the Ho-ling Kaliṅga identification, which becomes completely baseless if the new interpretation of Ho-ling is accepted.

In order to identify the Kaliṅga mentioned in Ceylonese sources with the Śrīvijaya empire, Paranavitana cites Majumdar's interpretation of the origin of the Śailendra dynasty of Śrīvijaya.³ According to Majumdar the Śailendra dynasty came to South-east Asia from the Kaliṅga region in India.⁴ He says that it was the Śailendras who adopted the name Kaliṅga for Malaysia because of their connection with the region of that name in India.⁵ However, present evidence does not support the Kaliṅgan origin of the Śailendras, about

² Wolters, op.cit. p.337, note, 110.
³ Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, p.85.
⁵ Ibid., pp.153 and 225.
which there are various other theories.\(^1\) Whatever the origin of this dynasty, neither epigraphy nor literary sources support the theory that the Śrīvijaya kingdom was known as Kaliṅga during any period of her history. The misinterpretation of the name Ho-ling mentioned in the Chinese sources, which was taken to be Kaliṅga, has already been pointed out.\(^2\)

Therefore Paranavitana's argument in favour of the connection between Māgha and Śrīvijaya does not get any support from South-east Asian sources.

Apart from references already mentioned, Paranavitana tries to find further toponyms in the Malay Peninsula which are similar in sound to Kaliṅga in order to prove that there was a kingdom of that name in that region. In the state of Selangor in Malaysia there is a place known as Klang or Kelang. The date of the origin of this name is not known. According to Paranavitana it was derived from Kaliṅga due to its association with that region.\(^3\) Several other scholars

---


\(^2\) See supra, pp. 94 ff.

\(^3\) Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, p. 108.
have interpreted this name differently. Linehan suggests that Kelang comes from the Khmer \textit{klong} which means 'storehouse', 'market' or 'public place'; or from \textit{galong} or \textit{glong} which means 'royal storehouse'.\footnote{W. Linehan, 'Historical notes mainly about Klang', JMBRAS, Vol. XXIV, pt.3 (1951), p.85.} Some say that \textit{Kelang} also means 'tin' in Malay and this may be the true origin of the name. Moreover, according to them, the state of Selangor between Malacca and Perak was formerly known as Nageri Kalang, the 'tin country'.\footnote{Yule and Burnell, Hobson-Jobson, p.145.} The Malay Peninsula is rich in tin and therefore it is quite likely that Klang received its name because of tin. Apart from the similarity of the sound there is nothing to show that Klang got its name from Kalinga other than Paranavitana's guesses.

\textit{Jambudīpa} is mentioned in the \textit{Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa} as the place from which Magha and his followers hailed.\footnote{\textit{Hvv (P.T.S.)}, p.30} Although \textit{Jambudīpa} is well known to any Ceylonese as India, to suit his new interpretation of the material, Paranavitana tries to identify it as Jambi in Sumatra as follows:

\begin{quote}
If 'Jambudīpa' denotes here, as it normally does, the Indian sub-continent, the statement is vague. If, as we have inferred above, the soldiers of
\end{quote}
Magha were people from the Jambi area in Sumatra, they might have been described as having come from Jambidīpa. If this text originally had the reading Jambidīpa, copyists of a later generation, to whom a place name 'Jambi' was not known, but were familiar with 'Jambudīpa', might very well have considered it to be a mistake, and altered it to what is now found in the manuscripts and printed editions of the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa. This suggestion of Paranavitana cannot be accepted for more than one reason. It is significant that the term Jambidīpa does not occur in any of the manuscripts consulted by the editor of the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa. These all unanimously agree with the present reading 'Jambudīpa'. Hence an emendation to suit Paranavitana's thesis seems rash and unwarranted.

Moreover the place-name Jambi does not occur in any of the Sinhalese or Pāli writings of the period or even of later times. Thus it is not even certain that the Ceylonese knew this name at all. Furthermore, the whole island of Sumatra was not known by the name Jambidīpa (Jambi-dīpa), though the capital of Śrīvijaya was known as Jambi. The earliest reference to Jambi is found in Chinese sources, in the form Chan-pei. The Pei-hu-lu, which was written in about A.D.875,

---

1 Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, pp.85-6.
2 Hv. (P.T.S.)
mentions Chan-pei. The Ling-piao-lu-i, written during the period between A.D.889 and 904, has a reference to Pi-chan, reversing the characters. By Jambi is meant here the region on the south-eastern coast of Sumatra, and missions came to China from Jambi in A.D.853 and 871. In the History of the Sung Dynasty (A.D.960-1279) a king is mentioned called Chan-pi. Groeneveldt thinks that this reference is to the king of Jambi. In the History of the Ming Dynasty (A.D.1364-1643) Chan-pi is again mentioned. Wang Ta-yuang in A.D.1350 describes both Jambi and Palembang as prosperous trading centres. Thus from all these Chinese sources it appears that a particular area of the south-eastern coast of Sumatra was known as Jambi and the term was not used for the whole island. None of the Indian sources or Arab writers mention Jambi as denoting the island of Sumatra. Jambi was known as Malaiyur among

3 Wolters, op.cit., p.144.
4 W.P. Groeneveldt, Historical Notes on Indonesia & Malaya Compiled from Chinese Sources, p.63, note 5.
5 Ibid., pp.72-3.
the Indians. Rajendra Cola mentions it as one of the places invaded by him. ¹ Thus 'Jambi' was not used for the whole island (dīpa) of Sumatra and hence it is difficult to believe that when in the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa Jambudīpa was given as the place from which Magha came to Ceylon the correct reading should have been Jambidīpa. Therefore to emend the Jambudīpa given in that chronicle to Jambidīpa without strong reason and reliable evidence is unwarranted.

The Sinhalese version of the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa has Jambudvīpa-pradesāyen in place of the Jambudīpa in the Pāli work. Paranavitana's interpretation of this term is as follows:

This expression Jambudvīpa-pradesā is nowhere found in Ceylon literature where the Indian sub-continent is clearly meant. On the other hand, an authoritative Sanskrit work dealing, among other things, with the geography of the world as known to the ancient Indians, uses the expression 'Jambudvīpa-pradesā' as the designation of a particular region, and that precisely the one from which, as we have concluded, Magha came to Ceylon.²

Taking the Yamadvīpa and Malayadvīpa mentioned in the Vāyu-purāṇa as among the pradesās of Jambudvīpa Paranavitana locates them in South-east Asia and maintains that this

¹ Nilakanta Sastri, History of Srīvijaya, p.81; Coedès, The Indianized States, p.142. It is mentioned as Malaiyur.

² Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, p.86.
Jambudvīpa-pradesā is almost equivalent to the English usage of 'Further India'. In the light of this interpretation, Paranavitana thinks that the Jambudvīpa-pradeśayen mentioned in the Elu Attanagaluvamsa could be understood as 'Further India' and that Māgha therefore came from that region.

However this interpretation of Paranavitana is not necessary for the understanding of that term in the Sinhalese chronicle. It can be taken as referring to Kaliṅga as a region or a pradeśa of Jambudvīpa. Evidence can be given from Sinhalese sources to show that the term pradeśa was used to denote regions of India. The Pujāvaliya, in its accounts of the foreign conquests of Parākramabāhu I, states that he despatched a very large army to Dambadiva, and that this army fought with the Coḷas and Paṇḍyas as far as Aramaṇa and extended his power to Dambadiva. Then the Pujāvaliya says that the people who lived in the pradeśas were so frightened of Parākramabāhu that they dared not cross over to Ceylon. Thus the term pradeśavāsin surely denotes here the people of the pradeśas of Jambudvīpa.

1 Vāyu-purāṇa, chap.48, vv.13-14, 41; Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, pp.86-7.
Moreover, in both Sinhalese and Pāli works, Jambudīpa is used solely to denote the Indian Sub-continent from the earliest times even up to the present day. Therefore it is not necessary to make imaginary alterations and interpretations to understand the term. In the chronicles and other literary sources, when kings such as Moggallāna, Dātopatissa and Manavamma crossed over to South India to raise mercenary troops, we are simply told that they went to Jambudīpa.¹ Thus the foregoing discussion shows that by Jambudīpa and Jambudvīpa-pradeśayen both the author of the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa and its Sinhalese translator meant the well-known India. Hence we must accept that Māgha and his soldiers invaded Ceylon from India and not from Malaysia as Paranavitana has suggested.

To support his new thesis, Paranavitana interprets in a new way the identity of the Keralas, who were mentioned in the Cūlavamsa as being in Māgha's army. He says:

If, on the face value of the term "Kerala" applied to them in the Cūlavamsa, we take that the army of Māgha was composed of Malayalis, it may be questioned why they, after having captured power in this Island, were content to be subservient to one who was not of them, for whether we take Kaliṅga to have been in India or in Malaysia, Māgha was not of Malabar origin.²

¹ Cv, XXXIX, 20-22; XLVII, 40-42.
² Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, p.87.
According to Paranavitana, the Keralas were Malaysians who came to Ceylon with the Kaliṅga rulers of that region.

Again Paranavitana's argument does not appear to be sound. From Indian history as well as from the history of Ceylon we have enough evidence to prove that troops from Malabar, Keralas therefore, often served as mercenaries under rulers who were not of Malabar origin. There were recruits from Keralā in the Cola army. Paranavitana's argument applies equally well to the Cola rulers who also had Keralā mercenaries. It is very clear that the Keralas were ready to serve anywhere for pay. Therefore we have to accept that, like other rulers, Maγha employed Keralā mercenaries who were readily available. From the way he treated them after conquering Ceylon, giving them land and other facilities, we gather that his army was mercenary in nature.

Paranavitana says that these Keralas may have been Malayalis who migrated to South-east Asia. In search of evidence for this argument, he turns to Kern who has stated

---

1 Cv, LV, 5 & 12; LXIX, 18; LXX, 230; LXXIV, 44.
3 Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, p.88.
that Malayalis were to be found among the tribes of Karo-Bataks in Sumatra. This evidence hardly proves that those tribes were so numerous as to provide Magha with 24,000 soldiers. To strengthen his case he draws attention to a single strophe in the Vāyu-purāṇa where there is a reference to a people called the Kirātas living to the east of Bharatavarṣa. Then he shows how the word Kirāta might become Keralā through the intermediate stages of 'Keraṭa' and 'Keraḍa'. Explaining how this word came into use among the Sinhalese he says:

The mariners from Bharukaccha to ports in Further India called at havens in Ceylon; from them the Sinhalese people would have frequently heard the name which would thus have been in common enough use for it to have undergone normal phonetical development, even if the Sinhalese themselves did not visit these lands, and come in contact with the people called the Kirātas. ¹

This explanation is highly imaginative. It is impossible to prove that the Keralā mentioned in these Ceylonese sources is derived from Kirāta, a name which became known through mariners from Bharukaccha. First of all the numerous references to the Kirātas do not suggest the meaning which Paranavitana has given to the word, denoting the people of Malaysia and Further India. The Kirātas are mentioned in the Mahābhārata, along with the Yavanas, Kambojas, Gandhāras and Barbaras who dwelt in the

---

¹ Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, pp.88–9.
Uttarāpatha. The reference to them in the Śrīmadbhāgavata in company with the Hūnas, Āndhras, Puḷindaś, Pulkaśas, Ābhīras, Yavanaś and other non-Āryan tribes supports the Mahābhārata. Kirātas are mentioned in the Viṣṇu-purāṇa as people dwelling in India. The location of Kirātas in the Uttarāpatha is attested to by Ptolemy, who includes them among the Sogdiana tribes.

From these numerous references to the Kirātas in Indian literature as well as in the foreign accounts, there is none which mentions them as people from Sumatra or the Malay Peninsula. Sylvain Lévi has pointed out that Nepalese usage still gives the name Kirāta to a certain people, and that there is evidence to show that the Kirātas once occupied a much more extensive area in Nepal. Geiger takes the word to be the Sanskrit term for 'hill people of dwarfish structure' when explaining the Kirāta mentioned in the Ceylonese chronicles. According to the Cūlavamsa there were some Kirātas in the army of Parākramaśāhu I. They were skilled at

1 Mahābhārata, XII, 207, v.43.
2 Śrīmad Bhāgavata, II, 4, 18, cited by B.C. Law, Tribes in Ancient India, p.282.
3 Viṣṇu-purāṇa, tr. Wilson, 142, 150, 156, 158, 162, etc.
4 McCrindle, Ancient India, p.277.
6 Geiger, Culture of Ceylon in Mediaeval Times, p.18.
wandering by night in the wilderness of the forests and mountains, and slew many people by night and day. ¹ In Champa, too, these barbarous mountain tribes were called Kirātas. ² Majumdar takes the Kirātas to be hill tribes. ³ Malalasekara's opinion is that Kirāta is a name given to a tribe of jungle men and their language is classed as that of Milakkhas (Skt. Mlecchas) ⁴ or barbarians. Some of the hill tribes of South-east Asia would have been known by the name Kirāta, as we have noticed in Champa, but there is no evidence whatsoever to take Kirātas as generally referring to the people of Malaysia and Sumatra, as Paranavitana has suggested. Moreover, the intermediate forms through which Kirāta might have changed to Keralā are quite hypothetical, as neither of the terms 'Kerāta' or 'Kerāda' occurs in any literary or epigraphical sources. The foregoing discussion shows how weak is Paranavitana's interpretation.

Paranavitana takes Chau Ju-kua's statement ⁵ (A.D.1225) that Ceylon was a tributary of San-fo-ch'i i.e. Srivijaya

---

¹ Cv, LXXII, 208.
² Majumdar ed., The Struggle for Empire, p.746.
³ Majumdar ed., The Classical Age, p.313.
⁴ Malalasekera, Dictionary of Pali Proper Names, p.607.
⁵ Chau Ju-kua, tr. Hirth and Rockhill, p.62.
at its face value, and says that Magha invaded Ceylon with
the approval of Srīvijaya, and that after he gained power
over the Island he maintained relations with his homeland.¹
To accept this interpretation we have first to believe that
Magha came from Malaysia. But the evidence for this is not
sound, as we have seen. Chau Ju-kua who was the Inspector
of Foreign Trade² at Ch'uan-chou, a port of Southern China,
includes Ceylon among the fifteen dependencies of Srīvijaya
when he gives his account of that kingdom.³ On the other
hand when he writes on Ceylon itself, he says that it was
under the ruler of Nan-p'ı, i.e. Malabar.⁴ Thus there is an
inconsistency on this matter in the book of Chau Ju-kua
itself which shows what little knowledge he had.

Chau Ju-kua was more interested in trade than in the
political situation of the foreign countries he mentioned.
He got most of his information from traders who visited the

---
¹ Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, p.89.
³ Ibid., p.62.
⁴ Ibid., p.72. Nan-p'ı is the Malabar coast. Chau Ju-kua, p.74, note. 3. Since Magha came to Ceylon with 24,000
Kerals Chau Ju-kua would have been informed that Ceylon
was under Magha who had a large army of Kerals. Hence
he would have thought that Ceylon was under Malabar.
Chinese ports, though he used some of the early Chinese sources. The traders of Srīvijaya, to get priority attention for their commodities and for the sake of fame too, may well have exaggerated the power of their kingdom, for in fact Srīvijaya was declining when Chau Ju-kua wrote his account. He would have incorporated such information without checking it, if he had no way of doing so. Therefore it is not proper to take the statements of Chau Ju-kua about Ceylon at their face value without further evidence to support them.

To show Māgha's connection with Srīvijaya, Paranavitana gives some evidence from the Pujāvaliya. This Sinhalese work refers to Māgha as Māgharāja nam Kaliṅgu rāja, which means 'the Kaliṅga king named Māgharāja'. Commenting on this, Paranavitana says that Māgharāja 'seems to be a Pāli rendering of a dialectical form of "Mahārāja", the title by which Malayan potentates were referred to by Arab writers.' But this argument of Paranavitana, like his interpretation of Jambudvīpa, is devised to suit his own purposes. If the writer of the Pujāvaliya wanted to write Mahārāja he would

---

1 Chau Ju-kua, pp.36-7
2 Nilakanta Sastri, History of Srīvijaya, pp.89 ff.
3 Pjv, ed. Suraweera, p.108.
4 Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, pp.89-90.
have done so, as that title was not an unfamiliar one. With this type of argument anything can be proved without regard to sources.

Thus, though Paranavitana has tried to prove that Magha with his Malala soldiers came from Malaysia, we believe that his arguments are not convincing, and we maintain the traditional view, that Magha invaded from the Kaliṅga region in India. Paranavitana in the same manner tries to prove that, like Magha, all the other Kaliṅga kings who ruled the Island after Parākramabāhu I until Magha's invasion, hailed not from the Kaliṅga region in India, but from a Kaliṅga in Malaysia.

The Tooth Relic was brought to the Island from Dantapura in Kaliṅga in India during the reign of Sirimeghavanna (A.D.301-28). From then until modern times this relic has been highly venerated in Ceylon. In fact during the mediaeval period, rulers thought that it was necessary to possess the Tooth Relic in order to get the support of the people. It was so popular that not only the Sinhalese literati but also the ordinary people knew from where it was brought to the Island, who brought it, why it was brought,

\[CV, XXXVII, 92-8\]
and so on. But Paranavitana, analysing the accounts of the Tooth Relic given in the chronicles, says that the scholars who wrote these works had no geographical knowledge of Kālīṅga in India. These scholars, he says, described the path followed by Hemamāla and Dantakumāra, who brought the relic to the Island, from their knowledge of the geography of a Kālīṅga in Malaysia.¹

There are three main chronicles written in Sinhalese and Pāli on this relic, apart from the mention of it in other chronicles and literary works such as the Cūlavamsa and the Pujāvaliya. The Pāli Dāṭhavamsa was written in A.D.1210 by a therā named Dhammakitti, who based his work on a Sinhalese chronicle on the relic which was written during the reign of Sirimeghavannā.² The Sinhalese text which he used is no longer extant, therefore it is not possible to determine how far Dhammakitti followed this work.³ In any case it may be expected to have contained a very trustworthy account, as it was written during Sirimeghavannā's reign, most probably from first-hand information provided by Dantakumāra himself, who

¹ Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, pp.96-97.
² Dāṭhavamsa with Sinhalese paraphrase, ed. Āsaba Tissa (Kelaniya, 1883).
³ Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, p.96.
brought the Tooth Relic to the Island. The Dalada-sirita, written in the fourteenth century, and the Dalada-pūjāvaliya, written at the end of the fourteenth or the beginning of the fifteenth century A.D., are two Sinhalese works on the subject.

Dhammakitti describes the defeat of King Guhasīva of Dantapura by an enemy who wished to have the Tooth Relic for himself, and then gives an account of how it was brought to Ceylon by Dantakumāra, the son-in-law of King Guhasīva. Just before the enemy entered Dantapura, Dantakumāra, acting according to the instructions given by his father-in-law, took the Tooth Relic, and fled to a spot south of the city, where he crossed a river on the bank of which he deposited the relic. Then he returned to Dantapura, collected his wife Hemamāla, who was disguised as a Brahman woman, came to the bank of the river, recovered the relic and travelled southwards until they reached Tamalitti from whence they embarked for Ceylon. In the Sinhalese Sanne, which is said to have been written by Dhammakitti himself, the Tamalitti given in the Pāli Dathavamsa

3 Dathavamsa, chap. IV, 21-41.
has been glossed as Tamaliṅgama. Basing his arguments on the route followed by Dantakumāra and his wife, Paranavitana says that the Tamalitti mentioned in the Dāthāvamsa cannot be the same as the Indian Tamralipti. He says:

This Tamalitti cannot be the same as Tamralipti in Bengal, for it is inconceivable how a person travelling southwards from Dantapura, the modern Palura six miles to the north-east of Ganjam, could arrive at the mouth of the Ganges.

The Dalada-sirita has given the name of the river which was crossed by Dantakumāra, and where he deposited the relic. Paranavitana uses the earlier edition of the work by Rajasekera, which gives it as Gaṅgam Gaṅga heba, and therefore states that it is the Ganjam river which is mentioned here. But the critical edition of the Dalada-sirita by Sorata gives the correct name of the river as Gaṅga nam Gaṅga heba, which means the bank of the river Ganges. A comparison of the two phrases clearly indicates that in the earlier edition the letter na between the letters ga and ma was accidently omitted either by the editor or by the scribes. In the Dalada-sirita,

1 Dāthāvamsa and the old Sinhalese Sanne, ed. Śīlālamkara-sami (Alutgama, 1914) p.81.
2 Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, 97.
3 Dalada-sirita, ed. Rajasekera, p.36.
4 Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, p.97.
the port from which Dantakumāra embarked for Ceylon is given as Tamalitti. Therefore since there is no port called Tamalitti at the mouth of the Ganjam, the correct name of the river mentioned here could only be taken as the Ganges, where there was a port called Tamalitti. There is no doubt about the name of the river in the Dalada-pūjāvaliya where the phrase Gaṅga nam gaṅgin etarava occurs, which means 'after crossing the river Ganges', and this agrees with the name given in the Sorata edition of Dalada-sirita. Thus as the Dalada-sirita and the Dalada-pūjāvaliya both mention the Ganges, one can safely take this as the name of the river crossed by Dantakumāra.

The Tamalitti mentioned in the account cannot be anything other than the well-known Tamralipti near the mouth of the river Ganges. Paranavitana, referring to a Kaliṅga in Malaysia says that the Tamalitti here mentioned does not mean the Tamralipti in Bengal and he prefers to take this Tamalitti to be the Tambraliṅga from which Candrabhānu invaded Ceylon. One of the two main reasons for him to identify this Tamalitti as Tambraliṅga, is the mention of Tamaliṅgama in its Sanne

1 Dalada-sirita, ed. Sorata, p.31.
2 Dalada-pūjāvaliya, ed. Ratanaramsi, p.51.
instead of the Tamalitti in the Dāṭhāvamsa. The other is the use of the name Tamaliṅgomu in the Dalada-pūjāvaliya as the name of the port from where Dantakumāra and Hemamāḷa embarked. According to Paranavitana, no sea-port with a name like Tamaliṅgama is known to have existed on the east coast of India south of the river Ganjam.¹ But we have already seen that the river mentioned here is not Ganjam but Ganges. On the other hand Tamaliṅgamu in the Dalada-pūjāvaliya creates no problem as here the Ganges is clearly mentioned in the phrase Gaṅgā nam gaṅgin etarava. If the author of the Dalada-pūjāvaliya meant the Tambraliṅga in the Malay Peninsula, it is strange that a person crossing the Ganges in India should arrive at Tambraliṅga in the Malay Peninsula in order to embark for Ceylon. In this connection Paranavitana says:

If the Kaliṅga in India is well known to him and his readers, he [The author of the Dalada-pūjāvaliya] would not have brought Tamaliṅgamu into the narrative, for in that case he would have been condemned by critics for allowing the blemish of deśa-virodha in his poem.²

¹ To identify Tamalitti as Tambraliṅga, Paranavitana finds a Dantapura somewhere around Ligor. He says that in a Portuguese map of A.D.1595 there is a place named Tandafori just south of Mergui and he prefers to take this to be Dantapura. Ceylon and Malaysia, p.98
² Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, p.98.
Here it is important to note that the Tamralipti of India was also known as Tamaliṅgamu among the Sinhalese literati of the medieval period. The Saddharmālaṅkaraya relates a story about sixty Sinhalese Buddhist monks who reached the roadstead of Tamaliṅgamuva on their way to the City of Pāḷalup (Pāṭaliputra).¹ It is clear that they could not go to Pāḷalup, which was in Magadha in India, by way of Tambraliṅga in the Malay Peninsula, and therefore by Tamaliṅgamuva undoubtedly the writer meant Tamralipti in India. According to the Saddharmaratnākaraya, the ship bearing the sapling of the Bodhi-tree touched at Tamaliṅgamūtoṭa on its way from Budda Gayā to Ceylon.² In this context too, Tamaliṅgamūtoṭa could be Tamralipti, and it is quite certain that ships used to sail down the lower Ganges at that time. Thus it appears that Tamaliṅgamu was in usage for Tamralipti and hence there is no reason to condemn Dhammakitti for allowing the blemish of deśa-virodha, in using Tamaliṅgamuva for Tamralipti, as this alternative form would have been well-known to his readers also.

On the other hand the Buddhist monks had close contacts with eastern India during the mediaeval period and there is no

¹ Saddharmālaṅkaraya, ed., Saddhatissa, p.391.
reason to think that they had no knowledge of Kaliṅga and Tamralipti. Sinhalese monks were familiar figures among the pilgrims who visited the shrines in eastern India. In the tenth century a Sinhalese monk named Śrījana was the composer of a panegyrical inscription about a Rāṣṭrakūṭa prince. A 'Ceylon Assembly' in Mahābodhi is mentioned in an inscription dated in the fifty-first year of the Era of Lākṣmapāsena (A.D.1157) of Bengal. Taking all this evidence into consideration, Gunawardene says:

It is evident from the foregoing evidence and particularly from the twelfth century inscription cited above that, apart from the occasional pilgrims who came to worship at the shrines of eastern India, there was a community of Sinhalese monks who were permanent residents at the monastery of Buddha Gaya. It is unlikely that they were confined to Buddha Gaya. Most probably, some of them would have been attracted to the centres of Buddhist learning which flourished at short distances from this shrine.

---

Thus Buddhist monks had close relations with eastern India and therefore it can hardly be said that they had no knowledge of Kaliṅga, Tamralipti or the Ganges.

One serious objection raised by Paranavitana to identifying this Tamalitti with the Tamralipti in India is that Dantakumāra, after having left Dantapura, fled to the south of that city. Therefore, he argues, how could a person travelling southwards from Dantapura arrive at the mouth of the Ganges. But it is not proper to expect an accurate present-day knowledge of the geography of Kaliṅga from the Buddhist monks who wrote these accounts and the strange itinerary may be merely a matter of faulty geographical knowledge. On the other hand it is not easy to find a direct route from Dantapura in Kaliṅga to the Ganges through difficult countryside. It may well be that Dantakumāra went in a southern direction for some distance until he reached the normal route to northern India via south Bihar. Here he would have crossed the river and proceeded down-stream to reach Tamralipti. Thus from this reference alone we can hardly say that the writers of the account had no knowledge of Indian Kaliṅga. By the mention of Tamralipti, the Ganges and Dantapura one can hardly doubt that Dhammakitti as well as the authors of the Dalada-sirīta and the Dalada-puḷāvaliya knew that they were writing about Kaliṅga in India and that they gave their accounts accordingly.
In order to locate Kalinga in the Malay Peninsula, Paranavitana draws attention to the accounts of Couto and Queyroz. Diego de Couto states that the father of Vijaya, the first king of Ceylon, was a ruler of Ajota and further says that this was the same as Tenasserim. Paranavitana, taking this Ajota to be another name for Kalinga, says that Couto would have got his information from a Sinhalese prince. Further commenting on Couto, Paranavitana says:

Couto has been chided by his translator for blundering as he had reported facts which do not agree with the knowledge possessed by modern Orientalists on historical geography; on the other hand, what has been stated already about this matter and what will follow would show that he deserves a word of praise for having reported faithfully what he learnt from his informants.

Couto was a Portuguese soldier, and he would have had very little knowledge about the ancient history of Ceylon. Furthermore we are not sure whether he had enough knowledge of Sinhalese to understand his informants correctly in matters concerned with early history. Apart from that, being a soldier, he would not have come into contact with literary men or other people who had a knowledge of history. His manner of reporting ancient history may be seen from his account of the origin of

---

1 JCBRAS, Vol.XX, no.60, pp.62 ff. and 101.
2 Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, p.101.
the name Ceylon. According to him Ceylon got its name from the Chinese who once ruled the Island. Thus as his knowledge of the ancient history of Ceylon was meagre he invented fanciful stories. With regard to the Ajota mentioned by Couto, it may be pointed out that this could be the Ayodhya in India. Ayodhya in India was not well known in those days and the Portuguese in particular would not have been familiar with this name. But there was another Ayodhya which from the fourteenth century had been the capital of one of the kingdoms in Thailand and this was well known to them because of their contact with the Malay Peninsula. One of Couto's informants, most probably a Sinhalese soldier who had little knowledge of the ancient history of the Island, would have told him that Ayodhya was the home of Vijaya, the first ruler of Ceylon. Since Couto had no knowledge of Ayodhya in India, he would have linked this with the Ayodhya which was somewhat closer to Tenasserim. Queyroz, another Portuguese writer, says that Vijaya came from the kingdom of Telingo or Calingo in the neighbourhood of Tenasserim. According to Father Perera,

1 JCBRAS, Vol.XX, no.60, p.31; Yule and Burnell, Hobson-Jobson, p.838.
2 The Temporal and Spiritual Conquest of Ceylon by Father Fernao de Queyroz, tr. S G. Perera, p.5.
who translated the account of Queyroz, one of Queyroz's sources was Couto's account. Hence Queyroz repeated Couto's mistake by saying that Vijaya came from Tenasserim. It is not safe to depend on these isolated references from the accounts of Portuguese writers who had very little knowledge of the ancient history of Ceylon and to build up theories without further evidence and firmer foundations. Neither can these accounts be taken as representing the knowledge about the first ruler of the Island prevailing among educated Sinhalese during the sixteenth century. The contemporary literature, the work of the Sinhalese themselves, has to be taken into consideration. These literary works do not mention any tradition that Vijaya came from Kaliṅga in the Malay Peninsula.

The Cūlavamsa says that the three kinsmen who came with Tilokasundarī, the Kaliṅga queen of Vijayabāhu I, came from Siṃhapura. The Polonnaruva slab inscription of King Niśāṃkamalla states that Parākramabāhu I, towards the close of his reign, sent emissaries to Siṃhapura in Kaliṅga who

---

1. Ibid., Introduction.
2. Cv, LIX, 46-7
brought back his son-in-law to succeed him.\(^1\) Niśśaṅkamalla and Sāhasamalla say that they came from Simhapura in the Kaliṅga region.\(^2\) The Simhapura mentioned in all these sources was in Kaliṅga. Geiger writes that the Simhapura from which Tilokasundarī and her kinsmen came was the same Simhapura mentioned in the Vijaya tradition, which is said to have been founded by Vijaya's father in Lāḍhadesā. Then Geiger proceeds to identify this with the present Singhbhūm in the south-eastern district of Chutiā Nagpur in the west of Bengal.\(^3\) D.C. Sircar comments on Geiger's identification as follows:

...It has, however, to be noticed that in the age of Vijayabāhu I (really from about the end of the sixth at least to the end of the twelfth century A.D.), the name Kaliṅga was exclusively applied to the kingdom of the Gaṅgas of Kaliṅganagara (modern Mukhalingam near Srikakulam) who styled themselves as Kaliṅga-ādhipati. Simhapura (mod. Singupuram in the same neighbourhood) was, however, the capital of the Kaliṅga-ādhipatis in the fourth and fifth centuries. It was no longer the capital of Kaliṅga, but may have been the residence of some scions of the Gaṅga family. Rādha and Kaliṅga do not appear to have had continuous boundaries in any known period of Indian history....The representation of Simhapura as the capital of Kaliṅga in the Mahāvaṃsa tradition seems to be due to the fact that the chronicle was composed

---

2 Ibid., II, no.17, pp.109; no.37, p.227.
3 Geiger, Cy, tr. LIX, p.213, note.1.
about the fifth century, while the *Chulavāhha*
appears merely to have continued the same tradition,although the later capital of the country was at Kāliṅganagara.

Paranavitana takes the *Sīṁhapura* mentioned in thechronicles as well as in the inscriptions to be a city in theMalay Peninsula, in keeping with his new theory. Tracing theevidence for a *Sīṁhapura* in the Malay Peninsula, Paranavitana
says that there was more than one *Sīṁhapura* there. He prefers
to identify Singora as the *Sīṁhapura* mentioned in Ceylonese
sources because this suits his identification of Kāliṅga in the light of Hsū Yun-ts'iao's location of the kingdom of Ch'ih-t'u mentioned in Chinese histories.²

Hsū studied the references to Ch'ih-t'u or the RedLand, given in the *History of the Ming Dynasty*, the *Historyof Sui Dynasty*, and the *History of the Tang Dynasty*. In theaccount of Ch'ih-t'u given in the *History of the Sui Dynasty*,it was mentioned that the king dwelt in the city of Seng-chih.In the *T'uan-tien* it was mentioned as Shih-tze-cheng which

---


literally means 'Lion Seat' or 'Lion City'. Hsü identifies this Seng-chih or Shih-tze-cheng with Singora, which also means 'Lion City' or 'Lion Seat'. He then concludes that the Chinese gave this name, which is somewhat similar to the name by which they identified Ceylon, to Singora on account of the resemblance of its landscape to that of Ceylon. Hsü has nothing to say about Kaliṅga contact with, or influence in, the region which could have resulted in the naming of Singora after Śimhapura in Kaliṅga.

On the other hand there is another possible source of the name Singora. The Chih-tu-lun says 'Buddha is the lion in human species, and so wherever the Buddha sits, be it bed or floor, the Lion Seat is'. In giving an account of the state of Tōng-liu-meǐ, Chau Ju-kua says that 'there is a mountain called Wu-nung (where) Shī-kia (i.e., Sakyamuni Buddha) (after his) nie-pan (i.e. nirvāṇa) manifested himself ... the event being commemorated by a bronze

---

1 Hsü, op.cit., p.11.
2 A name used by the Chinese for Ceylon is Shi-tze-kuo (the Lion State).
3 Hsü, op.cit., p.12.
4 Ibid., p.11.
elephant (at this place). This shows that a tradition prevailed that in the region of Ligor the Buddha manifested himself after attaining nirvana. As it is stated in the Chinese sources that whatever the Buddha sits on, be it bed or floor, becomes a 'Lion Seat' there is a possibility that this tradition may account for the origin of the name Singora. Chinese who heard of this tradition would have called this region Shi-tze-cheng (Lion Seat).

Whatever may be the origin of the name Singora, there is another serious objection against identifying this as Simhapura mentioned in the Ceylonese sources; this is that while the latter was in Kaliṅga, there is no evidence for a Kaliṅga kingdom in the region of Ligor during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

The Simhapura mentioned in the Mahāvamsa in connection with the Vijaya legend, and the Simhapura mentioned in the Cūlavamsa as the city from which Kaliṅga rulers hailed would appear to be two different places, the former in Lāḍha and the latter in Kaliṅga. Therefore why did Niśāṇakamalla emphasise the connection of his dynasty with that of Vijaya,

---

1 Chau Ju-kua, p.57.
the first ruler of Ceylon? The reasons are quite obvious. The Kaliṅga dynasty was an alien one in Ceylon and, judging from the struggle they had with princes who did not belong to their dynasty,¹ and from the wording of Niśśāṃkamalla's inscriptions,² it appears that the people of Ceylon were not satisfied with their rule. Therefore in order to get the support of the Sinhalese people, Niśśāṃkamalla stated in his inscriptions that his dynasty had connections with the family of the first king of the Island, and tried to prove that the Kaliṅga rulers had legitimate rights by descent. The ordinary people knew that Vijaya came from Śrīhāpura in India but they were ignorant of the geography of the mainland, and at least some of them would have believed that both the Kaliṅga rulers and Vijaya came from the same Śrīhāpura.

In India there was more than one Śrīhāpura. We have already noticed references to two of them in the Mahāvamsa and the Cūlavamsa. Hsüan-Tsang says that the western border of the kingdom of Śrīhāpura was on the river Indus, and the city itself was situated about 700 li to the south-east of

² Ibid., pp. 509-10.
Taxila. A Simhapura in western India is also mentioned in the Cetiya Jātaka. The Simhapura from which the Kaliṅga rulers came was in Kaliṅga, but in none of the sources where it is mentioned in this connection is it described as the capital of Kaliṅga. During the period of Gaṅga rule Kaliṅganagara was the capital, as is attested by the fact that most of the Gaṅga rulers issued their inscriptions from this place. According to his inscriptions, Niśśaṅkamalla's father was Jayagopa. Jayagopa is not mentioned in any of the inscriptions issued by the Eastern Gaṅga rulers from Kaliṅganagara. Therefore it appears that Jayagopa, though he was known as Mahārāja, was not a recognised ruler in Kaliṅga and had no direct connection with the main line of the Gaṅga rulers. That may be the reason why princes such as Niśśaṅkamalla and Sāhasamalla sought their fortune in a distant island like Ceylon. Sircar rightly points out that Simhapura may have been the residence of some scion of the Gaṅga family. The rulers of Ceylon may have been the

---

4 D.C. Sircar, The Struggle for Empire, ed. Majumdar, p.268.
descendants of a branch of the Gaṅga family of Kaliṅga who were ruling from Simhapura. As there is no mention in Ceylonese sources of Simhapura being the capital of Kaliṅga, there is no serious objection to identifying this Simhapura in Kaliṅga in India as the home of the Kaliṅga rulers. Thus the Simhapura mentioned in Ceylonese sources was not Singora, as Paranavitana suggests, because there is no Kaliṅga kingdom in its vicinity. On the other hand, though Nissaṅkamalla links his family with that of Vijaya for his own purposes, this does not constitute a serious objection to identifying the Simhapura he mentions with the Simhapura in Kaliṅga in India.

In support of his theory of the Malayan origin of the Kaliṅga rulers, Paranavitana interprets in a new way some of the terms in their inscriptions. Singora was the capital of Ch'ih-t'u, a name which means 'Red Land'. It is thought that this name is due to the colour of the soil of that region. Paranavitana suggests that it should be taken as a Chinese transcription of Setu, and then tells how the name Setu, which means 'causeway or bridge', was applied to the narrow neck of the Malay Peninsula which was the overland trade route connecting the Bay of Bengal with the Gulf of Siam. But

---

1 Hsü, op.cit., p.13.
before accepting Paranavitana's theory it is necessary to see whether this region was indeed known as Setu.

In Chinese writings Topo-teng has been mentioned as the name of the state which bordered Ho-ling on the west. By amending this location to the north-west and situating Ho-ling in the Malay Peninsula, Moens says that Topo-teng was on the east side of the narrow neck of the peninsula. Then he equates the name Topo-teng with a conjectural old Malay word *duwawwatan* meaning 'two bridge land' and explains that this region acquired such a name because of the land route from coast to coast which traversed it.¹ Here again, to accept Moens' identification and the location of Topo-teng in the narrow neck region, we have to accept his location of Ho-ling in the Malay Peninsula. Though there were diverse opinions regarding the location of the kingdom of Ho-ling in the light of Chinese evidence it has now been more or less conclusively proved that this name had no relation whatsoever to the name Kalinga and that it was a kingdom of Java.²

Two T'ang histories point out that Topo-teng was situated to the west of Ho-ling. Since Ho-ling has been located in Java, Topo-teng has to be looked for either in Java or Sumatra.

Wolters says about Topo-teng:

The exact locations of the Javanese kingdoms have not been supplied nor has attention been given to minor toponyms such as Mo-ho-hsin or To-p'o-têng. Nor, with the exception of Vijayapura, has the real name of any of these kingdoms been suggested. Their exact location and their names will become apparent only when new inscriptions are found.

Damais remarks that Topo-teng may be a Sumatran toponym. Thus Moens' hypothesis of the equation of Duwawwatan with Topo-teng no longer has any foundation.

Paranavitana supports Moens' theory by adducing evidence from a Sinhalese inscription and from the Nalanda copper plate inscription of Devapala dēva. The inscription of Sundara-mahādevī in the Maravidiya cave at Dimbulagala contains the phrase Devotuna manda upan. Bell read this as describing Vikumbā nirindu in the inscriptions and interpreted

---

2 Ibid., p.220.
it as meaning that both the parents of Vikramabahu were crowned and therefore he was called Devotunu manda upan which means 'born between two crowns'. Wickramasinghe, who edited the inscription for the second time, accepted Bell's interpretation. But Paranavitana takes this as an adjectival phrase qualifying Sundara-mahadevi, saying that this phrase signifies her birth-place. According to him, as she was not a native princess but was born in Kalinga, Devotunu was the name of that region in the Malay Peninsula where the Kalinga kingdom was. Then Paranavitana uses Moens' identification to equate Devotunu with Duwawwatan. He then tries to see a similarity not only in sound but also in meaning between the Malay name and the Sinhalese phrase. In the phrase Devotunu manda, de means 'two' and manda could be translated as 'in between', but what Paranavitana finds most significant is votunu. Generally this Sinhalese word votunu means 'crown'. But Paranavitana interprets it as the Sinhalese form of the Sanskrit word vartma (Pali and


2 EZ,Vol.II,no.34, pp.194-202. In his first edition of the inscription Wickramasinghe read it as la da-votunu mata... Ibid., no.31, pp.184-89. Later he accepted Bell's reading. Ibid., no.34.
Prakrit vatuma) which means 'way or route'. Then he translates the above phrase as 'the land between the two routes'.

Thus Paranavitana equates the Sinhalese phrase with the Malay name in sound as well as in meaning by implying that the Sinhalese knew that the narrow neck region was called Duwawwatan and found a Sinhalese expression to suit it. But we cannot assume that they came to know this name as we are not sure whether the region was in fact then known as Duwawwatan. It mainly depends upon Moens' hypothesis, but his identification of Topo-teng has been questioned by some historians, in the light of the new interpretation and identification of the kingdom of Ho-ling.

To support his theory as well as Moens' identification, Paranavitana also draws attention to the Nālandā copper plate of Devapāladeva. This records the grant made by the Pāla king Devapāladeva of Bengal, of a gift of a village to the temple founded at Nālandā by King Bālaputradeva of Śrīvijaya.

1 Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, p.106.
2 BEFEO, Vol.LII, pp.93-141.
3 De Casparis dates this inscription between A.D.860 and 870, Prasasti Indonesia, Vol.II, p.297.
In this record Bālaputradeva's maternal grandfather is mentioned as Dharmasetu. Hirananda Sastri, who edited the inscription, read this name as Dharmasetu and gave Varmasetu as a possible alternative reading.¹ N.G. Majumdar's opinion is that Varmasetu is the only justifiable reading.² Paranavitana accepts Majumdar's reading and amends it further by saying that if it is taken as Varmasetu, 'armour causeway', it has no meaning. Therefore, according to Paranavitana, to make a meaningful proper name, Varma has to be changed to Vartma by adding a t. He then gives a number of reasons for the disappearance of the t from this name. According to him this letter could have been omitted by the engraver, or worn out. Further, he says that 'it is also possible that a difficult sound as that of the nexus rtma was actually pronounced as rma, and the name was used in the document as it was pronounced'.³ But the idea that there may once have been a t in the middle of the name had never even occurred to the two Indian writers, as there was no gap between the two akṣaras.

¹ EI, Vol.XVII, p.326, note 5.
³ Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, p.107.
The meaning of *Vartma* suggested by Paranavitana, is 'the causeway' (on the trade routes). Then he says that this would have been the name of both the kingdom and its king and thus the Vartmasetu mentioned in the above inscription could be the ruler of the Malay Peninsula from where the Kalinga princess Sundara-mahādevī hailed.\(^1\) In fact *setu* may mean 'causeway', but the meaning of *vartma* is simply 'road, path or track'.

Scholars have different opinions with regard to the identification of the King Dharmasetu. Stutterheim identifies Dharmasetu with the father of Devapāladeva of Bengal and says that the name Dharmasetu could be regarded as a poetic synonym for Dharmapāla. He thinks that Mahāyāna Buddhism was introduced into the kingdom of Śrīvijaya as a result of a matrimonial alliance.\(^2\) But Bosch rightly argues that if the king of Bengal was meant here, his son would have recorded it unmistakably on the Nālandā plate. His opinion is that Tārā, the daughter of Dharmasetu, was a Javanese princess who married into the Śailendra dynasty in Sumatra.\(^3\) Most scholars, including Coedès, agree with Krom's identification

---

\(^1\) Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, p.106.


of Dharmasetu. According to Krom, Dharmasetu was the king of Srivijaya and his daughter was married to Samaragravīra, the Sailendra king of Java. If we accept this, it would appear that Dharmasetu was a ruler of Sumatra. In any case present evidence does not suggest that he was ruler of the 'two bridge land', and, even if he had supremacy over that region, as it was not his main centre, he would not have been named after such a remote area in his kingdom.

From the foregoing discussion it is clear that Topo-teng was not in the narrow region of the Malay Peninsula. Thus the suggestion that Duwawwatan was the name of that region, from which the Chinese are said to have got the name Topo-teng is a hypothesis without evidence. Therefore Paranavitana's equation of Duwawwatan with Devotunu has no foundation either, being mainly based on Moens' identification, which has no proof. The name Ch'ih-t'u need have nothing to do with setu, as Paranavitana has proposed, but may be accepted as meaning 'Red Land'. In the light of all the data available, the Siṃhapura mentioned in the Ceylonese sources could not be

1 Nilakanta Sastri, History of Srivijaya, pp.57-8; Coedès, The Indianized States, pp.92, 108-9; De Casparis, Prasasti Indonesia, II, p.258, note 71.

2 N.J. Krom, 'Het Hindoe Tijdperk', Geschiedenis van Nederlandsch Indië, I, ed. F.W. Stapel (Amsterdam, 1918) p.162.
anything other than the well known Simhapura in the Kaliṅga region of India. Therefore the Kaliṅga rulers can only have come from that region.

From an inscription of Niśṣaṅkamalla from Polonnaruva it appears that one of the gates of Polonnaruva was named Kāmbōjāvaśala¹ (Cambodian Gate). His slab inscription at Ruvaṇvāliṣya in Anurādhapura has recorded that Niśṣaṅkamalla ‘bestowing on Cambodians gold and cloth and whatever other kind of wealth they wished ... commanded them not to catch birds.’² Paranavitana, in the light of these references, says that Niśṣaṅkamalla had Cambodian bodyguards in his service:

If Niśṣaṅkamalla came from Singora, in the Malay Peninsula, he must have brought with him some troops from that region who could be relied upon to guard his person, which he would certainly have not entrusted to Sinhalese troops. And not very far from Singora, in the Malay Peninsula, there was a region of which the people were Khmer-speaking, as is proved by the inscription on the pedestal of a Buddha image found at Grahi. A prince from Kaliṅga in India would hardly have had Khmer people in his service.

Here Paranavitana does not explain why Niśṣaṅkamalla, being a Malay prince, brought Khmer-speaking people as his bodyguards. He could have brought his own men rather than Khmers, who also

¹ ASCAR (1911–12), p. 100.
³ Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, p. 110.
were not of his own race and therefore would be no more trustworthy than the Sinhalese. Moreover, on account of the expansion of the Khmer empire of Cambodia in the direction of Thailand and the Malay Peninsula, he would not have been likely to trust Khmers. Like Paranavitana's Kerala argument, this present argument that 'a prince from Kāliṅga in India would hardly have had Khmer people in his service' is not very convincing.

First of all it has to be proved that the Cambodians were in his service as bodyguards. Though there is indeed evidence of their presence in Polonnaruva, there is no definite proof of their being bodyguards. On the other hand there is no lack of evidence of friendly relations between Ceylon and Cambodia, at least from the reign of Parākramabāhu I onwards. As has been shown above, one of the main causes for the hostility between Ceylon and Burma was these friendly relations. Moreover, we have suggested that before Parākramabāhu sent missions to Cambodia with a Sinhalese princess there may have been a Cambodian mission to Ceylon. Niśāṇkamalla, too, in his inscriptions, says that he had friendly relations with Aramaṇa, and Kamboja.¹ Such a friendship may well have resulted in the coming of the Cambodians to Ceylon. Some of them would have

come for trade purposes, and catching rare kinds of birds may have had something to do with this. It is not impossible that Niśśaṁkamalla, though an Indian prince, should have had Khmer-speaking people in his service, if in fact they ever did serve as bodyguards. Though it is uncertain how a gate of Polonnaruva was named Kāmbōjavāsala, this too could have been one of the results of the longlasting friendship between the two countries. The gate would have been given its name during the reign of Parākramabāhu I when there was close friendship with Cambodia. Envoys from Cambodia may have been given this part of the city, which would then have come to be known as the Kāmbōjavāsala, and this would have still been the case under Niśśaṁkamalla, as he too had friendly relations with Cambodia. Be that as it may, the evidence is too meagre to enable a definite conclusion to be arrived at.

In Niśśaṁkamalla's rock inscription at Polonnaruva, Vijayapura in Kaliṅga is mentioned among other places in Ceylon and abroad as a spot where he established alms-houses. Paranavitana prefers to identify this Vijayapura with the capital of the Śrīvijaya kingdom in Palembang, in the light of the evidence in a Nepalese manuscript of the tenth or the

1 Ibid., no.29, p.178.
eleventh century, where Śrīvijayapura in Suvarṇapura is mentioned. To accept Paranavitana's suggestion we have also to accept his theory that Śrīvijaya was known as Kaliṅga during this period. But it has already been shown that Śrīvijaya was not known by this name in any period of her history. Except for the similarity of the names there is no other evidence to equate the Vijayapura mentioned in Niśāśākmalla's inscription with the Vijayapura referred to in the Nepalese manuscript. If Niśāśākmalla meant Śrīvijayapura, the capital of the kingdom of Śrīvijaya, it is not clear why the prefix Śrī which was so common in Ceylon, was omitted. On the other hand, evidence is not lacking for a Vijayapura on the mainland in the vicinity of the Kaliṅga region. The Nāgārjunakonda inscription of the fourteenth year of the reign of King Virapurisadata, records the building by a lay member, Bodhi Śrī, of a chaitya grha for the therīs of Tambapanni in the Cūladhammagirivihāra on the Śrīparvata to the east of Vijayapūrī. It has been suggested that this Vijayapūrī was near Nāgārjunakonda. Though the Kaliṅga

1 Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, p.110.
2 D.C. Sircar, The Successors of the Satavāhanas in the Lower Deccan, p.32.
rulers had no direct supremacy over the Andhra territory, this whole region was known as Trikaliṅga. Therefore it could be said that Vijayapurī was in the Kaliṅga country. Though our reference to this city belongs to the early centuries of the Christian Era, the name of the place could well have continued into later times even though we have no reference to it. From the presence of therīs from Tambapanni it appears that this Vijayapurī had contacts with Ceylon. Because it was a Buddhist centre, Nissāṃkamalla would have selected it to build an alms-house for the Buddhist monks. Therefore Vijayapura in India suits the inscription better than does Śrīvijaya in Sumatra, as Nissāṃkamalla personally crossed over to South India.¹

Paranavitana has stated that some of the names and titles in some of the inscriptions of the Kaliṅga rulers are non-Sinhalese and he tries to identify these as Malayan names and titles. Thus he relates the name Tavuru, mentioned in Nissāṃkamalla's inscriptions² as belonging to one of Nissāṃkamalla's generals, to Tuvavūravān, a part of the name of one of the Sailendra king's officers who built the Buddhist

² EZ, Vol.II, no.27, p.156; no.29, p.176.
shrine at Nagapattana during Rajendra Cola's reign.¹ He thinks that this name was Telugu in origin. If this is so, since the Telugu region certainly had relations with the Indian Kalinga, is it not possible to trace such names direct from Indian names, rather than indirectly from Telugu names used in Malaya? If this General Tavuru was not a Sinhalese, he might have come to Ceylon from Indian Kalinga with Nissamkamalla. Another such name is the sam in Vijaya sam-singu senevi, a title given to Cudāmani who was a high-ranking minister under queen Lilāvatī.² According to Paranavitana this sam appears to be the same as the Malay sang which is prefixed as an honorific to the personal name. He is of the opinion that Adi, the name of a minister in Kalyāṇavatī's reign, was derived from the Malay 'haji', a royal title. Manakka and Erapatta are two other such names given by Paranavitana as non-Sinhalese. Paranavitana's methods can best be understood by quoting from Indrapala's review, when he refers to Paranavitana's non-Ceylonese toponyms as follows:

... the defects in this method of research are very glaring. We know of only a few place-names of ancient Ceylon from our records. The vast majority of our toponyms are unknown to us. Under these circumstances, can we easily dismiss a place-name

¹ EI, Vol.XXII, p.258.
² EZ, Vol.IV, p.81.
occurring in one of our inscriptions as non-Ceylonese on the ground that it is not "known to have existed in Ceylon"?

The same comments could be applied to his non-Sinhalese proper names to demonstrate that this type of argument is not acceptable or substantiated by reliable sources.

The statement in Niśśāṅkamalla's inscription that the Kaliṅga kings were descended from Vijaya has been interpreted as a reflection of similar legends which were current in the Malay Peninsula. Niśśāṅkamalla in his inscriptions stated that his family was descended from Vijaya, the first king of Ceylon, and came from the same Simhapura as Vijaya did. Paranavitana, commenting on this, says that the Simhapura in the Vijaya legend was in Lāḍha and not in Kaliṅga. Therefore this claim of Niśśāṅkamalla and of his kinsmen is not in accordance with Sinhalese tradition if they came from Kaliṅga in India. On the other hand he says, 'if they came from the region of Singora, ...they could with apparent truth claim to be descended from Vijaya who made Lāṅka a habitation of men'. According to him,

2 Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, p.112.
3 EZ, Vol.II, pp.112 and 164.
4 Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, p.112.
Laṅkasuṅka, which was near the Patani district on the coast of the peninsula, was believed to be the abode of beings corresponding to the Yakṣas of Ceylon legends. Furthermore, he says that the name Laṅka was probably given to Ceylon as well as to this region in the Malay Peninsula by the people who came from Kaliṅga in India. But to come to such a conclusion it is necessary to have at least some mythical stories from this region connecting Kaliṅga and the Malay Peninsula. The name was probably given by Indians to both places, but whether they were Kaliṅgas or Indians from another part of India cannot be determined.

Vijaya was the first king of Ceylon. Paranavitana now tries to find another Vijaya who was the first king of Laṅkasuṅka to show a similarity between the history of the two countries. He draws attention to the names of two rulers named Vijayavarma (Pisapatma A.D.433) and Śri-pi-jia-a (Śrīvijaya A.D.452) who ruled in Ho-lo-tan and sent envoys to the Chinese court. According to Moens, Ho-lo-tan adopted the name of Śrīvijaya shortly after A.D.666. Using this as evidence, Paranavitana says that the kingdom was given that name after its king, Vijaya. Thus, according to him, if Niśaṅkamalla's family was the same as that of this

---

1 JMBRAS, Vol.XXIX, pp.166 ff.
2 Ibid.
Sri Vijaya, then he had the right to say he belonged to the family of the Vijaya who made Lanka an abode of men.

Paranavitana's suggestion is that Niśśamkamalla and other Kaliṅga rulers came from the region of Singora in the Malay Peninsula. Though Moens argues that the first capital of Śrīvijaya was in the Malay Peninsula, the data now available show its headquarters to have been in Palembang. We have no evidence to show that the two rulers Śrīvijaya and Vijayavarma were first rulers of the Śrīvijaya kingdom, because the Ho-lo-tan where they reigned was located in Java. Hence there is no evidence of a King Vijaya who founded a dynasty in Lāṅkāśuka, the region proposed by Paranavitana as that from which Niśśamkamalla hailed, for the latter to claim descent from. Nor is it possible to link Niśśamkamalla and the rulers of Śrīvijaya. Thus the King Vijaya mentioned in the inscriptions of Niśśamkamalla could be no other than the famous first king of Ceylon. On the other hand if Niśśamkamalla was a Malay prince and claimed descent from an Indian prince the Ceylonese, who were familiar with the Vijaya tradition, would have rejected his claim as a deśa-virodha (contradicting geography) statement.

---

1 Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, pp.103 ff.
2 Wolters, Early Indonesian Commerce, pp.207 ff.
3 Ibid., p.151.
Gerini has recorded a legend prevalent in Ligor that the city was founded by Dantakumāra, who arrived in Ligor after having been shipwrecked. There is another legend that Dharmāśoka, driven by pestilence from his homeland of Magadha, set sail with the remnants of his people in a golden junk and was wrecked on the sand of Ligor. It appears that some Ligor families claimed descent from those who came with Aśoka.¹ According to Paranavitana these legends are similar to those found in Ceylon. Therefore he says:

> The statement of Nissaṃkamalla that he was a descendant of Vijaya who made Lankā an abode of men, could have therefore been due to a tradition that the originator of his family in the Malay Peninsula was a scion of the Vijaya dynasty of Ceylon.²

Thus Paranavitana, who earlier subscribed to the idea that Nissaṃkamalla's claim to connections with Vijaya was due to the fact that the originator of the Śrīvijaya kingdom was known as Vijaya and that he had connections with that dynasty, now gives a different argument. However, there is no evidence to support even this theory, and such legends as are common to both Ligor and Ceylon no doubt originated from the Indian and Buddhist influence which was common to both regions.

¹ Gerini, op.cit., pp.107-8.
² Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, p.113.
Paranavitana draws attention to a passage in the *Rajāvaliya* which reads *daladā gena Kalingayen ā Kīrti Niśāmaka[malla]* i.e. *Kīrti Niśāmaka[malla]* who came from Kaliṅga with the Tooth Relic.¹

From the history of the Tooth Relic it is certain that *Niśāmaka[malla]* did not bring this relic at all. Here it is probable that a scribe who copied the manuscript made a mistake by omitting 'ā' after the word 'gena'. In the original it would have been *daladā gena ā Kaliṅgayen ā Kīrti Niśāmaka[malla] raja* or *daladā genā Kaliṅgayen ā Kīrti Niśāmaka[malla] raja*, i.e. 'Kīrti Niśāmaka[malla] who came from the Kaliṅga whence the Tooth Relic was brought'. Paranavitana takes this passage in the *Rajāvaliya* as it stands, and says that this was probably due to a tradition that his family were descended from Dantakumāra who brought the Tooth Relic to Ceylon. He connects this evidence with the legend that the city of Ligor was founded by Dantakumāra. If such a legend had been prevalent, *Niśāmaka[malla]*, who boasted so much in his inscriptions about his connections with Vijaya and his belonging to the Buddhist Faith, would have undoubtedly used it to get the support of the Buddhists. Though he records the building of a Tooth Relic temple, there is not even the slightest hint of his connection with Dantakumāra, nor do any other literary sources contemporary or of later date mention any such tradition.

¹  *Rjv*, ed.Pemananda, p.68.
Thus we believe that the arguments so far put forward by Paranavitana fail to prove his thesis of the Malayan origin of the Kaliṅga rulers of Ceylon. The traditional view is further reinforced by the evidence from epigraphical records and chronicles about these rulers. The names used by some of the Kaliṅga rulers are quite similar to those of the Eastern Gaṅga rulers whose kingdom was in the Kaliṅga in India. One of the kinsmen who came with Tilokasundari to Ceylon was called Madhukannava. This name strongly resembles the names Madhu-kāmārṇava and Kāmārṇava borne by princes of the Indian Gaṅga dynasty. Anikāṅga and Códagaṅga were two names used by the Kaliṅga rulers of Ceylon. These were also quite common names among the Gaṅga rulers of India. Thus there are more grounds for linking the Kaliṅga rulers of Ceylon with the Eastern Gaṅgas than with Malayan rulers.

One of Niśākaṃkamalla's queens was Kalyāṇavatī, who, according to the Galpota inscription of Polonnaruva, came from Kaliṅga and was a Gaṅga princess. Paranavitana, commenting on

---

1 Cv, LIX, 46.
3 Ibid.
this, says that the Kāliṅga rulers of Ceylon, who came from the Malay Peninsula, would have had matrimonial alliances with the Kāliṅga kingdom in India and that Kālayāṇavatī might have been one of the princesses brought from there.¹ If we accept that they had matrimonial alliances with the Indian Kāliṅga, this would show that Ceylon had close relations with that region and this contradicts the earlier statement of Paranavitana that during this period Ceylon had no knowledge of Kāliṅga in India.² On the other hand, if Niśāṇakamalla came from a Kāliṅga kingdom in Malaysia and if the Kāliṅga rulers had matrimonial alliances with Kāliṅga in India, it is not clear why they did not distinguish the Indian Kāliṅga from their original home in the Malay Peninsula. If they came from the Malay Peninsula they would have known very well that two Kāliṅga kingdoms were being referred to. To avoid confusion, they would undoubtedly have made the difference clear in their inscriptions. But they used Kāliṅga without any definition because they knew that they were writing about one Kāliṅga kingdom only, which was both their original home and the country with which they had matrimonial alliances, that is Kāliṅga in India.

¹ Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, p.115.
² See supra, p.111.
Nissāmkamalla's Galpota inscription clearly mentions that he came from Dambadiva where Buddhas, Bodhisattvas and universal Monarchs were born.1 Thus here Dambadiva meant India. However, Paranavitana thinks that this is not conclusive enough evidence to identify him as Indian because Greater India too was included in the term Jambudīpa. He gives some evidence from I-Tsing's account and from the Jinakālamālī to support his argument.2 But Nissāmkamalla was addressing the people of Ceylon and therefore would have presented his account of himself in accordance with their own beliefs. In none of the Sinhalese sources is there any reference to Buddhas being born outside the Indian Sub-continent. On the other hand the Sinhalese writers used Jambudīpa and Dambadiva to denote the Indian Sub-continent alone. Therefore according to the beliefs prevalent among the people of Ceylon, Buddhas were born in India and not in the Malay Peninsula, Java, Sumatra or any other South-east Asian land. Thus if Nissāmkamalla had been a prince from the Malay Peninsula, the people would not have believed that he was born where Buddhas were born, because the Malay Peninsula was not included in their conception of Jambudīpa. Thus it is almost certain that the Jambudīpa mentioned in the inscription could have been no other than the Indian Sub-continent.

1 EZ, Vol.II, no.17, p.115.
2 Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, p.116.
The data found in Niśśaṅkamalla's inscriptions concerning his foreign relations suggests links with India rather than with the Malay Peninsula. In his inscriptions he says that, being desirous of war, he crossed over to Jambudīpa with his four-fold army and fought various battles, and that apart from the hostile attitude he adopted towards the Coḷas and Pāṇḍyas, he entered into friendly relations with countries like Kārṇāṭa (Mysore), Nelluru (Nellur), Gauḍa (Bengal), Kaliṅga (Orissa), Teliṅga (Telingana), Gurjara (Gujarat), Aramaṇa (Burma) and Kamboja (Cambodia). Here the Kaliṅga mentioned between Gauḍa and Teliṅga clearly denotes the Kaliṅga region in India. Then Niśśaṅkamalla says that he had matrimonial alliances with countries like Kaliṅga, Veṅgi, Kārṇāṭa, Nellur and Gujarat. Here too, the Kaliṅga mentioned among all the other kingdoms in India has to be taken as the Kaliṅga in India. Thus it is quite clear that, except for Aramaṇa and Kamboja, all the countries mentioned were regions in India. As Burma and Cambodia had close relations with Ceylon during the Polonnaruva period, Niśśaṅkamalla would no doubt have continued the

---

1 EZ, Vol.II, no.14, pp.84-90; no.17, pp.98-123; no.20, pp.128-30; no.21, pp.130-34; no.27, p.156.
2 Ibid., I, no.9, p.134; II, no.17, pp.98-123; no.26, pp.148-52; no.27, pp.153-6.
3 Ibid. II, no.17, p.95; no.42, p.289.
long-standing friendship with those two countries. Though Paranavitana says that the Kāliṅga rulers were supported by the rulers of the Śrīvijaya empire, it is odd that there was not a single word about these Śrīvijaya rulers in their inscriptions. If they ever had contacts with that mighty empire they would surely have mentioned it in their records, as Niśāṇakamalla has given the names of most of the countries with which he had friendly relations.

The evidence about the Jaffna kingdom also supports the Indian origin of the Kāliṅga rulers of Ceylon. The Yalpana-vaipava-malai, the Takṣiṇa-kailaca-purāṇam, the Vaipāṭal and the Kailāsa-malai, have preserved legends about its origin. From these legends historians have come to the conclusion that the founder of the Jaffna kingdom was Kāliṅga Māgha. Indrapala, who consulted all the sources on the subject, believes that it was most probably founded in the thirteenth century A.D. by Māgha and his followers. The Vijaya-kulaṅkai mentioned in the legends about the kingdom of Jaffna has been identified as Māgha.

---


3 Ibid., pp.460 ff.
From both archaeological and literary sources, it appears that the founders of Jaffna had close relations with the Kaliṅga region in India. The coins issued by the early Jaffna rulers have certain similarities to those of the Eastern Gaṅga rulers of Kaliṅga in India. Some gold coins found at Ganjam, which belonged to the Eastern Gaṅga rulers, have a recumbent bull facing to the left with the rising sun or liṅga in different positions in relation to the bull.¹ The recumbent bull with the rising sun was represented in the coins of the Jaffna rulers,² and also on their banners.³ The Eastern Gaṅga rulers had for their crest a couchant bull facing to the left.⁴ From these similarities it appears that the Jaffna rulers borrowed their crest from the Gaṅga rulers.

The Jaffna rulers claimed that they belonged to the Gaṅga-vamśa.⁵ As it has been concluded that Magha was the founder of the Jaffna kingdom, the Gaṅga-vamśa here referred to has to be taken as the Eastern Gaṅga dynasty of Kaliṅga in India.

¹ Hultzsch, 'Miscellaneous South Indian Coins', IA, Vol.XXV, p.322.
² Rasanayagam, op.cit., pp.300-1; plates between the pages 300 and 301.
³ Ibid., p.302.
⁵ Rasanayagam, op.cit., p.304, note 1.
Though Paranavitana argues that the 'Kankai' mentioned in the legends as the *vamsa* of the Jaffna rulers, has to be taken as 'Gaṅgā', not as 'Gaṅga', Indrapala has given enough evidence to show that 'Kankai' can be taken as 'Gaṅga' as well as 'Gaṅgā'.

Therefore as we have evidence to show connections with the Gaṅga dynasty of Kaliṅga in India, this too can be taken as a reference to that dynasty. Rasanayagam has drawn attention to the similarity of the legends in the inscriptions about the origin of the Eastern Gaṅgas to the legends in the chronicles about the origin of the rulers of the kingdom of Jaffna.

According to the Tamil chronicles, the capital of the early kings of the kingdom of Jaffna was Cankainagara or Sinkainagara (Sīṁhanagara). This capital seems to have been named after the Kaliṅga city of Sīṁhapura. We have seen already that Niśāṁkamalla and other Kaliṅga rulers came from Sīṁhapura in Kaliṅga. It is likely that Maṅga, who founded the Jaffna kingdom, would have named the capital of his new kingdom after his same original home.

---

2 Rasanayagam, op.cit., p.304.
4 Ibid.
Thus the data available about the beginnings of the Jaffna kingdom show that its foundation was due to the retreat of Magha and his followers to the northern part of Ceylon. As we have evidence to show that the founders of the Northern Kingdom had connections with the Eastern Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga in India, this too can be given to support the identification of the Kaliṅga region, from which these rulers of Ceylon hailed, with the Kaliṅga in India.

All the evidence cited above goes to prove that the Kaliṅga rulers, who reigned in Ceylon from the death of Parākramabāhu I until the invasion of Magha, were Indian princes who originally came from the Kaliṅga region in India, and thus we do not believe that they were Malay princes as Paranavitana has suggested. Therefore there is hardly any evidence to demonstrate that Malaysia played a vital role in the politics of Ceylon during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries A.D.
CHAPTER III

The Invasions of Candrabhanu.

The only recorded invasion of Ceylon which definitely came from the direction of South-east Asia occurred during the reign of Parākramabāhu II (A.D.1236-1270), when Candrabhanu of Tambraliṅga twice invaded the Island. His attempt, however, was a failure and during the second invasion he even lost his life. Therefore this inroad had little effect on the politics of the period and it was only an episode in the long history of Ceylon.

The Culavamsa, the Pūjavaliya, the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa, the Rajavaliya and the Dambadeni-asna all give accounts of Candrabhanu's invasions.¹ According to the Culavamsa, our main chronicle for the period, he landed with an army of Javakas during the eleventh year of the reign of Parākramabāhu II.

The Culavamsa says:

When the eleventh year of the reign of this king [Parākramabāhu II] had arrived, a king of the Javakas known by the name of Candrabhanu landed with a terrible Javaka army under the treacherous pretext that they also were followers of the Buddha. All these wicked

Jāvaka soldiers who invaded every landing-place and who with their poisoned arrows, like to terrible snakes, without ceasing harassed the people whomever they caught sight of, laid waste, raging in their fury, all Lāṅka.

Here in the chronicle Candrabhānu is simply called a Jāvaka who landed with a Jāvaka army. Therefore the early writers on the subject identified Candrabhānu as a Javanese prince, and Krom went to the extent of taking him to be a Śrīvijayan ruler, saying that the double defeat of Candrabhānu contributed much towards the downfall of the Śrīvijayan empire. Ferrand equated Jāvaka with the 'Zābag' by which Arab writers designated the Śrīvijaya kingdom.

All these speculations came to an end when Coedès published an inscription from Chaiya dated A.D.1230 mentioning a Candrabhānu who appeared to be the ruler alluded to in the Cūlavamsa. Later he analysed Krom's paper and clearly proved that Candrabhānu was not a Śrīvijayan ruler. In his paper,

1 Cv, LXXXIII, 36-51.
Coedès showed that Jāvaka was an ethnic name meaning Indonesian and according to him it has the same sense as the modern Cambodian 'Java' which applies to the Malays of the Peninsula as well as to the Islands of Indonesia. Therefore the 'Jāvakas' mentioned in the Cūlavamsa can be taken as inhabitants of Tāmbraliṅga, which was in the Malay Peninsula.

Numerous references to Candrabhanu prove that he was a ruler of Tāmbraliṅga. It is stated in the Chaiya inscription that Candrabhanu Śri Dharmarāja was the lord of Tāmbraliṅga.¹ The Hatthavanagallaviharavamsa says that he came from the country of Tambaliṅga.² The Sinhalese translation of this work made in A.D.1382 gives Tambaṅgāgam as the name of the country from which Candrabhanu hailed.³ A fifteenth century Sinhalese translation of the same Pāli chronicle gives the name as Tamaliṅgāmu.⁴ According to the Rājaratnakaraya of the sixteenth century, the invading forces came from Tamaliṅgāmu although Candrabhanu is not mentioned personally.⁵ The

¹ BEFEO, Vol. XVIII, p.32.
² Hvv (P.T.S.), p.32.
³ Elu-Attanagaluvamsaya, ed. Ariyaratna, p.45.
⁴ Elu-Attanagaluvamsaya, ed. Tennakoon, p.71.
⁵ Rājaratnakaraya, ed. Tisera, p.37.
Dambadeni-asna says that he came from Tamalingamu. Thus, as all these names are variant forms of Tambraliṅge, we may safely take it as the home of Candrabhānu. Therefore there is no serious objection to identifying Chandrabhānu mentioned in the Chaiya inscription with the invader of that name alluded to in the Ceylonese sources.

Paranavitana, in the light of the account of Candrabhānu given in the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa equates Candrabhānu with the Maharāja of Zābag or Śrīvijaya in the account of Arab writers. The Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa gives a vivid picture of Candrabhānu. There he is described as

A lion in prowess unto the rutting elephants who are the kings of many other countries, whose impetuosity could not be resisted by any one, who had deluded the whole world by a show of service to the world and the religion, who possessed an abundant military train, who was determined on taking possession of the sovereignty of Lāṅkā, who came from the Tambaliṅga country and was accompanied by feudatory kings.

Paranavitana taking this account literally, says that this description with its reference to feudatory kings 'would call to one's mind a potentate like the Maharāja of Zābag, whose might and wealth have been extolled by the Arab geographers,
rather than a local ruler of obscure origin who had but recently shaken off his allegiance to his suzerain of Śrīvijaya, as Candrabhānu is generally held to have been by historians.\(^1\)

Here Paranavitana's conclusions do not give much consideration to the nature of the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa nor to the contemporary history of South-east Asia, particularly of the Ligor region. The Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa was written during the reign of Parākramabāhu II, to whom the author's teacher, named Anomadassi, owed certain privileges. He received general favours from the ruler.\(^2\) In addition Parākramabāhu had close personal contact with the Hatthavanagalla monastery of which Anomadassi was the chief incumbent.\(^3\) Therefore, it would have been natural for its grateful head to make his pupil eulogize his patron and exaggerate his prowess and might in order to increase his importance. By describing the might of the enemies defeated by Parākramabāhu, the author wanted to show the greatness of this ruler. Furthermore to these Buddhist

---

\(^1\) Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, p.78.

\(^2\) The author states in his introductory verses that it was written at the request of his teacher Anomadassi. *Hvv*, p.1. This teacher is identified with elder for whom Patirājadeva following orders of Parākramabāhu II built a temple of three stories at Attanagalla vihāra. *Cv*, LXXXVI, 37-39; Geiger, *Cv*, tr. pt.2, p.174, note 1; Malalasekera, *The Pali Literature of Ceylon*, p.219.

\(^3\) *Cv*, LXXXV, 73 ff; LXXXVI, 37-39; *Hvv*, pp.32-33.
monks, who had suffered for a considerable period while Ceylon was under alien rule, Parākramabāhu II, who liberated Laṅka, would have appeared as a saviour and they naturally would have painted a glowing picture of their hero. Therefore it is necessary to treat the account given in the Hatthavanagallavihāra-vamsa with caution and not to accept Candrabhānu as a Maharāja of Zābag on its authority alone. Indeed such a conclusion is ruled out entirely if we survey the contemporary history of Tambraliṅga.

Tambraliṅga, the kingdom ruled by Candrabhānu, has been located by Coedes as the region of Ligor, which was its centre. Braddell, though he admits that the Ligor region was a part of Tambraliṅga, prefers to locate the centre of the kingdom in the Kuantan area, on the basis of the existence there of a river with the name of Tembeling. Wolters, who surveyed the history of this kingdom, writes about the location of Tambraliṅga as follows:

Only its geographical identity has been established with some certainty. The state is associated with the coastal lands round the Bay of Bandon in the narrowing waist of the Malay Peninsula. Sometimes it is referred

---


to as the State in the Ligor area. Little is known of its extent north or south. To the south it may have reached towards the state of Langkasuka which scholars today tend to locate in the Patani area. To the north it may have extended at least as far as Jaiya and probably further.

Thus we can suppose that Tambraliṅga was a kingdom comprising a considerable area of the Malay Peninsula with Ligor as its capital.

When Candrabhaṇu undertook his two invasions of Ceylon Tambraliṅga appears to have been a separate kingdom independent of the empire of Śrīvijaya. Coedes has clearly demonstrated that Candrabhaṇu was not a Śrīvijayan ruler and he even doubts whether the Malay Peninsula was under Śrīvijaya rule during this period.\(^2\) Krom too, who originally put forward the idea that Candrabhaṇu was a Śrīvijayan ruler, later accepted Coedes' thesis.\(^3\) Wolters after a careful study of all the sources relating to Tambraliṅga, came to the conclusion that it had been independent ever since the end of the tenth century. According to him only the famous Sanskrit Ligor inscription of A.D.775 contains a definite reference to Śrīvijaya and therefore it provides the only clear evidence

---

3 Krom, Hindoe-Javesansche Geschiedenis,2nd ed. (1931), p.335.
of Śrīvijayan supremacy over Tambraliṅga.\(^1\) After the invasion of Rājendra Coḷa the Śrīvijaya kingdom had hardly any political control over the Malay Peninsula and therefore Tambraliṅga was independent long before Candrabhaṅu became the ruler of that region.\(^2\) Furthermore Candrabhaṅu’s inscription of A.D.1230 is definite evidence that he was an independent ruler.\(^3\) Therefore Paranavitana’s argument, based only on the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa, which gives a prejudiced account of Parākramabahu, has no support from other historical sources. We have no evidence to take Candrabhaṅu as the Maharaja of Zābag, nor could we say that he got any support from the ruler of Śrīvijaya when he undertook his two invasions of Ceylon.\(^4\)

From the account given in our sources about this expedition, it is not easy to understand why it should have been sent to a land like Ceylon, which was so far from the Malay Peninsula. In describing the first invasion, the Cūlavamsa says nothing about the causes of the expedition,

---


\(^2\) ibid., p.597.


\(^4\) From the history of Śrīvijaya it appears that it had its own problems at this time especially with regard to provincial rulers who were trying to become independent. Nilakanta Sastri, *History of Śrīvijaya*, pp.95-101; Coedès, *The Indianized States*, pp.158, 168, 184-88.
except that the invaders came under the pretext that they also were followers of the Buddha. In the description of the second invasion the Culavamsa says that he sent forth messengers to the Sinhalese king saying 'I shall take Tissihala: 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.' From this second account it appears that Candrabhānu was interested in Buddhist relics. But the Culavamsa is not clear when it says in the first account that the Javakas came under the pretext that they also were Buddhists. It appears that the author of the Culavamsa was reluctant to admit that Candrabhānu was a Buddhist because of the hostilities which ensued in consequence of Candrabhānu's arrival. However, the Chaiya inscription confirms that he was a Buddhist when it eulogizes Candrabhānu 'who gave great felicity to the religion of the Buddha.'

1 Cv, LXXXIII, 37.
2 Ibid., LXXXVIII, 65-66.
4 Coedès, BEPEQ, Vol. XVIII, p.32; Nilakanta Sastri, History of Srivijaya, p.133.
From the eleventh century onwards Theravāda Buddhist influence from Ceylon was spreading in countries of South-east Asia. Therefore the Buddhist monks of Burma, Thailand and Nakhon Srit'amarat turned to Ceylon for guidance on religious matters.¹ They, on their visits to Ceylon in quest of learning, and the Sinhalese monks who crossed over to South-east Asia on missionary activities, took with them sacred texts and holy relics from Ceylon, resulting in Ceylon becoming well known for its Buddhist relics. In Nakhon Srit'amarat (Tambraliṅga), this Sinhalese influence was felt² and hence Candrabhānu too would have indeed been interested in obtaining relics from the Sinhalese ruler. Perhaps these relics may have had some political significance. They were thought to possess magical powers, which would bring security and prosperity to the kingdom and thus strengthen the power of the ruler. The story in the Jinakālamālī where the king of Nagarasiri Dhammarāja (Tambraliṅga) and the ruler of Sukhodaya are mentioned as making a joint effort to get a Buddha image from Ceylon, would also support this conclusion.³ Therefore the desire of obtaining Buddhist relics from Ceylon would have been one of the reasons,

¹ See infra, chapters V and VI.
² See infra, pp.276-79.
³ Jinakālamālī (P.T.S.), pp.86-91.
if not the only one, for Candrabhānu's first expedition to Ceylon.

Candrabhānu could hardly have had a political motive in undertaking his first invasion. If he had been interested in territorial expansion he could have used his power and resources without much difficulty in the vicinity of his own homeland. The Śrīvijaya empire which had once ruled the whole of Malay Peninsula up to Tambralinga and most of the surrounding islands was an ailing power at that time and therefore he would have had ample opportunities for realizing such an ambition.

Did Candrabhānu have any commercial reasons for such an undertaking? From the sources dealing with the subject we do not get even a hint of such motives. Nevertheless, Candrabhānu's kingdom was on the overland trade route across the Isthmus of Kra, and even though the Śrīvijayan empire was deteriorating it was still taking an active part in the maritime trade. From the eleventh century onwards the Arabs

---

1 Liyanagamage, op. cit., p.138.
2 Hirth and Rockhill, Chau Ju-kua, pp. 60 ff.
were taking an active part in the trade between China and the western world.\(^1\) They had close trade relations with the Śrīvijaya kingdom and some of them on their way to China took a route via Śrīvijaya and the Ceylonese ports.\(^2\) Did Candrabhanu have any idea of diverting this trade through his kingdom across the Isthmus? Ceylon was more or less the stepping stone for the Arabs on their way to South-east Asia. However, even if Candrabhanu did have such motives, they are impossible to prove due to lack of relevant evidence in our present sources. Therefore, in the present state of our knowledge about his invasion, it is more or less certain that religious motives were behind his expedition, though other causes too may have contributed towards it.

There is not much difficulty in fixing the date of Candrabhanu's first invasion, as in the Ālavaṃsa it has been specifically given as being in the eleventh year of the reign of Parakramabahu II.\(^3\) The Pujāvalīya too gives the same date.\(^4\)

\(^2\) Tibbetts, op.cit., p.27.
\(^3\) Cv, LXXXIII, 36.
\(^4\) Pjv, ed. Suraweera, p.117.
Without sufficient knowledge of the Sinhalese rulers, Kern accepted Wijesinghe's chronology, which gives A.D.1240-1275 as the reign of Parākramabāhu II, and fixed the date of the first invasion of Candrabhānu as A.D.1251. This date was accepted by Krom as well as by Ferrand. By taking into account Jouveau-Dubreuil's corrections to Wijesinghe's chronology Coedes first arrived at A.D.1236 as the date of the first invasion. But later he accepted Geiger's chronology and fixed the date in A.D.1247, taking A.D.1236 as the year of the accession of Parākramabāhu II.

Therefore, since the date of accession is fixed conclusively, the date of the invasion, which came in the eleventh year of the reign of Parākramabāhu, may be safely taken as A.D.1247.

5 Coedes, *The Indianized States*, p.185.
According to the *Cūlavamsa* Parākramabahu defeated the enemy in fearful battles. The chronicle says:

Then the king sent forth his sister's son, the heroic Prince Vīrabhāhu, with soldiers to fight the Jāvakas. The fearful Rāhu, namely Vīrabhāhu, with his terrible appearance completely destroyed (the moonlight, namely) Candrabhanu in the fields of heaven, namely in the battle. He placed his heroic Sīhala soldiers here and there and began to open fight with the Jāvaka warriors. The good Sīhala warriors, sure in aim, the archers, shattered in pieces with their sharply pointed arrows, in the battle the countless number of arrows whizzing against them with their poisoned tips which were shot swiftly one after the other by the Jāvaka soldiers from a machine. Going forth to the combat like Rāma, Prince Vīrabhāhu slew number of Jāvakas, as Rāma (slew) the Rakkhasas. The Veramba wind, namely Vīrabhāhu, possessed of great vehemence, shattered again and again the forest wilderness, namely the Jāvaka foes. After thus putting to flight the Jāvakas in combat, he freed the whole region of Lāṅka from the foe. Hereupon he betook himself to Devanagara, worshipped there the lotus-hued god and celebrated for him a divine sacrifice.... Thereupon he turned and came to the town Jambuddonī, he sought out Parākramabāhu, and he was overjoyed.

In view of the *Cūlavamsa* account, Paranavitana says that Candrabhānu landed at southern seaports and fighting took place in the southern part of the Island. The main reason for his reaching the above conclusion is that Vīrabhāhu visited

---

1 *Cv*, LXXXIII, 41-51.
Devanagara\(^1\) to make offerings to the God Uppalavānṇa after defeating Candrabhānu. The Cūlavāmsa does not say anything about the location of their landings except that they invaded every landing place.

During most of the early period Mahātittha (Māntai), Sūkaratittha (Orātoṭa), and Goṇagāmakā-pañcana (Trincomalee) were the main landing ports.\(^2\) Until the invasion of Candrabhānu all recorded invaders came from the Indian Sub-continent and therefore they used the northern ports. On the other hand Candrabhānu, who came from a completely different direction, the Malay Peninsula, may have used southern ports because he had reasons for doing so. When this invasion took place, the northernmost parts of Ceylon were in the hands of Māgha. Candrabhānu, who was interested in the Buddhist relics which were in the hands of Parākramabāhu, whose kingdom was in the south of Ceylon, would have selected the southern ports.\(^3\) Moreover, these seem to have been known to the ships coming from South-east Asia. The name 'Hambantota'

\(^1\) Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, p.75. Devanagara or Devundara, the southernmost point of Ceylon, has been a great centre of pilgrimage for a long time and the temple there is the abode of God Uppalavānṇa. He was the god to whom, according to the Mahāvamsa Sakka delegated the task of protecting Ceylon. Mv, VII, 3-5. The god is identified with Viṣṇu.


\(^3\) Liyanagamage, op.cit., p.139.
does not seem to be a toponym of recent origin. The Indonesian ships sailing between India and South-east Asian islands would have called at Ceylonese ports en route and from these visits by 'sampans' the name 'Hambantota' could have originated. From the accounts of the Arab writers it is apparent that southern ports like Galle had become important centres of trade, and the Chinese inscription found in Galle makes it clear that even the Chinese were making use of them. Thus the southern ports were familiar to the South-east Asian ships and Candrabhānu would have used them for his landing.

However, if we accept that Candrabhānu landed in southern ports, we have to face another problem. From the later history of the Jāvakas in Ceylon, it appears that they came into contact with Māgha whose kingdom was in the northernmost part of Ceylon. If the Jāvakas landed at the northern ports and fought in the northern region, it is easy to imagine that they might have retreated after their defeat to Māgha's kingdom. But if they fought in the south it might be thought that they were too far away for contact with Māgha. However, even though Candrabhānu landed in the south and fought in the southern region he may still have come into contact with this northern ruler after his

defeat by Parakramabahu II because he still had a fleet, and may have retreated in that direction.

The Culavamsa account says that Candrabhanu's first attempt was a failure. From the use of poisoned arrows and machines to shoot them it appears that the Jávakas were better equipped than the Sinhalese. But undoubtedly the number of the Sinhalese soldiers must have exceeded that of the Jávakas who would have had to cope with the difficulty of transporting troops by sea from a place as distant as the Malay Peninsula. Furthermore, they would not have been familiar with the Ceylonese terrain whereas the Sinhalese soldiers were in a better position in that respect.

To understand the second phase of relations between Candrabhanu and Ceylon we have to turn to the South Indian inscriptions. An inscription of Jatavarman Sundara Páṇḍya (A.D.1251-1268) dated in his seventh regnal year (A.D.1258) says that he invaded Ceylon. The date of the invasion is not given but it says that Sundara Páṇḍya compelled the ruler of Ceylon to pay tribute of precious jewels and elephants. Then Jatavarman Víra Páṇḍya's (A.D.1253-1275) inscriptions dated

---

A.D. 1263 and 1264 mention another invasion of Ceylon. The first of these inscriptions, dated in the tenth regnal year of Vīra Pāṇḍya (A.D.1263), mentions him as one who was pleased to take among others Ilam and the crown of the Śavakan together with the crowned head. In the Kuḍumiyamalai prāṣasti dated in Vīra Pāṇḍya's eleventh regnal year, the Pāṇḍya ruler says that he killed one of the two kings of Ceylon, captured his army, chariots, treasures, throne, crown, necklaces, bracelets, parasols and other royal possessions and raised the flag of victory on the Koṇamalai and Trikūṭāgiri besides subjugating the other ruler. Furthermore, the inscription says that the son of the Javaka king (Śavakan maindan), who had been disobedient for some time, made his submission to Vīra Pāṇḍya, received rewards and was restored to the kingdom of Ceylon once ruled by his father.

1 ARE (1895), no.185; ARE (1906), no.356; ARE (1916) no.588; 8th All.Ind.Or.Conf., op.cit., p.508; TBG, Vol.LXXVII, p.254. The chronology of the Later Pāṇḍyas is characterised by overlapping dates. Therefore we could see Jatāvarman Vīra Pāṇḍya ruling along with Jatāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya. The Struggle for Empire, p.258.


3 Ibid.
From these Pāṇḍya inscriptions, it appears that two invasions, one led by Sundara Pāṇḍya and the other by Vīra Pāṇḍya, were launched against Ceylon during the reign of Parākramabahu II, as both dates fall within his reign. Indrapala has rightly pointed out that the first invasion, which took place in A.D.1258 and was led by Sundara Pāṇḍya, was not against Parākramabahu II, who was then ruling from Dambadeniya, but against a Javaka ruler who was ruling another part of the Island. For this reason, he says, the Cūlavamsa has omitted any mention of this invasion. As a result of the expedition, the Javaka ruler had to pay tribute to the Pāṇḍya emperor.

Now we have to identify this Javaka who was ruling a part of Ceylon when the Pāṇḍya invasion was launched against the Island. Paranavitana, who at first identified him as Candrabhanu, later changed his view and identified him as Māgha, assuming that the latter was a Malayan prince. We have already seen that Māgha was not a Malayan prince but a Kalinga ruler who came from India. Therefore, as there was no other Javaka political connection during this period, the

---

3 Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, p.90.
Jāvaka here referred to can only be Candrabhānu, the sole Jāvaka mentioned in the sources of the period. Thus from the evidence of the Pāṇḍyan inscriptions it seems that even though Candrabhānu was defeated he did not leave Ceylon completely but was able to hold the northern part. This would mean that at the time of the first Pāṇḍya invasion under Sundara Pāṇḍya he would have been a local ruler who submitted to him and paid tribute to the Pāṇḍya empire.

The Jāvaka association with the northernmost part of Ceylon is supported by certain toponyms of that region. Certain Sinhalese works known as the Kaḍāimpotās, composed in recent centuries, which give the name of the territorial divisions in the three kingdoms of the Island, include Jāvagama as a part of Pīhiṭiraṭa. Jāvagama has been identified with Jaffna and derived from Jāvaka. Apart from that, first Codrington and then Paranavitana, have drawn attention to some toponyms in the Jaffna Peninsula containing the element 'Jāvaka'. Cavakacceri (Jāvaka ceri = Jāvaka settlement), and Cavakotte (Jāvaka Koṭṭai = Jāvaka fort) are amongst such names still in use and mentioned in the Yalpama-vaipava-malai, the

1 Indrapala, Ph.D. Thesis, p.466.
2 Tri-Sīṃhale Kaḍāim ha Vitti, ed. Marambe (Kandy, 1926), p.23.
Kokila-Sandēsaya and some of the Kadaimpotas. ¹ From the study of these place names it appears that the Jaffna Peninsula and a few of its adjoining regions had some sort of a connection with the Javakas and this is corroborated by the information gathered from the Pāṇḍyan inscriptions.

When Candrabhānu invaded Ceylon for the first time, Māgha had an independent kingdom in the Jaffna Peninsula. ² But none of our sources which give an account of this invasion says anything about how Candrabhānu came into contact with Māgha and his kingdom. Indrapala writing on the subject says:

As we are inclined to identify this Jāvaka of the Pāṇḍya inscriptions with Candrabhānu, it is possible to conjecture that this Malay ruler, after his defeat at the hands of the Sinhalese, fled to the northern kingdom. In course of time by some means he was in a position to succeed to the throne there. Probably he won the favour of Māgha, if he was still living at that time, and succeeded him. Or, it is possible that he was able to wrest power from the ruler of the northern kingdom. If such was the course of events,... it was as ruler of the northern kingdom that Candrabhānu launched his second attack on the Sinhalese kingdom...³

We have already seen that the explicit intention of Candrabhanu's first invasion was to secure some Buddhist relics from the Sinhalese ruler. As Candrabhanu originally had no intention of acquiring territory, after his defeat he could have come to a compromise with Magha so that they could undertake a joint effort to defeat Parakramabahu II, their common enemy. For Magha it was important to defeat him in order to recover his former kingdom and therefore it would probably have been Magha who took the initiative in arriving at this compromise. But this agreement could not be put into practice either because Magha died before the preparations were complete and Candrabhanu succeeded to his throne or because Candrabhanu secured the throne in some other way. Most probably he succeeded after Magha's death, if the latter did not have a successor in his kingdom.

However, while preparations were still being made, Candrabhanu had to face a Pāṇḍya invasion and submit to the Pāṇḍya ruler, but he continued to rule his kingdom as a vassal of the Pāṇḍyas. Thus Candrabhanu would have used his kingdom in the north of Ceylon as the base of operations when he invaded the Sinhalese kingdom for the second time.
The *Jinakālamālī* says that the rulers of Nagarasiri Dhammarāja and Sukhodaya obtained a Sinhalese Buddha image by sending a joint envoy to the Sinhalese ruler.¹ Coedès' suggestion is that Candrabhānu (King Siridhamma or the ruler of Nagarasiri Dhammarāja mentioned in the *Jinakālamālī*) after the failure of the first attempt to get the image by force, managed to get it by peaceful means in association with the ruler of Sukhodaya.² If we accept his suggestion, we have to answer two other questions. With the experience of the first attack by Candrabhānu still fresh in his memory, did the Sinhalese ruler readily hand over the Buddhist relics to his enemy's envoy? Furthermore, why did Candrabhānu invade the Island for a second time after resuming friendship and receiving the Relics? It is not possible to answer any of these questions with certainty as we have very little information on the subject. With the available data we can only make some suggestions.

If we accept Coedès we have to believe that Candrabhānu went back to his kingdom in Tambraliṅga at some stage after the failure of his first invasion. As the Pāṇḍya inscription speaks

---

¹ *Jinakālamālī* (P.T.S.), pp.86-88.
of a son of Jávaka, it appears that Candrabhānu's son was in the Jaffna kingdom when Vīra Pāṇḍya sent his expedition. When Candrabhānu led his first invasion he would have left his kingdom in charge of his son, who would then have been in Tāmbraḷiṅga. We have already seen that Candrabhānu secured the Jaffna kingdom for himself and after the Pāṇḍya invasion became a vassal of the Pāṇḍya empire. Thus, as far as the security of the Jaffna kingdom was concerned, it would have been quite safe, as the Pāṇḍyas were then powerful. It is not impossible that the Pāṇḍyas left some troops in Ceylon. Now Candrabhānu would have thought of going back to his own kingdom in Tāmbraḷiṅga to look after matters there while preparations were going on for the second invasion of the Sinhalese kingdom. Therefore he would have sent for his son before he left Ceylon so that he could leave the Jaffna kingdom and the preparations for war in his care until his return.

Though the Jinakālamālī says that Rocarāja (Indraditya), the ruler of Sukhodaya, came down to the kingdom of Siridhamma, desirous of seeing the sea,¹ it is not impossible that he came to see Candrabhānu (the king referred to as Siridhammarāja in the Jinakālamālī) having heard of his arrival in Tāmbraḷiṅga.

¹ Jinakālamālī (P.T.S.), p.87.
Candrabhānu would not have been in a position to send a mission to the Sinhalese ruler asking for the relics after his first invasion. Therefore, as the ruler of Sukhodaya was also interested in obtaining Buddhist relics, Candrabhānu would have suggested to him the sending of an envoy to the ruler of Ceylon. Thus the envoy would have been sent under the name of the ruler of Sukhodaya. The Sinhalese king opposed Candrabhānu, but he had no reason to be hostile to the rulers of Sukhodaya. As a matter of fact, he would have been pleased to receive his envoys because they also were interested in Theravāda Buddhism. Therefore the Sinhalese monarch would have readily handed over some Buddhist relics to the envoys to be taken to the kingdom of Sukhodaya. If the mission was a joint one sent by Candrabhānu and the ruler of Sukhodaya, the former would have instructed them to visit his kingdom in Northern Ceylon. If the envoys did so, the son of the Jāvaka (Candrabhānu's son) would have informed them of the plans for the second invasion and they would have brought back the information. Accordingly the second invasion would have been undertaken by Candrabhānu.

The Culavamsa gives the following account of Candrabhānu's second invasion:

At that time the Lord of men Candabhānu formerly beaten after hard fighting, having collected from the countries of the Paṇḍus and Coḷas and elsewhere many
Damila soldiers, representing a great force, landed with his Javaka army in Mahātittha. 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 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."¹

This time Candrabhānu landed at Mahātittha, which was in the north of Ceylon. Kurundi and Padī mentioned in the above account have been identified with Kurunthanur and Padaviya respectively, both in the northern part of the Island. From the situation of these two places it is not impossible that the Javakas controlled even Mahātittha, which was then very important for foreign relations. Thus from the Jaffna kingdom they spread their influence southwards towards the Sinhalese kingdom. Therefore, Paranavitana is quite right when he says that Candrabhānu was much stronger when he led his second invasion.²

In bringing over the Sinhalese to his side, Buddhism would have helped him, because during Māgha's rule Buddhism did not gain any support here and even after his defeat this northern region became only nominally a part of the Sinhalese kingdom. Parākramabāhu II would not have had time to restore the Buddhist Order in that region immediately after conquering it, as he was

¹ Cv, LXXXVIII, 62-67.
busy in the main part of his kingdom around Dambadeniya. He did not even start repairing Polonnaruwa until after the second defeat of Candrabhānu. Therefore as the Sinhalese Buddhists of this northern part of Ceylon had not had a Buddhist ruler for a long time, they would have accepted Candrabhānu as their ruler when he appealed to them as a true Buddhist.

It appears that the invader on this occasion was interested not only in relics but also in territorial possessions. This is natural because he had been controlling the Jaffna kingdom for some time. Furthermore, the changes that had taken place in his kingdom and the surrounding region also would have made him interested in territorial possessions elsewhere. In the latter part of the thirteenth century the Sukhodaya kingdom of Thailand became powerful and other small kingdoms on its borders became a prey to this kingdom. Though we have evidence of its expansion towards the Malay Peninsula only at the end of the thirteenth century their influence reached as far as the kingdom of Tambralīṅga. If we are to believe the Jinakālamālī the ruler of Sukhodaya visited Tambralīṅga frequently and from the relationship between the rulers of these two kingdoms it appears

---

1 Ibid., p.627.
that the ruler of Tambralinga was more or less subordinate to the Sukhodaya kingdom. Therefore to be freed from this pressure Candrabhanu would have been encouraged to seek some other region where he could carve out an independent kingdom. Furthermore Ceylon would have attracted Candrabhanu for other reasons as well. The Island was well known for her Theravada Buddhism, Buddhist relics and sacred shrines. Therefore the desire to become the ruler of such a Holy Island and to possess all its valuable relics would have naturally made him interested in capturing the Sinhalese kingdom for himself. By doing so his fellow Buddhists would consider him as the protector of the Faith. Hence religion and the threat from the kingdom of Sukhodaya would have been the main causes for his invasion of the Sinhalese kingdom for the second time.

Fixing the date of this second invasion is rather a problem as it has not been dated in any of the sources dealing with the subject. Coedès fixed it as A.D.1256, basing his calculations on the account given in the Jinakālamālī. This chronicle says that after a lapse of 1800 years from the Parinirvāṇa of the Buddha, Rocarājā (Indraditya) reigned in the city of Sukhodaya. This is the only date mentioned in that text about the incident.

1 Jinakālamālī (P.T.S.), p.87.
This year of the Buddhist Era is equal to A.D.1256. Though the *Jinakālamālī* says that the kings Siridhamma and Rocarājā sent envoys to Ceylon, it does not say anything about Siridhamma's (Candrabhānu's) invasion of Ceylon.¹ We are not told even whether they sent the envoys in the year mentioned. Even if they sent envoys in that year, we cannot take it as the date of the second invasion because the text does not mention any expedition. It may well be that the invasion did not take place until a few years later.² Therefore from the *Jinakālamālī* we get nothing about the date of Candrabhānu's second invasion.

The *Cūlavamsa*, our main chronicle, too, is not very helpful for the task. But the *Pūjavaliya* says that the two princes Vijayabahu and Virabahu entered Polonnaruva in the twenty sixth year of the reign of Parākramabahu II (A.D.1262) after defeating Candrabhānu.³ Furthermore we are told by the same literary work that Candrabhānu invaded for the second time after prince Vijayabahu had been entrusted with the administration of the Dambadeniya kingdom.⁴ According to an

---

¹ Liyanagamage, op.cit., p.135.
² Ibid.
³ *Pjv*, ed. Suraweera, p.137.
⁴ Ibid., pp.130 ff.
inscription found at Alutnuvaradāvāḷa, Paṟakramabāhu II was afflicted with an incurable disease in A.D. 1258 and control of the affairs of the state was entrusted to Prince Vijayabāhu, his eldest son. Thus from the inscription and the Pujavaliya it appears that the invasion took place between A.D. 1258 and 1262.

The Pujavaliya says that Paṟakramabāhu requested his son Vijayabāhu to undertake what he himself failed to achieve, namely the completion of the work of restoring the Mahāthūpa at Anurādhapura, the occupation of Polonnaruva so that the Tooth Relic may be installed in its ancient shrine, etc. As the prince did not get a chance to enter Polonnaruva until he defeated Candrabhanu, the restoration work would have taken place as soon as the opportunity became available, to satisfy his ailing father. Therefore Vijayabāhu would have entered Polonnaruva either in the same year or in the year after Candrabhanu lost his life. Thus we arrive at either A.D. 1261 or 1262 as the date of Candrabhanu's invasion.

2 Pjv, ed. Suraweera, pp. 131-132.
3 Liyanagamage, op. cit., p. 152.
We may now turn to the Pāṇḍya inscriptions referred to for further information. Though the Pāṇḍya inscriptions claim that Jātāvarman Vīra Pāṇḍya defeated Jāvaka (Candrabhānu) alone we shall see later that he did so with the help of Parākramabāhu II. The Pāṇḍya ruler mentions his invasion and his 'taking the crown of the Śāvaka together with the crowned head', in his inscriptions dated A.D.1263 and 1264. This achievement is not mentioned in any of his inscriptions issued in the early part of A.D.1262. Therefore it must have happened either in the latter part of A.D.1262 or in A.D.1263. But, as we have already seen, according to the Pūjāvaliya Vijayabāhu after defeating Candrabhānu entered Polonnaruva in the twenty-sixth year of the reign of Parākramabāhu; hence we may take the latter part of A.D.1262 as the date of Candrabhānu's second invasion of the Sinhalese kingdom.

According to our sources Candrabhānu had a formidable army. The Cūlavamsa says that he had a number of Damilas from the Coḷa country, the Pāṇḍya country and elsewhere. Indrapala is of the opinion that he did not bring all these south Indian soldiers from India, but recruited some in Ceylon itself.

---

2 Cv, LXXXVIII, 62-63.
This interpretation seems right, because if Candrabhanu was well established in the Jaffna kingdom before he launched his attack, there were a number of Tamil settlements from which he could recruit his troops. In fact, Māgha invaded with a strong force of Tamils and when he captured Polonnaruva he colonized the northern regions of Ceylon with them. The army would have continued in service under him in Polonnaruva and even after his retreat to the Jaffna Peninsula they would have followed him there. Therefore when Candrabhanu inherited the Jaffna kingdom which had been under Māgha, the Tamil forces would have continued their service under the new leader. Furthermore, when Sundara Pāṇḍya subjugated the Jaffna kingdom which was then under Candrabhanu, some Pāṇḍya troops would have been left behind under his service. These would account for Candrabhanu having Tamils at his disposal when he invaded the Sinhalese kingdom. It is not impossible that he also recruited some Tamil mercenary forces from South India.

When we compare the Culavamsa account and the information we gather from the Pāṇḍya inscriptions, it appears that both sources are referring to the same incident, though the Sinhalese and Pāṇḍya rulers claim independent victories over

1 Cv, LXXX, 76-78; LXXXI, 14; Pjv, ed. Suraweera, pp.108-109.
Candrabhānu. Probably both Parākramabāhu and Vīra Pāṇḍya made a joint effort to defeat the Jāvaka ruler.¹ The Kuḍumiyanimalai inscription speaks of a request made by a Ceylonese minister, but it does not mention the nature of the request.² Comparing all the evidence it would appear that this Ceylonese minister took a message from Parākramabāhu II to the Pāṇḍya ruler inviting him to intervene in the war.³ The Sinhalese ruler turned to the Pāṇḍyas mainly because Candrabhānu was under their vassalage.

If the Jāvaka was a vassal of Vīra Pāṇḍya we are not sure why the latter helped the Sinhalese ruler against his own subordinate. Vīra Pāṇḍya's inscriptions state that the Jāvaka had betrayed his commands and displayed hostility. It may be that Candrabhānu, being subordinate to Vīra Pāṇḍya, asked his permission to undertake an invasion of the Sinhalese kingdom, but that for some reason this permission was not granted. Perhaps the Pāṇḍya ruler did not want to see his vassal become powerful, which would be a threat to his authority in the

Jaffna kingdom. The Jāvaka ruler must have ignored his command and continued with the invasion, which disobedience would have accounted for Vīra Pāṇḍya's ready response to Parākramabāhu's appeal. Perhaps Candrabhānu stopped paying tribute to his lord when he became powerful enough. If this is so he had to pay dearly for his disobedience, as his army was no match for the joint forces of Vīra Pāṇḍya and Parākramabāhu II.

The Kuḍumiyamalai inscription is also important because it says that the Pāṇḍya king levied tribute from another ruler of the Island.\(^1\) This king could be no other than Parākramabāhu II and as the latter appealed for help, the Pāṇḍya ruler considered him to be a subordinate ally.

Though the Cūlavamsa says that both Vijayabāhu and Vīrabāhu fought great battles, as fierce as Rāma's combats, Pāṇḍya help would have contributed a lot towards the victory of the Sinhalese. According to the chronicle Candrabhānu fled, and all the loveliest women in his court, and all his elephants, horses, swords and many other weapons, and his entire treasure were captured by the Sinhalese.\(^2\) Vīra Pāṇḍya's inscription gives a similar account of the booty captured by him and

\(^1\) 8th All.Ind.Or.Conf. (1937), pp.524-26; TBG, Vol.LXXVII, pp.267-68.
\(^2\) Cv, LXXXVIII, 74-75.
obviously refers to the same incident. This description of the wealth captured from the Javaka ruler also bears out the fact that this second invasion took place after he had become well established in Ceylon.

The result of this second invasion was disastrous for Candrabhanu. Vīra Pāṇḍya's inscriptions say that the Javaka ruler was killed in the battle. But according to the Cūlavamsa account Vijayabahu 'sent the lord of men Candrabhanu flying defenseless'. The Pujāvaliya specifically mentions that he was killed in the battle. The Hatthavanagallaviharavamsa too leads us to believe that he was destroyed by the Sinhalese. Thus from these numerous references it appears that Candrabhanu lost his life in the battle during his second invasion. Furthermore, as his son did not leave Jaffna we may surmise that Candrabhanu's kingdom in Tambraliṅga ceased to exist and was eventually overrun by the Sukhodaya kingdom in Thailand.

---

2 Ibid.
3 Cv, LXXXVIII, 73.
4 Pjav, ed. Suraweera, p.117.
5 Hvv (P.T.S.), p.32.
The death of Candrabhanu failed to unite the Island. The Pandya monarch placed Candrabhanu's son on the throne of Jaffna, saying that the son should rule the kingdom which was ruled by the father, in order to sustain it under his sway, and the Sinhalese king would have been agreeable to this so long as his own security was not threatened.

The history of Jaffna now becomes clouded in obscurity, owing to a lack of historical material relating to this period, and we know nothing about the downfall of the Javaka rulers to account for the rise of the next dynasty mentioned in the chronicles and other literary sources, the Arya Cakravartis.

Before gaining control of the kingdom of Jaffna, the Arya Cakravartis had been Pandya feudatories in the region of Ramnad district. The earliest Ceylonese reference to them appears in the Culavamsa. It tells how, after the death of Bhuvanaikabahu I, when the country was in the throes of a famine, five brothers who ruled the country of Pandya despatched an army under the leadership of a great general named Arya Cakravarti. He landed in Ceylon and laid the country waste on every side before entering the capital.

1 Their inscriptions are found engraved on the walls of the temple at Tirippullani, SII, Vol. VIII, nos. 396 and 398.
Subhagiri (Yapahuva) and capturing the Tooth Relic, and all the costly treasures. Then he returned to the Pāṇḍya kingdom where he presented them to King Kulaśekhara (A.D.1268-1308) 'who was as the sun for the lotus blossom of the stem of the great kings of the Paṇḍus.' This expedition invaded Ceylon at a time when there was no legitimate ruler of the Sinhalese kingdom, according to the Sinhalese sources.

The description of the invasion given in the chronicle is rather interesting. Paranavitana comments on it are as follows:

What is noteworthy in the chronicler's account of this invasion is the lack of condemnation of the invaders, in spite of the fact that they laid their hands on the most venerated religious object of the Buddhists. The somewhat uncomplimentary reference to the name of the leader is little more than literary embellishment, but the Pāṇḍya monarch has been given very complimentary epithets. It seems that the invasion was not unwelcome from the point of view of the chronicler, and this tone of his in dealing with the event can only be explained if Yapavu and the districts invaded were under the control of a personage towards whom the official historian had reason to entertain feelings of hostility.

1 Cv. XC, 43-47.
According to Paranavitana the chronicler was not particularly hostile in his treatment of the invaders because they had really come to help the Sinhalese against the Jávaka ruler in the north.  

Bhuvanaikabahu I had moved his capital to Yapahuva because of this threat from the north, where the power of the Jávaka ruler was waxing strong. But when the Sinhalese ruler died the kingdom was left without strong leadership, and the Jávaka ruler of the Jaffna kingdom took this opportunity to wipe out the disgrace of his father's defeat. Thus he would have invaded Yapahuva and captured the sacred relics and other booty. The Sinhalese nobility would have appealed for help to the Pândyas once again, as they did on the occasion of Candrabhánu's second invasion. The Pândya rulers would have sent Árya Cakravarti with an army to help the Sinhalese. When they landed, the kingdom of Yapahuva would have been in the hands of the invader and Árya Cakravarti would have secured them by defeating the Jávaka ruler, who may have lost his life in this encounter. But all these conjectures are hypothetical and in the Cūlavamsa account there is no mention of the Jávakas in connection with the invasion of Árya Cakravarti. After this none of the sources refers to the Jávakas and it

---

1 Ibid.
may be that Jāvaka rule in the Jaffna kingdom came to an end with Ārya Cakravarti's expedition to Ceylon.

It is possible that the son of Candrabhānu met the same fate as his father at the hands of the invader, or else was ousted by the Ārya Cakravartis who later became the rulers of Jaffna. For even if he had survived, the Pāṇḍya ruler would not have considered making him a feudatory again after the two previous experiences. Instead, he would have appointed Ārya Cakravarti, the leader of the Pāṇḍya expedition, his feudatory in the Northern kingdom of Ceylon. When Parākramabāhu visited the Pāṇḍya kingdom to fetch the Tooth Relic, the Pāṇḍya emperor would have come to terms with him on the question of allowing the Northern Kingdom to be ruled by Ārya Cakravarti under the Pāṇḍya aegis. Parākramabāhu had no alternative but to accept, as he himself had to depend on the Pāṇḍyan ruler for the return of the Sacred Relic which would ensure the security of his position.²

According to Paranavitana, Jāvaka rule did not come to an end as a result of Ārya Cakravarti's invasion.³ He says that

---

1. Ibid., p.632.
the Javakas not only continued to rule the Jaffna kingdom but also were able to gain control of the Sinhalese kingdom and remained in power until the sixteenth century A.D. On close examination the basis on which his argument is founded appears unsound.

Paranavitana's opinion is that the Savulū dynasty which was founded by Vijayabahu V was a Javaka family. He tries to find evidence to show that Ārya Cakravarti rulers too were known as Savulūs. He has drawn attention in this respect to an inscription dated in the third regnal year of Vikramabahu III (A.D.1357-1374), found in the Galagane vihāra at Mādavala in Harispattu, Kandy district. His reading of the inscription is as follows:

1. Śrī Sirisāṅgabo Śrī Vikramabahu
2. cakravarti-svāmin-vahansēta tunvanu Uduvapapura
3. aṭa(vaka sa)ndhanayen Singuruvana Balavita, Mātale Dumbara
4. Sagama-tunraṭa Sa(va)lu-pati Ma(r)ttāṇḍam-
   perumālun-vahansē
5. maṭigaya pavarādena bamuṇan Tenuvara Malamaḍala Naḍuvalantāru.

The Marttāṇḍam-perumālun-vahansē mentioned in the inscription has been identified by Paranavitana as an Ārya Cakravarti ruler

1   Ibid.
named Martanda mentioned in the Yalpāna-vaipava-malai. Thus in his opinion this Arya Cakravarti ruler also belonged to the family of Savulu rulers. Then he commences his main argument by saying that the term 'Savulu' has the same meaning as Javaka. He says:

This word Savalu is, in my opinion, the same as Javaka. Java is pronounced in Tamil as Cava or Sava to which al, meaning 'person', has been added, on the analogy of Malavāli from Malaya-al. A Savāli or Savāl would thus denote a person of Javaka race. The final vowel u suggests the influence of Telugu which, ..., was the language of the rulers of the Javaka kingdom in the Malay Peninsula... Magha came from Malaysia with a following of Malay warriors and, if he founded a kingdom in North Ceylon, the ruling class of that kingdom would have been Javakas or Savāl. The region over which they exercised dominion could also have been known by this name. And, further, the Arya Cakravarti from Rāmeśvaram who married into the Javaka family and secured power in the kingdom, and his descendants, would have been referred to as their lord by the Savāli or Savalu people. The epithet 'Savalu-pati' applied to the Arya Cakravarti in the Mādavala inscription, is thus satisfactorily explained on the basis that the royal family into which the Arya Cakravarti from Rāmeśvaram married was that of the Javakas.2

This leads Paranavitana to conclude that after the Muslim penetration into South India Arya Cakravarti came to Jaffna

---

2 JCBRAS, NS, Vol. VII, pt. 2, p.199; Ceylon and Malaysia, pp.129-30. This 'Savulu' has been interpreted as the name of a village. D.B. Jayatilaka, Sinhala Sāhitya Lipi, p.113.
with a large following of soldiers, that he undertook the subjugation of the Sinhalese kingdom on his own initiative or at the suggestion of his Savulu host, and that he then installed the Savulu monarch as the overlord of Lanka. For his services, Ārya Cakravarti kept the kingdom of Jaffna for himself and possibly also the right to collect certain dues from the rest of the Island, and then, after having contracted a matrimonial alliance with the Jávaka family acknowledged the suzerainty of the Jávaka ruler.

Paranavitana's thesis is mainly hypothetical. Our sources have nothing to prove his theory, which is mostly based on assumptions and the interpretation of uncertain words, particularly the identification of the word 'Savulu'. But some scholars, for example Indrapala, have contested his interpretation of this name. Indrapala writing on Paranavitana's theory says:

This seems to be a far-fetched theory. In the first place, the identification of Marttandam of the Madavala inscription with an Ārya-Cakravartin of Jaffna is not certain. Even if this is granted, the derivation of Savulupati from Jáva is rather ingenious. It is true that Jáva is pronounced in Tamil as Čava or Śava. But the analogy on which this is made, the first element of Savali, is certainly wrong. Malayāli is not derived from the two words Malaya and āl, but from Malayalam, the Tamil name for Keralam, meaning 'valley', in the same way as Vahkali (Bengali) is derived from Vaṅkālam (Bāṅgāla - Bengal). No one would say that the latter is derived from Vaṅka (Vaṅga) and āl, although it would appear quite logical. The derivation of Savalu, occurring in the Sinhalese works, is disputed by scholars. Various other interpretations have been given to it. It does not occur in any Tamil work and it is doubtful whether
any Āryacakravartin bore this title. Further, the inscription in which it is claimed to occur as the epithet borne by a certain Marttāṇḍam is badly damaged. Paranavitana admits that "the record is badly weathered, and from its sixth line, only a few letters are legible here and there" and that even "some letters in the first few lines are also indistinct". The term Savalupati occurs in the fourth line and two letters of this word, namely va and ti, are not clear. Under these circumstances, one cannot be sure that the epithet is Savalupati and not some other word.¹

None of the Sinhalese or Tamil sources dealing with the history of the Ārya Cakravartis make any mention of this epithet Savalupati. If there was any connection between the Ārya Cakravarti family and the Savulu dynasty the writers of the Tamil chronicles would have certainly mentioned it with pride. Moreover, the relations between the Savulu rulers and the Ārya Cakravartis were anything but friendly, ² thus making it impossible to believe that they were dependent upon and allied with the Ārya Cakravartis. They claimed that they were related to Parākramabāhu I. If they were Javakas we have not been able to find any proof of their claim, as Parākramabāhu had no connections with the Javakas, to the best of our knowledge. The Sinhalese sources where we find information about the Savulu dynasty have nothing to say about their family connections with the Ārya Cakravartis. In these circumstances, we agree with Indrapala who says that

Savulu rulers were not Jávakas. Thus, we still believe that Jávaka rule in the Jaffna kingdom came to an end with the invasion of Írya Cakrabarti during the reign of Kulaśekhara, the Páňda emperor.

From the foregoing discussion it is clear that Candrabhānu invaded Ceylon for the first time in A.D. 1247, but did not leave the Island after his defeat by Parākramabāhu II. Instead, he fled to the Jaffna kingdom which was then under Māgha. Somehow or other he managed to secure that kingdom for himself, though when Sundara Páňya invaded Ceylon Candrabhānu had to submit and pay tribute to him. But later on, when he became powerful enough, he once again invaded the Sinhalese kingdom. Parākramabāhu II with the aid given by Vīra Páňya defeated the Jávaka invader. Though Candrabhānu lost his life in the battle, the Páňya ruler avoided handing over the Northern kingdom to Parākramabāhu II by appointing the son of the Jávaka Candrabhānu as its ruler and thus retaining it for himself. Certain references in our sources give us to believe that this Jávaka son became a threat to the Sinhalese king, but he once again protected his kingdom with Páňya help, which arrived under the able leadership of Írya Cakrabarti. Finally Írya Cakrabarti was given the Jaffna kingdom by his Páňya overlord, but when the Páňya empire collapsed owing
to the Muslim inroads to South India, Jaffna became an independent kingdom under the Ārya Cakravartis. Thus ended the Jāvaka rule in Northern Ceylon.
The long reign of Parakramabahu VI (A.D. 1415-1467) was one of the glorious periods of Ceylon's history with notable achievements in peace as well as in war. The early life of this king is surrounded with mystery and the historical sources and literary works only refer to him after he became king of Kotte. But popular imagination has filled the vacuum left by the scholars; folk tales about his childhood and the manner of his coming to the throne originated not long after his death or even in his life time. These have found a place in the histories written about two centuries later.¹

Parakramabahu VI of Kotte has been traced as a descendant of Vijayabahu V (A.D. 1335-1341) of the Savulu dynasty.² This has led Paranavitana to think that, like the Savulu rulers, he too belonged to the Javaka family, which held sway over the Jaffna kingdom, and even had some control over certain parts of the Malay Peninsula. Therefore he interprets certain

² Savulu vijēba nirinđu pit Pāракum rajun haṭa munuburu, Pāракumbā-sirita, ed. Charles de Silva (Colombo, 1954), v. 27.
literary references in accordance with his theory.\(^1\) We have already seen that the epithet 'Savulu' was not derived from Javaka and there is no other evidence to show that the Savulu rulers were members of the Javaka family. Therefore the fact that Parakramabahu was related to the Savulu family does not mean that he was of Javaka origin, and it is necessary to examine what other proofs Paranavitana has given in order to establish Parakramabahu's connections with the Malay Peninsula.

First, we must turn to the work of Ramacandra, who was a Bengali Brahmin who came to Ceylon to study under Toṭagamuve Śrī Rāhula and was patronised by Parakramabahu VI.\(^2\) He wrote a commentary to the Vṛttā-ratnākara known as the Vṛttā-ratnākara-pancika,\(^3\) in which he includes a number of his own original verses eulogizing his patron Parakramabahu. There the king is described as Kusuma-pura-nagara-vara-viracita-padam 'he who has set up his abode at the excellent city of Kusumapura (Pāṭaliputra)', Kusuma-pura-pati 'Lord of Kusumapura', and

\(^{1}\) Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, pp.136 ff.

\(^{2}\) Vṛttā-ratnākara with Pañcika, ed. Seelakkhandha (Bombay, 1903), p.4

\(^{3}\) Ibid., pp.1-2.
Magadha-pati ‘Lord of Magadha’. Paranavitana comments on these epithets as follows:

It is well known that Kusumapura was a name of Pāṭaliputra, the capital of Magadha. It is hardly possible to justify the use of these epithets indicating overlordship of Magadha and Kusumapura as due to the reason that the genealogy of Parākramabāhu has been traced to a Maurya prince Sumitra, who came to Ceylon with the branch of the Sacred Bo-tree in the time of Asoka of India and Devanampiya Tissa of Ceylon. The expression Kusumapura-nagara-vara-viracita-padam cannot be explained in that manner. We have therefore to conclude that Parākramabāhu VI exercised effective authority, or at least claimed titular suzerainty, over a region known as Magadha, and a city named Kusumapura or Pāṭaliputra.2

According to Paranavitana there is no evidence to show that Parākramabāhu claimed any authority over Pāṭaliputra in Magadha in India, and he draws attention to an eighteenth century document which refers to a Pāṭaliputra on the Malay Peninsula. This is an account of a religious mission sent to Thailand by Kīrti Śrī Rājasimha of Kandy in A.D. 1750, written by Vilbagedara-Naide, one of the leaders of the mission.3 Vilbagedara tells how, when the mission was returning home with some Thai monks, the ship in which they

1 Ibid., pp.26, 66 and 72.
2 Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, pp.136-37.
were sailing sank in mud and they had to land at a place called Muan Lakon and send the ship away for repairs. They had to stay at Muan Lakon until the ship returned and in the description of the place, Vilbăgedara-Naide says that there was a city known as Pāṭaliputra where they found a stūpa which was as large as the Ruvanvīlisāya at Anurādhapura. According to him there was also a Bo-tree which had been taken from Anurādhapura at the request of Dharmāsoka the younger, who became the king of that city later.¹

Muan Lakon mentioned in the above account was in the Ligor region which is in the Malay Peninsula and belonged to the kingdom of Ayodhya in Thailand. If we are to accept Vilbăgedara's account, Muan Lakon was known as Pāṭaliputra in the eighteenth century. Paranavitana, in the light of this account, thinks that Muan Lakon was known as Pāṭaliputra as far back as the fifteenth century also, and he believes that this city and the region on the Malay Peninsula which was known as Magadha was the area over which Parākramabāhu claimed overlordship.²

Here again Paranavitana's interpretation is purely hypothetical. If Parākramabāhu had any political supremacy over the Malay Peninsula, the Indian scholar Ramacandra would

¹ P.E.E. Fernando, op.cit., pp.67 ff.
² Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, p.138.
certainly have mentioned it, since he was a contemporary of the ruler and moreover, as an Indian Brahmin from Bengal, would have been well acquainted with the Magadha and Pāṭaliputra in India. If he had been referring to a Pāṭaliputra and a Magadha on the Malay Peninsula he would have specified that it was not the Magadha in India which was familiar to the contemporary Ceylonese as well as to himself. But he did not make any such distinction.

Paranavitana's argument for a Magadha kingdom in the region of Ligor are rather unconvincing. Parākramabāhu is referred to by Rāmacandra as Magadha-pati. In explaining this Paranavitana says that as Pāṭaliputra was in Magadha, the region on the Malay Peninsula where Muan Lakon was situated was also known as Magadha. To get support for his theory he draws attention to the term Magadhakkhara used by the Sinhalese literati of the eighteenth century to describe the Thai Buddhist manuscripts written in the Pāli language in Cambodian characters. Paranavitana interprets this by saying that Sukhodaya received Theravāda Buddhism from Nakhon Srit'ammarat, where Cambodian characters were in use owing to the Cambodian occupation of the area; and that the Pāli scriptures taken to Sukhodaya from Nakhon Srit' ammarat were written in the Cambodian script although the language was Pāli. The Thais continued the use of the same
script in copying the manuscripts and the Sinhalese literati used the term *Magadhakkhara* for these characters, because the Nakhon Srit'ammarat from which this script came to Thailand would have been known as Magadha. Thus according to Paranavitana Nakhon Srit'ammarat was known as Magadha and as Parākramabāhu VI had supremacy over that region, Rāmacandra used the epithet *Magadha-pati* in eulogizing his patron.¹

In saying that the Cambodian script came to Thailand from Nakhon Srit'ammarat, Paranavitana has failed to recognise that at one stage most of Thailand itself was under Cambodian supremacy and that Cambodian domination lasted there for some time. Until the introduction of the Thai script by Rāma Khamhaeng² in A.D.1283 various forms of the Cambodian alphabet had been in use in Thailand.³ Even the script introduced by him consisted of forms of the existing Cambodian characters altered and adopted so as to render them suitable for writing Thai words.⁴ Thus the Cambodian script was well known in Thailand and it is not impossible that

---

⁴ Ibid.
before the advent of the Thais the Buddhist scriptures which were in use in the regions of present Thailand were written in Cambodian characters. The Khmer inscription of Lū Tai dated A.D.1361 would prove that the Khmer language and script was still in use even after the introduction of the Thai script. The Thais used Khmer letters to inscribe the Pāli canon long after the Thai script was introduced. Therefore it is not impossible that as the Thai script was not yet developed for writing Buddhist scriptures the Buddhist monks continued copying them in Cambodian characters. This would explain the use of Cambodian characters to write the Buddhist manuscripts in Thailand. Hence it is very unlikely that these manuscripts were brought from Nakhon Srit'ammarat to Thailand as Paranavitana has suggested because Cambodian script was well known in Thailand even before the arrival of the Thais in that region.

Moreover, at no time in its history was Nakhon Srit'ammarat known as Magadha and thus there was no reason for the Buddhist monks of Ceylon to use the term Magadhakkhara to denote the Cambodian script which was supposed to have been in use in

that region. Thus Paranavitana has failed to find proof that Nakhon Srit'ammarat was known as Magadha in the fifteenth century A.D.

Why did Rāmacandra use the epithets Kusuma-pura-nagara-vara-viracita-padam and Magadha-pati in eulogizing his patron Parākramabahu VI? This was because of the king's family connections with Magadha in India, not because he had any political supremacy over it. In the Vṛtta-ratnākara-pancika, Rāmacandra says that Parākramabahu's mother was Sunetrādevī and his father was Jayamāla-mahipati. He says:

```
Kālīnga-desa-sañjata-bhumipala-kulodhbhava
Sunetra nama devi sa Parakramabhujaḥ prasūp
Dharmasoka-nrpanvaye Jayamalo mahipatiḥ
Tasya putraḥ prajaśriye Parakramabhujo 'bhavat. ¹
```

Sinhalese literary works, too, have given the names of the father and grandfather of this king as Jayamahalena.² As well as taking Parākramabahu to be a Jāvaka ruler Paranavitana interprets the name of his father accordingly. He thinks 'Māla' is the same as Malaya and takes it to be synonymous with Jāvaka. He explains the derivations of 'Māla' as follows:

Malaya = Mayala = Māla. Thus according to him Jayamāla is the

¹ Vṛtta-ratnākara with Pañcika, p.20.
same as the Sinhalese Jaya-malaya or Jaya-mala which means Jaya, the Malay. But the origin of the family of Jayamahalena was traced back to Sumitra who came from India with the Bo-tree and was given the title Maha-lekhaka with the addition of Jaya for his services. The Kavyasekharaya states that this Prince Sumitra was given the title Jayamahale and was asked to guard the Bo-tree. It says:

Damsō nirindu put - Mihindu mahimi diya kot
mayil vana rivi got- Sumit kumaruṭa mahat guṇa yut
namin Jayamahale - tanaturu devana mangule
Vijayindu raja kule - Devanapā Tis ekale...
Mahabo rakina lesa - sālasū bō kalak vasa -
emahabo abiyesa - visū kulayen melaka mulbāsa...
Lāmani kula pivituru - Jayamahalāna munuburu ¹
guṇa gana mīni sayuru-siyal nirindun mudunmāl yuru
Parakumba nirindu ... ²

According to the Kavyasekharaya descendants of Sumitra’s family continued the service to the Bo-tree and used the same title Maha-lekhaka. We are told by the Parakumbā-sirita that Sumitra was appointed Jayamahale and was enjoined to see that offerings to the Bo-tree were duly carried out and maintained. ³ Thus according to writers contemporary with Parakramabahu Mahalē or

---

¹ The editor has used manapiru but has given a variant form as munupuru which means grandson and is more appropriate in the context. Kavyasekharaya, ed. Dharmarama, p.304, note 3.
² Kavyasekharaya, canto 15 vv.12-13, 17, 20, 21.
³ Parakumbā-sirita, v.11.
Mahālenā is the same as Mahā-lekhaka. This with the addition of Jaya, was the title appropriate to the head of the family that claimed descent from Sumitra, one of the kinsmen of Asoka, who are said to have accompanied the Bo-tree to Ceylon.¹

Thus the tradition prevailing in the fifteenth century was that Parākramabāhu VI belonged to the family of Sumitra, who was connected with King Asoka of Magadha. This would explain the statement of Rāmacandra that Parākramabāhu's father belonged to the family of Asoka (Dharmāsoka- nrpanvaye). Furthermore, that was why he used the epithets Magadha-pati and Kusuma-pura-nagara-vara-viracita-padam in eulogizing his patron. If the contemporary writers knew that Parākramabāhu's ancestors came from the Malay Peninsula and Māla stands for Malaya it is strange that they should have given various other interpretations. There is no legend, folklore or tradition recorded about relations between Jayamālas, Parākramabāhu VI and the Malay Peninsula.

The long and glorious reign of Parākramabāhu VI was one of the brightest periods in the literary history of Ceylon,² Well known Buddhist scholars such as Toṣagamūve Śrī Rāhula, Vidāgama Maitreya, Karagala Vanaratana, Vimalakīrti Dhammadinna, Vattāve Terindu and a number of others were active in contributing to

to Sinhalese literature. Many literary works, including Saddharmaratnakaraya, Kavayasekharaya, Parakumbā-sirīta, Kokila-sandesaya, Sālalihini-sandesaya, Girā-sandesaya, Paravi-sandesaya, Hāmsa-sandesaya etc., were written during this reign and most of these contain an account of the king. Though at times they have exaggerated various facts, one would expect contemporary reports to contain some truth. But in none of these accounts is there any mention of Parākramabāhu having political relations with the Malay Peninsula.

In this respect Paranavitana has drawn attention to a poem in the Parakumbā-sirīta. It says: Gajapati hayapati narapati rajun-edi māda gat katāra. Paranavitana's translation of the passage is 'he who, after having crushed the arrogance of kings who are lords of elephants, lords of horses and lords of men, captured Kaṭāra.' Paranavitana then interprets the katāra mentioned in the above passage as the name of a region in Malaysia called Kaṭāram or Kiṭāram in Tamil, the modern Kedah. Thus he takes this as evidence for Parākramabāhu having political

---

1 Punchibandara Sannasgala, Simhala Sāhitya Vamsaya (in Sinhalese) pp.245-90.
2 Ibid.
3 Parakumbā-sirīta, v.73.
4 Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, p.145.
supremacy over the Malay Peninsula. But the translation given by Paranavitana does not suit the context of the poem. When we translate the first line we have to take the whole poem into consideration. Four lines of the poem are as follows:

Gajapati hayapati narapati rajunedi māda gat kaṭāra
buja bala yasa vaturu uturu kala sakvalinut piṭāra
raja niya muṇī bana viyaraṇa kav naļu sarasavi koṭāra
vājambi meraju tuti puvatara kapaṭa rājaturu kuṭāra.

The translation of the poem would be as follows:

The widespread fame of this king, the water of fame of the might of whose arms has spilled over the very ends of the earth, manifests itself as a cauldron of the vanquished pride of kings who are lords of elephants, lords of horses, and lords of men; as a treasure house of polity, Buddhist doctrine, exegesis, poetry and drama for the Goddess Sarasvatī; and as an axe for the trees of scheming kings.

Thus the translation of the word kaṭāra by Paranavitana as Kaṭāha, a name of a place in the Malay Peninsula, does not suit the context. It has to be taken as a 'cauldron' to give the correct meaning to the poem. Therefore this could not be given as evidence to support the theory that Parākramabāhu VI had political control over the Malay Peninsula.

The material we gather from the Pārakumbā-sīrīta about Parākramabāhu's conquests and military activities does not support such a conclusion. In this literary work, which is a panegyric in

1 Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, p.145-46.
2 Pārakumbā-sīrīta, v.73.
honor of Parākramabāhu VI, almost all his achievements are discussed. But here nothing is mentioned about his connections with the Malay Peninsula or anything about his supremacy over that region. The poem, being a panegyric written during the reign of Parākramabāhu himself, would certainly have mentioned it if the ruler had any control over the Malay Peninsula.

Paranavitana has drawn attention to a Pāli stanza in the colophon of Saddharmaratnakaraya which, according to him gives Parākramabāhu VI the epithet 'Candrabhānu'. The stanza is as follows:

Ramma bhavantu sakala'pi ca rajadhānī
dhamme ramantu (sic) Jagatīpati Candabhānu (sic)
Sammodayantu janataṁ subha-kālameghā
Sabbe bhavantu sukhita mudita samagga.  

The Saddharmaratnakaraya was written during the seventh year of Parākramabāhu VI by a Buddhist monk named Vimalakīrti Dhammadinna. According to Paranavitana 'Candrabhānu' was a title used by the Javaka family of Candrabhānu and, because he was related to this

1 Supressing of provincial rulers and bringing all the Sinhalese provinces under his authority, v.46; conquest of Jaffna, v.52; repelling an invasion by Kanarese forces, v.51; Sinhalese expedition to Adriampet, v.53; suppression of the rebellion by Jotiya Sitāna of Kandy, v.48.
3 Punchibandara Sannasgala, op.cit., p.251.
families, Parākramabāhu too used this epithet. But for more than one reason Paranavitana's interpretation cannot be accepted. First from the context in the Saddharmaratnakaraya, it is not certain that this verse refers to Parakramabahu VI. Secondly, even if it did, writers like Coedes have pointed out that Candrabhānu was not a title but the name of the ruler of Tambraliṅga who invaded Ceylon during the reign of Parakramabahu II.

This is the only reference to Parākramabahu VI using this title and Paranavitana explains that because of the unpopularity of Candrabhānu among the Ceylonese, since he was an enemy of the Buddhist religion, Parākramabahu did not use this title as he wanted to consolidate his power. But if he had been a Jāvaka and the Savulu dynasty had been a Jāvaka family, as Paranavitana asserts, then there would have been no need for the Jāvakas to worry about using this title, as the Savulu family was already well established in the fifteenth century. The people accepted them as the rulers of the Sinhalese kingdom and they had the support of the Buddhist monks. Therefore there was no reason for Parākramabahu not to use the epithet if he really wanted to do so. But the problem is whether he wanted to use it or not. For the

1 Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, pp.139-40.
3 Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, p.140.
Savulu family, as we have already seen, was not a Čavaka family; therefore Parākramabāhu VI, who was a Savulu, could not be regarded as a Čavaka and he had no special reason for using the Čavaka epithet. Moreover, Candrabhānu was not an epithet to be used by the members of his family. In the Saddharmaratnakaraya the author probably included 'Candabānu' as an adjective to the word 'Jagatīpati'. If the author meant Parākramabāhu VI by 'Jagatīpati' its adjective could be taken as a eulogy which would mean 'the Lord of the World as splendid as the radiance of the moon'.

In order to support his thesis that Parākramabāhu had close contacts with the Malay Peninsula Paranavitana has given some evidence from the Chinese histories. During the reign of the Yung-lo Emperor (A.D. 1402-1424) of the Ming dynasty there was a Chinese naval expedition to Ceylon under the celebrated Chinese commander Cheng Ho. In the course of his first expedition to the west in A.D. 1405 Cheng Ho visited Ceylon.

---

The Chinese sources say that A-lieh-k’unai-erh (Alagak-konara) who was then ruling the Island, was hostile to the Chinese commander. Cheng Ho returned to China, but came once again in A.D.1411, when he captured Alagak-konara who was taken back to China with his family as a prisoner. The Chinese emperor treated the captives with consideration, set them free, and ordered them to select the most worthy subject to be placed on the throne. They selected someone called Yeh-pa-nai-na who was proclaimed king of Ceylon under Chinese suzerainty. Some sources have given the name of the person selected to be appointed king as Pu-la-ka-fa-ssu-la-cha which has been identified as Parakramabahu-raja. One Chinese work says that Yeh-pa-nai-na later became Pu-la-ko-ma-ssu-la-cha.

Hitherto the name Yeh-pa-nai-na has been taken by scholars, including Paranavitana, to be the Chinese transcription of the Sinhalese title apanan (apa-naña). However, according to the new interpretation of the material Paranavitana identifies this title as the Chinese version of Yapana and gives the meaning

1 Willetts, op.cit., pp.31 ff.
3 Wu-hsueh-pien, cited by Willetts, op.cit., p.35.
'Lord of Yapa, i.e. Java' to it.¹ This interpretation of Paranavitana is very hypothetical because we can find no evidence either in Sinhalese literature or in epigraphy for Yapa to be taken as Java. When the Sinhalese chroniclers meant Java they simply used that name, as we have seen in the Culavamsa account of the Javaka invasions.²

Further Paranavitana says that Parâkramabâhu was supported by a Malay ruler, as Parâkramabâhu himself was a Malay prince, and he came to Ceylon, allied himself with the Chinese commander Cheng Ho, under the protection of his armada and took the prince with them to the Chinese court.³ This argument again is based on the interpretation of a single word occurring in the RaJayavaliya in connection with a foreign invasion. Some years before the accession of Parâkramabâhu VI the RaJayavaliya says:

During the reign of king Vijayabâhu, Dosraja, king of Great China (Mahâcîna), landed in Laâkâ with an immense army and under pretext of bringing presents and curiosities, craftily carried away king Vijayabâhu, who fell into his hands, foolishly thinking that he also brought presents....

¹ Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, pp.143 ff.
² Cv, LXXXIII, 36 ff.
³ Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, pp.144 ff.
⁴ Riv. tr. Gunasekera, p.57.
Paranavitana thinks that the Mahācīna mentioned in this account means Greater China and denoted a region which included the eastern coast of the Malay Peninsula. Thus the Dosraja of Mahācīna was a Malay prince who allied himself with Cheng Ho and came to Ceylon.¹

Here Paranavitana's interpretation is obviously unsatisfactory, unless one has the preconceived idea of proving the existence of close political links between Ceylon and the Malay Peninsula. This account cannot be taken as a reference to a Malay ruler for more than one reason. First of all the Rajāvaliya account does not seem to be trustworthy because it contains so many obvious errors. It says King Vijayabāhu was taken captive to China which is completely wrong. It was Alagak-kōnāra who was taken captive. Furthermore, the Rajāvaliya says that Alagak-kōnāra ruled the Island from that time until the accession of Parakramabāhu VI. Thus the author did not have a clear picture of the history of the period. Secondly, the derivation of the name Dos from Jāvesa, 'Lord of Jāva' through the intermediate forms Davesa and Davasa is highly imaginary. Thirdly the Chinese sources have no reference to a Jāvaka accompanying Cheng Ho to Ceylon. In these circumstances the Rajāvaliya account cannot be taken as evidence of Jāvaka relations with Ceylon.

¹ Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, pp.144-45.
According to the Ming-shih, in A.D. 1459 the last envoys were sent to China from Ceylon.\(^1\) The name of the ruler of Ceylon given in the Chinese chronicle is Ko-li-sheng-hsia-la-shi-li-pa-chiao-la-jo. Paranavitana takes this name to be the Chinese transcription of Kālinga-Sīnhala-Śrīvijaya-raja. Then he identifies this ruler as Parākramabāhu VI, saying that after he captured Kāṭāha the Sinhalese ruler added the Śrīvijaya to his title. Further, Paranavitana adds that 'it is also not impossible that his ancestors, too, claimed to be titular sovereigns of Śrī Vijaya and Parākramabāhu's capture of Kāṭāha was undertaken to justify the claim'.\(^2\)

However, we have already seen the difficulties of accepting that Parākramabāhu VI captured Kāṭāha. Moreover he is not related to any dynasty in South-east Asia. Therefore Parākramabāhu had no special reason to use the title Śrīvijaya. Then again, Paranavitana's derivation of Śrīvijaya from shi-li-pa-chiao is also not justifiable. Leslie Gunawardene noticed this as follows:

The key term that Paranavitana uses for his argument is represented by the four characters shi-li-pa-chiao ... which is taken to represent Śrī Vijaya. But the Chinese maintained very close relations with the

---


\(^2\) Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, p. 146.
empire of Śrī Vijaya and the chroniclers of the Imperial Court as well as other Chinese scholars used certain specific characters to denote Śrī Vijaya. Earlier Chinese writings like the works of I-tsing and Houei-je use the appellation Che-li-fo-che ... or its shortened form Fo-che... while the later chroniclers like the Sung-shih and the Ming-shih, the writings of Chao-ju-kua (1225), and particularly of Ma-Houan (1425-32?) who lived in the period under discussion consistently used the term San-fo-ts'i....It is most doubtful that the Ming-shih would have used two variant terms, different from each other in the number of characters and in their phonetic value, to denote the same region. Hence the attempt of Paranavitana to attribute the title Śrī Vijaya Rāja to Parākramabāhu does not seem to be supported by the Chinese evidence he cites.

The foregoing discussion shows that Paranavitana has failed to prove his theory of Jāvaka origin of Parākramabāhu VI and his having political supremacy over Malay Peninsula in his reign. From all the sources available about his reign it would appear that he was a Sinhalese monarch related to the Savulu family and the family of Jayamahalēṇa. Therefore we still believe that after the death of Candrabhāṇu's son the Jāvaka rule in Ceylon came to an end.

Religious Contacts between Ceylon and Burma

Religion was one of the main factors which stimulated international relations in early days. It was usually far more effective than commerce in the transmission of cultural elements. One of the ties which brought Ceylon and Burma together was Theravāda Buddhism.

Ceylon was an important centre of Theravāda Buddhism from the early centuries of the Christian Era. It had received the true doctrine of the Master from India during the reign of the great emperor Aśoka in the third century B.C. From then onwards Theravāda Buddhism took deep root and Buddhist centres like the Mahāvihāra, in spite of the Mahāyāna influence which came in from time to time from the Indian Sub-continent, endeavoured as far as possible to preserve the purity of both Doctrine and Order.

Burma was one of the Buddhist countries which sought guidance from Ceylon with regard to religious matters. Religious contacts between Ceylon and Burma can be traced back to fairly early times although there are no detailed accounts of them in our sources.

However, from the eleventh century onwards we are in a better position, as here we find a little more material about the subject, especially in Burmese sources.

In fact, Ceylon's close religious contacts with Burma started only from the eleventh century. According to our sources, the initiative taken by rulers of both countries from that time onwards paved the way for friendly intercourse, and whenever either country had to face religious problems it looked to the other for help. This led to the spread of Sinhalese influence in Burma and even to the establishment of a special sect of Buddhist monks called Śīhalasaṅgha.

Ceylon was under Cola occupation for a little over half a century, during which time Buddhism suffered severely. Most of the monasteries which had received support from the state and flourished during the Anurādhapura period (up to the eleventh century) were abandoned, and some of them were plundered by the Colas. Because of the resultant disorder, many Buddhist monks who had formerly been dependent on royal support and the generosity of the people had to look to other sources for their means of existence, and most of them could not maintain

---

themselves even in Rohana, which was not directly under the Coḷas, and had to migrate to foreign countries where Buddhism was flourishing.¹

Vijayabāhu I, who liberated Ceylon from the Coḷa yoke in A.D.1070, set about restoring and purifying the Buddhist Faith.² Ever since the establishment of Buddhism in Ceylon the rulers had been considered the protectors of religion and had been expected to look after the interests of the Buddhist Saṅgha as well as of the religion in general.³ When Vijayabāhu became the ruler of Ceylon after the expulsion of the Coḷas, he found that Buddhism was at a low ebb.

Theravāda Buddhism is very particular about Vinaya or the discipline of Buddhist monks, according to which they have to perform numerous ecclesiastical ceremonies to ensure the purity of the Order. In his effort to continue the religious policy of the Anurādhapura kings, Vijayabāhu found it difficult to get sufficient duly ordained monks to conduct the formal upasampada which was necessary for the ordination of a fully qualified monk.⁴ The Nikāyasamgrahaya and the Pūjavaliya say that there

² Cv, LX, 4 ff; Pjv, ed. Suraweera, p.105.
³ Walpola Rahula, History of Buddhism in Ceylon, chap.5.
⁴ Cv, LX, 4 ff.
were not even five virtuous Buddhist monks available to take part in these ceremonies.¹

This was not because the number of monks in Ceylon had diminished, but because they were not considered worthy of presiding over such rites.² Though most of the learned and elderly theras may have left the Island, it is not easy to assume that all the Buddhist monks in Ceylon left or gave up the robes during the Cola occupation of the country. In Rohana there were still a number of monasteries and the Colas could not have gained complete power there; so it is quite possible that many monks found shelter in that region. But because of the disorder and confusion caused by the invaders the monks would not have been in a position to conduct all the necessary ecclesiastical ceremonies and consequently would have become disqualified for the task of conducting higher ordination ceremonies.³ This may be the reason why Vijayabahu I could not get sufficient monks to hold the ceremony of upasampāda.

Vijayabahu had to turn to Burma to get help for his worthy cause. We have already noticed that the Burmese ruler had

¹ Nikāyasāṃgrahāya, ed. Samaranayake, p.76; Pjv, ed. Suraweera, p.105
³ Ibid.
entered into friendly relations with Vijayabahu I; it was to him that the latter sent envoys to obtain help in his struggle against the Coḷas,1 and it was to the same Burmese ruler that he turned for assistance for the restoration of the religion as well.

The Theravāda Buddhism which was flourishing during this period in Burma was well suited for Vijayabahu's purpose. Upper Burma or Pagan came in touch with that religion in the middle of the eleventh century. The Kalyāṇī inscriptions, the Maha Yazawin Gyi, the Sasanavamsa, and the Hmannan Yazawin give accounts of the spread of Theravāda Buddhism in Upper Burma.2 This was brought about by Shin Arahan, a young Talaing monk of Thaton well-versed in the sacred texts of the religion.3 He went to Pagan, where he lived in the jungle; and Anawrahta, the king of Upper Burma, came to know about him. He was invited to the palace and the king was impressed by his reputation and

1 Cv, LVIII, 8-9.
2 Sy, tr. Law, pp.68 ff; Glass Palace Chronicle of the Kings of Burma, pp.73 ff; IA, Vol.XXII, pp.17 ff; Maha Yazawin Gyi, Vol.1, pp.182 ff.
3 Ibid.
gave every support to him. Shin Arahan informed the king of the necessity of sacred texts for the spread of the religion and told him that the monasteries of Thaton had thirty sets of the Tripitaka. Anawrahta sent envoys with presents in order to obtain them, but the king of Thaton refused to send the texts, saying that it would not be seemly to send the Tripitaka and Buddhist relics to one such as Anawrahta who held a false doctrine. But the Pagan ruler did not give up the idea; he invaded Thaton and captured the sacred texts and relics as well as the ruler of Thaton, and brought them to Pagan. After that Theravāda Buddhism became the state religion and spread rapidly in every part of his kingdom. The rulers gave every support to Buddhism and as a result a number of temples and stupas were built, and the Buddhist

1 In Upper Burma, before the arrival of Shin Arahan, there was a debased form of Mahāyānism. The monks were known as Aris and their behaviour was arrogant. They were heavy eaters, and drinking was quite common among them. For Aris see Duroiselle, 'The Aris of Burma and Tantric Buddhism', ASIAR (1915-6), pp.79-93. Maung Htin Aung, Folk Elements in Burmese Buddhism (London, 1962), pp.125-39.


3 Although the Burmese sources say that Anawrahta invaded Lower Burma mainly to obtain Buddhist scriptures it is possible that political motives were behind this invasion. Since the Burmese ruler was heading towards the unification of the whole of Burma it was necessary that Lower Burma, which was important in several aspects, should be incorporated in the Pagan kingdom. Therefore the request for Buddhist scriptures might have been in fact a demand for submission.
Sāṅgha grew in numbers day by day. Thus, it was during a period when Theravāda Buddhism was in a flourishing condition in Burma, that Vijayabāhu sent envoys to his Burmese contemporary Anawrahta requesting assistance to re-establish Buddhism in his country.¹

A number of Ceylonese sources have recorded the invitation of Vijayabāhu I to Buddhist monks from Burma. According to the Vēlaikkāra inscription at Polonnaruwa, Vijayabāhu invited monks from Aramaṇa to purify the Sāṅgha of the three Nikāyas.² The following is the account given in the Cūlavamsa about this incident:

[Vijayabāhu] who had at heart the continuance of the Order, sent to his friend, the Prince Anuruddha in the Rāmaṇa country, messengers with gifts and had fetched thence bhikkhus who had thoroughly studied the three Piṭakas, who were a fount of moral discipline and other virtues, (and) acknowledged as theras.

According to the Pūjavaliya, Vijayabāhu after the expulsion of the Tamils, sent costly presents such as pearls and precious

¹ Geiger uses the chronology worked out by Phayre, who has placed Anawrahta's reign between A.D.1010 and 1052, to state that the assumption that Vijayabāhu and Anawrahta were contemporaries was probably an arbitrary one on the part of the author of the Cūlavamsa, or his source. But Gunawardene has drawn attention to the chronology revised by Maung Hla and rightly pointed out that they were indeed contemporaries. Vijayabāhu's reign falls between A.D.1055-1110 while Anawrahta's reign was between A.D.1044 and 1083. Geiger, Cv, tr. LX, p.214, note.4; Phayre, History of Burma, p.22; Maung Hla, JBS, Vol. XIII(1923), pp.83 ff; Gunawardene, Ph.D. Thesis, p.397.


³ Cv, LX, 5-7.
stones to the ruler of Aramaṇa, had his messengers bring back twenty theras, and thus re-established the Buddhist Order.¹

The Nikayasaṃgrahaya has a similar account of this mission to Burma,² but unfortunately there is no reference to it in any of the Burmese sources.

Vijayabāhu's request was granted by his friend Anawrahta and he was able to re-establish the Order with the help of the monks who came from Burma.³ These theras were well versed in the Tripitaka and they admitted new members to the Order with all the ecclesiastical ceremonies such as the upasampada, the ceremony of higher ordination, and the Buddhist Saṅgha was once again duly constituted.⁴

According to some scholars, the Buddhist monks who came to Ceylon at the request of Vijayabāhu were Ceylonese who had fled to Burma during the Cola rule of Ceylon. According to Paranavitana, the fact that the Buddhist Saṅgha was not named

1 Pjv, ed. Suraweera, p.105.
2 Nikāyasamgrahaya, ed. Samaranayake, p.76.
3 Cv, LX, 5-7; Pjv, p.105 ; Nikāyasamgrahaya, p.76.
4 Ibid.
after the country from which these theras came shows that the monks who came from Burma were Ceylonese or their disciples. Gunawardene has given some more evidence in support of this theory. According to him one reason for reaching the above conclusion is the silence of the Burmese chronicles about any Buddhist mission going to Ceylon to purify the Sangha at this time. But we have to keep in mind that the Burmese chronicles do not mention anything about some events described in the Ceylonese chronicles, while the latter are silent about certain events mentioned in the Burmese chronicles. In fact it was only when it seemed important from their point of view, that the authors, whether Sinhalese or Burmese, took any interest in recording an event. Further Gunawardene has drawn attention to the Kalyāṇī inscriptions, which state that the Sinhalese

---

1 When at the end of the eighteenth century the religion of Ceylon suffered a temporary eclipse, some of the Buddhist monks went to Burma, received higher ordination and returned with five Burmese monks. When these monks established a sect in Ceylon it came to be known as Amarapura-nikāya because the monks from Amarapura were responsible for its establishment. Ray, An Introduction to the Study of Theravāda Buddhism in Burma, pp.237 ff. Similarly, when some Thai Buddhist monks were invited to Ceylon, the nikāya established by them came to be known as Siyam-nikāya.


4 IA, Vol. XXII, p.29.
Sangha, which brought the valid higher ordination during Dhammazedi's reign, was a direct descendent of Mahinda Thera who originally brought the Faith to Ceylon. Of course it is not possible to take this very seriously, as the purpose of these inscriptions was to record the establishment of the Sinhalese Sangha in Burma during Dhammazedi's time, and such a statement could easily have been added as a proof of the validity of the higher ordination which was brought by the Sinhalese monks.

However, Gunawardene has drawn attention to a statement in the Nikāyasamgrahaya which definitely supports Paranavitana's suggestion that these monks were in fact Ceylonese. This work, in describing the monks who established the Buddhist Order in the reign of Vijayabāhu I, says that they were residents of Aramāṇa (Aramāṇa raṭa vāsi).¹ But Rev. Amaramoli in his edition of the text has given a variant reading in accordance with a different manuscript. The reading of this manuscript is Aramanayata vādi, which means 'those who had gone to Aramāṇa'.² All the four manuscripts of the Nikāyasamgrahaya in the British Museum agree with the latter reading.³ If this reading is

¹ Nikāyasamgrahaya, ed. Samaranayake, p.76.
³ Gunawardene, Ph.D. Thesis, p.399
accepted, it provides definite evidence to support the theory that the monks who were invited to Ceylon by Vijayabāhu were Sinhalese monks who had fled to Burma for protection when Ceylon was under the Coḷas.

According to the Sāsanavamsa, Anawrahta sent four great warriors to the island of Sīhala, who brought back copies of the Tripitaka to be compared with the Buddhist scriptures which had been obtained from Thaton. The task of comparison was undertaken by Shin Arahan, who found that neither version was deficient nor over-abundant, in other words that both were equally reliable. However, Shin Arahan edited the Burmese version of the pitakas in the light of the Ceylonese copy. Gunawardene, commenting on this account, says that as the Sāsanavamsa was not compiled until the nineteenth century and all the other chronicles are silent on this point, it is difficult to accept this as a historical account. Further he says, 'it is difficult to believe that Vijayabāhu would have had to obtain the scriptures from Burma if they had been sent to Anuruddha a few years earlier'.

---

1 Sv, tr. Law, p.71.
2 Sv, tr. Law, p.71.
In spite of the chronicle being of recent date, it may be that it does include something which the other chronicles failed to record. Though Buddhism was at a low ebb during the Cola occupation of Ceylon it is difficult to assume that all the monasteries were abandoned and all the Buddhist scriptures lost. Some of them would surely have been taken to Burma by the Buddhist monks who left Ceylon. Moreover, those monks who stayed in Ceylon would probably have preserved some of the scriptures in remote monasteries in Rohana. Therefore when Anawrahta needed a copy of the Tripitaka to check against the Burmese copies, he might well have asked Vijayabāhu for one and have been sent it. On the other hand Ceylonese monks returned from Burma would have brought back the Buddhist scriptures they had taken with them when they left. This may account for the statement in the Pujāvaliya and the Nikāyasamgrahaya that scriptures, too, were brought from Burma when King Vijayabāhu invited monks from that country, and would not necessarily mean that there was not a single copy of the Tripitaka in Ceylon. However, all these are assumptions which cannot be verified on the evidence available.

According to the Maha Yazawin Gyi and the Glass Palace Chronicle, King Anawrahta had already completed three terraces

---

1 Pji, ed. Suraweera, p.105; Nikāyasamgrahaya, ed. Samaranayake p.76.
of the Shwezigon Pagoda when he thought of wresting the Tooth Relic from Ceylon by force. The account says that he sent his generals to capture it, but that they were prevented from doing so by Sakka, the lord of the gods, who asked Anawrahta to acquire the Relic by peaceful means. Thereupon the king sent a mission with a white elephant as a present for the king of Ceylon and requested that the Tooth Relic be given to him. The Glass Palace Chronicle says that the ruler to whom Anawrahta sent envoys was Dhātusena. The same chronicle criticises the Maha Yazawin Gyi or the Great Chronicle for giving the name of the Ceylonese ruler as Sirisamghabodhi.¹

The story given in the chronicle is full of myth and legend. The ruler mentioned there could only be Vijayabāhu I, as he was the contemporary of the Burmese ruler to whom it refers. The name given in the chronicle is certainly wrong, because Vijayabāhu is not referred to as Dhātusena in any other source. Only one king of Ceylon was called Dhātusena and he reigned in the first century A.D.² As far as the name of the ruler of Ceylon is concerned, the Great Chronicle,

which has been criticised by the Glass Palace Chronicle, seems to be correct. Sirisamghabodhi was a title of Vijayabahu.¹

The account of the Tooth Relic in the Burmese chronicles contains a description of miracles performed by the relic. According to this account the Sinhalese king, having received the Burmese envoys, went to the chamber where the Tooth Relic was deposited and started praying. Then the Relic adorned itself with the thirty-two greater signs, the eighty lesser signs and the six rays of noble men, and it appeared in the sky like the living Buddha and started passing to and fro in the sky. The king with a gem-embroidered casket on his head pleaded with reverence. Then from the holy relic proceeded another Tooth, and they passed to and fro in the sky as if two Buddhas had appeared. When the king pleaded with the relic to come down the duplicate descended from the sky and settled in the casket. The ruler of Ceylon then sent it to his Burmese friend through the envoys.²

The story of miracles and the supernatural duplication of the relic is too incredible for a student of history to accept, but it does suggest that Vijayabahu sent a duplicate of the relic to his Burmese friend.

¹ EZ, Vol.II, no.35, p.211.
² Glass Palace Chronicle of the Kings of Burma, pp.88-91; Maha Yazawin Gyi, Vol.I, p.204.
Tooth Relic to the Burmese King. When this reached Burma King Anawrahta, after having made some more duplicates, deposited it with other relics in the Shwezigon Pagoda with great ceremonial. Thus we gather from the Burmese chronicles that there were close and friendly relations between Ceylon and Burma during the reign of Vijayabāhu and Anawrahta.

Anawrahta's successors, too, were devoted Buddhists. They also followed the same religious policy as the founder of their dynasty and maintained friendly relations with Ceylon. The Burmese chronicles record that Kyanzittha, one of the successors of Anawrahta, built the Pagoda Minochanta to enshrine nine relics sent by a prince from Ceylon. According to the Burmese chronology Kyanzittha ruled Pagan from A.D. 1084 to 1112. Thus this king was also a contemporary of Vijayabāhu I of Ceylon (A.D. 1055-1110). Though we do not get evidence to fix the date of the arrival of Buddhist relics from Ceylon, the Ceylonese prince mentioned in the Burmese chronicles may be Vijayabāhu I. Unfortunately the Ceylonese sources do not say anything at all about his contacts with Kyanzittha.

---

1 Ibid.; Harvey, History of Burma, pp. 32-3; Maung Htin Aung, A History of Burma, p. 36.
Buddhist monks played an active role in the political affairs of Burma and Ceylon from time to time. The part played by them in bringing about an agreement at the end of Parākramabāhu's invasion of Burma is already referred to. Furthermore, from both Burmese and Ceylonese sources we gather evidence for the movement of monks from Ceylon to Burma and from Burma to Ceylon in times of political turmoil in either country. The Burmese sources have recorded such an incident taking place just after the death of Alaunsithu, one of the rulers of Pagan. When he died his two sons, Narathu and Minshinsaw, disputed the succession. Since Alaunsithu's elder son was away from the capital, the younger one, Narathu, ascended the throne, but Minshinsaw, having come to know of his brother's usurpation, gathered an army and surrounded the capital. Narathu, instead of fighting, asked the Primate Panthagu, the successor of Shin Arahan, to intervene, promising the throne to Minshinsaw. So the Primate persuaded the elder prince to come to the capital and accept the throne. The wicked Narathu met his brother and placed him on the throne, but at the great feast that followed he poisoned Minshinsaw's food so that he died that same night. On hearing the news, Panthagu, disgusted with Narathu's evil deeds, left

---

1 See supra, p. 66-67.
Pagan for Ceylon. Further, the Burmese chronicles say that Narathu constrained some Buddhist monks to become laymen, and, in order to avoid this, some of them escaped to the island of Ceylon. Possibly these accounts are exaggerated by the chroniclers, as Narathu was noted for wicked deeds such as murdering his father and brother and so on. However, the account indicates that Burmese Buddhist monks during times of political chaos thought of Ceylon as a safe asylum because they maintained very close contacts with the monks there.

The Burmese chronicles do not say whether the monks, including the Primate Panthagu, who came to Ceylon returned to Burma when the troubles were over. Nevertheless, it is quite possible that they returned to Burma at the end of the troubled period. Like Vijayabahu when he had freed Ceylon from the Colas, Narapatisithu, when he extended his patronage to Buddhism, would have invited Panthagu and the other monks back.

After the victories of Vijayabahu I the Buddhist monks, who had suffered severely during the Cola rule, once again gained the support of the state and the religion became well established.

---

2 Harvey, History of Burma, p.55; Ray, An Introduction to the Study of Theravada Buddhism in Burma, p.111.
in the country. In Ceylon a number of new religious centres sprang up, among the most important being Dimbulagala. There were about five hundred monks in residence there, and royal grants were made for the upkeep of the monastery. The bhikkhus at Dimbulagala and other such religious centres were very busy with study and with training pupils to lead a correct religious life. Parakramabahu I, one of the successors of Vijayabahu, was a great patron of the religion and his reign was famous for religious reforms. After consulting leading theras such as Dimbulagala Mahakassapa, the king expelled all the undesirable elements from the Order and purified the Sāṅgha. Then he forced all the other fraternities such as Abhayagiri and Jetavana to receive higher ordination afresh from the Mahāvihāra.

After the unification of the three fraternities, a code of disciplinary rules was drawn up by the leading monks for the guidance of the Buddhist Sāṅgha and this was inscribed on a rock at Galvihāra. Thus, during Parakramabahu's reign, Buddhism

---

was purified and the Buddhist monks were united. A high standard of conduct among the members of the *Sangha* increased its prestige among the Buddhists of Burma and other Theravāda Buddhist countries and the fame of the Island as the fountain-head of Theravāda Buddhism spread far and wide.¹

This reputation alone would have drawn the attention of the Buddhist monks of Burma to Ceylon. The Burmese chronicles and the Kalyāṇi inscriptions give accounts of how Uttarajīva, the primate of Burma who succeeded Panthagu, and his disciples visited Ceylon on a pilgrimage.² If Panthagu returned to Burma, it is likely that he would have encouraged the Buddhist monks of his country to visit Ceylon, for he would have known from his personal observation of the Buddhist revival under Parākramabāhu I.

According to the Kalyāṇi inscriptions and the Burmese chronicles, when Uttarajīva and his disciples arrived in Ceylon they were warmly welcomed by the Sinhalese monks.³ After their arrival they conversed with the Sinhalese monks and, upon inquiring as to each others' lineage, they found that the elders

---

¹ In the fifteenth century, when King Dhammazedi of Pegu issued the Kalyāṇi inscriptions, he specifically mentions the religious reforms of Parākramabāhu I and their importance.


³ Ibid.
of Ceylon were direct descendants of Mahinda Thera and that the Burmese monks belonged to the lineage of Sōpa and Uttara Theras. Then, with both the parties represented, they performed the act of higher ordination on Chappaṭa, the only sāmaṇera (novice) who came with the party from Burma.\(^1\) Thus Chappaṭa was received into the Sinhalese Order and this was a very important event as far as the history of Buddhism in Burma is concerned. Unfortunately we have no mention of this mission in the Ceylonese chronicles, which would enable us to check or enlarge upon the Burmese version of the story.

The Kalyāṇī inscriptions have given the year 532 of the Burmese Era and six years after the purification of the Sāṅgha by Parākramabāhu I as the year of Uttarajīva's visit to Ceylon.\(^2\) Parākramabāhu I purified the Order\(^3\) in A.D.1165–6 and therefore Uttarajīva's visit would have taken place in A.D.1171–2, which approximates to the 532nd year of the Burmese Era.\(^4\) However, if Uttarajīva left Burma during the reign of Narapatisithu, as stated in the Burmese sources, the date has to be amended,

---

\(^1\) Ibid.

\(^2\) IA, Vol. XXII, p.17.


because Narapatisithu became the ruler of Pagan only in A.D.1173. In any case we are not certain about the accuracy of the chronology given in the Burmese sources and therefore it is not possible to give a definite date for the arrival of the Burmese monks in Ceylon headed by Uttarajīva.

Uttarajīva's visit to Ceylon resulted in close religious links between Ceylon and Burma and had far-reaching results. According to Ray, it was the first frank admission of the superiority of the Sinhalese Order over the Burmese. But it is worth noting that the higher ordination, after the arrival of the Burmese mission, was performed in the presence of both parties. It appears that the Ceylonese monks must have recognised the validity of the Burmese ordination, as only Chappatā, who was but a novice, received the higher ordination from the Sinhalese monks on this occasion, which would suggest that the Burmese ordination of the other theras was held to be valid.

However, the organization of the Buddhist Order in Ceylon had improved after the reforms of Parākramabāhu I. The Sinhalese monks had been more concerned about Vinaya or discipline and the ecclesiastical ceremonies. Moreover they claimed that they were the true descendants of Mahinda, who introduced Buddhism into Ceylon. The Mahāvihāra monks,

Ray, op.cit., p.112.
claiming to be the preservers of the true doctrine of Theravāda Buddhism, believed that only they had conferred true ordination without any break since its introduction in the third century B.C. Thus the Burmese monks would have been impressed by the way of life of the Ceylon monks, and respected them for their learning, organization and monastic conduct. Moreover, Ceylon possessed the most venerated holy relics, such as the Tooth Relic and the sacred Bo-tree. Therefore the monks who returned after having visited and worshipped those relics would have been regarded as holy men; for, it must have been accepted that by visiting and worshipping the holy places in Ceylon one could acquire great merit.

After worshipping at the holy places of Ceylon, Uttarajīva and his followers returned to Burma, leaving Chappaṭa behind. He stayed in Ceylon for about ten years and studied the Tripiṭaka and the commentaries under the Sinhalese monks. Then, desirous of returning to Pagan, according to the Kalyāṇī inscriptions he thought thus:

"If I were to return home alone, and if, in the event of the death of Uttarajīva Mahāthera, I did not wish to associate with the monks of Pugama in the performance of ecclesiastical ceremonies, how could I, in the absence of pañca-vaggagana perform such functions separately? It is perhaps proper, therefore that I should return home in the company of four other monks, who are well versed in the Tripiṭaka."

IA, Vol.XXII, p.29.
From this statement it appears that the Burmese monks who received the higher ordination from the Sinhalese monks did not consider the higher ordination of their brethren in Burma to be valid. This statement reflects a feeling of superiority on the part of those monks who had been ordained in Ceylon. But, as we have already noticed, the Sinhalese monks considered Burmese monks their equals and hence they performed the higher ordination ceremony together. Thus it was the Burmese monks who first regarded the Sinhalese ordination to be higher and more valid than that of Burma, and not the Sinhalese.

To a certain extent personal interests, too, would have accounted for the fact that the newly returned Burmese monks considered themselves to be superior to their brethren in Burma. This is reflected in the statement made by Chappaṭa on his return. The Kaḷyāṇī inscriptions say:

"As the Mahātheras of Ceylon associated with our teacher the venerable Uttarajīva Mahāthera (at the time of his visit to Ceylon), in the performance of ecclesiastical ceremonies, it is proper that we should now perform such functions after associating ourselves with the monks of Pugāma, who are the spiritual successors of Soṇaṭhera and Uttarathera. However, our teacher, Mahāthera Uttarajīva, who was a native of the Môn country, was formerly the sole head of the church, but now that the Burmese monks have become supreme, we do not wish to associate with them in the performance of ecclesiastical ceremonies." Thus through pride, Mahāthera Chappaṭa
declined to associate with the monks of Pukhama in the performance of ecclesiastical ceremonies and he performed such functions separately.  

If these were, in fact, the ideas of Chappata it shows that even if he recognised the validity of higher ordination by Burmese monks, he did not wish them to be supreme in the church, and this was a factor which contributed towards the rise of a division among them. Chappata was a Mon, and racial prejudice also seems to have been present when he says that Uttarajiva was a Mon monk and after him Burmese monks had taken the headship of the Saṅgha. This too may have been partly responsible for the dissension.

Thus Chappata returned home prepared to establish a separate sect, and brought with him four other Buddhist monks who were well versed in the Tripitaka. Of the four, Sivalī was a native of Tambralipti, and Tamalinda was the son of the king of Cambodia. Ananda Thera was a South Indian from Kāncipurā, and only one Sinhalese monk, named Rāhula, was among the four.

2 According to Coedes this Tamalinda was the son of Jayavarman VII of Cambodia. The Indianized States, p.178.
Chappaṭa would have expected the Burmese monks to make him the head of the Buddhist church as soon as he arrived, and to follow him, as he had received the higher ordination at the hands of the Buddhist monks of Mahāvihāra. But if the Burmese monks accepted the superiority of the Sinhalese church, they would have had to admit the subordination of the Burmese Order. It is quite natural that the older Burmese school resented and resisted this claim on the part of Chappaṭa and his followers. As Bode has rightly pointed out, the Burmese monks could argue with equal force and logic the validity of their ordination, as they claimed to be directly descended from Sopā and Uttara Theras.¹

The Kalyanī inscriptions say that in the 543rd year of Śaka,² and 124 years after the introduction of Theravāda Buddhism into Pagan, this religion from Ceylon was established in Burma.³ Since the introduction of Theravāda Buddhism to Pagan by Anawrahta took place in A.D.1057, the establishment of the Sinhalese sect of Buddhist monks would have taken place in

¹ Bode, The Pali Literature of Burma, p.19.
² By this the Burmese Khaccapaṇca Era or the Burmese Era based on A.D.638 is meant, not the Indian Śaka Era of A.D.78.
A.D.1181. Thus Chappata studied in Ceylon during the reign of Parakramabahu I (A.D.1153-86).

In most of the countries in which Buddhism took root, royal patronage played a vital role in spreading the religion. In Burma Chappata and his followers were fortunate enough to receive the warm patronage of the contemporary ruler. The fame gained by Ceylon as a Theravada country would have helped the five theras to gain the support of the monarch. The king had boats tied together to form a raft on the river Irrawady and requested these five theras to perform on this raft the higher ordination for those monks who wished to receive it. This they did in the Sinhalese manner.

Parakramabahu I, too, had built a pavilion on boats in the middle of the river Mahavali for the ceremony of higher ordination. Many novices were ordained by Chappata and his followers and gradually the number of those who had

1 Ibid.
3 Cv, LXXVIII, 28-30. Performing upasampada on a boat was approved by the Buddha. The Mahavagga of the Vinaya-pitaka says: 'I allow you, monks, when there may be a reliable boat or a reliable bridge to agree upon the other side of such a river as a boundary'. The Book of the Discipline, Vol. IV, Mahavagga, tr. I.B. Horner, SBB, Vol. XIV (1962), p. 139.
received higher ordination increased. This separate school of Buddhist monks established by Chappata and his colleagues was known as the Paccagana or the later school, while the older Burmese school was known as the Purimagana or the earlier school.

Vijayabahu II (A.D.1186-7), who ascended the throne after the death of Parakramabahu I, also continued friendly relations with Burma. The Cūlavamsa says that the Sinhalese king wrote a letter in Pali to the Burmese ruler.¹ According to the Burmese chronology, Vijayabahu's reign coincides with the reign of the Burmese king, Narapatisithu (A.D.1173-1210) and therefore we may safely assume that it was this king who received the letter of Vijayabahu. However, the Cūlavamsa does not say anything about the contents of the letter, which were probably religious in nature. The letter shows that Pali, the language of the Buddhist scriptures, was the medium of communication between the two countries.

According to some of Nissāṃkamalla's inscriptions, this king is said to have maintained friendly relations with Aramaṇa (Burma).² The inscription found at the shrine of Dhammayazika in Burma, dated A.D.1197, records the enshrinement of four sacred relics sent by the king of Ceylon. The Burmese king has

¹ Cv, LXXX, 6-7.
² EZ, Vol.II, nos 17, 26, 27.
been identified as Narapatisithu¹ and according to Ceylonese chronology the Sinhalese king at this time was Nissākamalla. As he has said in his inscriptions that he had relations with Aramaṇa, we are not wrong in inferring that Nissākamalla was the Ceylonese prince who sent the relics to the Burmese ruler.²

Though the establishment of Sinhalese Buddhism in Burma was a landmark in the history of the religion of that country, the five mahātheras who established this new sect could not remain united and dissensions soon arose. As a result, the Sinhalese saṅgha splintered into a number of sects and an account of these dissensions is given in the Kalyāṇī inscriptions, the Sasanavamsa and in Burmese chronicles.

According to these sources Rāhula, the only Sinhalese monk, was the first to leave, when he lost his heart to a dancing girl. On the advice of the other four theras Rāhula left Burma and went to Malayadīpa for good.³ Chappata, the leader of the sect, died some time later, and his death was followed by dissension between the other three theras.⁴

⁴ Ibid.
A present given to these three theras by the Burmese King Narapatisithu caused disagreement between Thera Ānanda and the other two. Of the three theras who received an elephant each from the Burmese ruler, Tāmalinda and Sīvalī liberated the two animals in the jungle in accordance with Vinaya rules, but Ānanda, not following the example of his colleagues, instead sent his elephant as a present to his relatives in Kāncīpura in India. This action was considered by the other two theras as against the Vinaya rules of monastic discipline, but Ānanda did not accept their arguments and decided to perform the ecclesiastical ceremonies separately.¹

Later Sīvalī and Tāmalinda, too, disagreed on a more important question of Vinaya. According to Burmese sources Tāmalinda sought to further the welfare of his pupils by suggesting that laymen should provide them with the necessary four requisites. But Sīvalī drew Tāmalinda's attention to the Vinaya rules and said that the Buddha forbade obtaining the four requisites by means of vaciṇṇatti (suggesting by word of mouth). But Tāmalinda pointed out that the Blessed One had disapproved only when such requests were made on one's own

¹ IA, Vol.XXII, p.31; Sv, tr. Law, p.72 ff; Glass Palace Chronicle of the Kings of Burma, p.146; Maha Yazawin Gyi, Vol.1, p.267.
behalf. Further, Tamalinda argued that he asked the laymen for the requisites for his pupils in order to promote the religion. However, he failed to convince Sīvalī, and thereafter they performed the ecclesiastical ceremonies separately and founded different sects.

Thus in Pagan there were several sects of Buddhist monks with no unity among them, and the monks belonging to the Sinhalese sect, all of whom claimed that they followed the purest form of religion were also divided among themselves. The Kalyāṇī inscriptions give an account of the state of religion in Pagan at that time:

At that time, there were in Pugāma, four distinct communities of priests, each of which formed a separate sect, namely the successors of priests who introduced the religion from Sudhammanagara, the disciples of Sīvalī Mahāthera, the disciples of Tamalinda Mahāthera, and the disciples of Ānanda Mahāthera. Of these communities, that of the spiritual successors of the priests who introduced the religion from Sudhammanagara were called by the Marammas of Pugāma, the purima fraternity, because of their anterior arrival, and the remaining communities whose members were the spiritual successors of priests who introduced the religion from Sīhaladīpa were called the Sīhala fraternity and also the paccima fraternity because of their later arrival.

---

1 IA, Vol.XXII, p.31; Sv, tr. Law, p.73; Glass Palace Chronicle of the Kings of Burma, pp.146-7; Maha Yazawin Gyi, Vol.I, pp.267 ff.
2 IA, Vol.XXII, p.31.
However, though the sub-fraternities grew in number, the impact of the Sinhalese sect as a whole was great and its influence reached even other outer provinces which were under the Pagan rulers.

We get some evidence from the Mahānāgakula-sandesa (Manavulu-sandesa), a Pāli work written in Ceylon, about the religious contacts between Ceylon and Burma in the thirteenth century A.D. It contains a message sent by Thera Nagasena of Mahānāgakula in Rohana through a minister named Gāna to Mahā Kassapa, a Burmese monk of Arimaddanapura (Pagan). The message was a request made to Burmese monks that they should initiate a purification in Burma on the lines of the purification of the Saṅgha effected by Parakramabahu I in Ceylon.\(^1\) We do not know who Nagasena was, but Barnett has drawn attention to inscriptions dated A.D. 1237, 1238, 1242 and 1244 which record donations made by Burmese kings to a monastery whose chief incumbent was Mahā Kassapa. He goes on to identify this Mahā Kassapa with the monk of that name to whom the Sinhalese thera sent his message.\(^2\) If this identification is accepted, the letter would have been sent to Pagan in the first half of the thirteenth century.

---


Burmese sources support such a suggestion in that they show that there were close religious contacts between these two countries during this period.

Among the outer provinces which received Sinhalese influence was Thaton. Before Pagan became the centre of Theravāda Buddhism, Thaton had been the centre, with its sacred scriptures, relics and learned Buddhist monks. When the Sinhalese came under the Colas, some of the monks who left Ceylon would have come to Thaton where Theravāda Buddhism was flourishing at that time. Therefore the Sinhalese form of Buddhism would have been well known there at an early date. The capture of Thaton, and the removal of the scriptures and the Buddhist monks by Anawrahta and his army would definitely have caused a set back to the religion there, but it is not possible to assume that the Buddhist Faith was completely wiped out from that region. There would have been many inland regions containing Buddhist monasteries, where Anawrahta's fury would hardly have penetrated. The Sinhalese Buddhist monks who had already had contacts with the region would have continued their relations even after the sacking of Thaton by Anawrahta. Therefore the Buddhist Faith was prevalent there, and the
Sinhalese influence was already felt there when Pagan was receiving inspiration from Ceylon in the eleventh century A.D.\footnote{Bode, The Pali Literature of Burma, p.31.}

According to the Kalyāṇī inscriptions, and the Sāsanavamsa, as a result of the new impetus in Pagan, Sinhalese Buddhism reached Thaton during the reign of King Narapatisithu. It is said that a Buddhist monk named Sariputta, from the province of Daḷa in Thaton, who went to Pagan and received higher ordination from Ananda Thera, was ordained according to the Mahāvihāra tradition of Ceylon. He studied the Buddhist scriptures and the commentaries and was noted as a learned scholar. His fame spread far and wide, and King Narapatisithu, having come to know about him, wanted to appoint him as the royal preceptor. Unfortunately he suffered from a physical deformity, and the king therefore did not give him his appointment, but conferred on him the title Dhammavilāsa, and gave him many offerings and sent him to the Mon country to spread the Faith there.\footnote{IA, Vol.XXII,p.32; Sv., tr. Law, p.46.}

Having arrived in Thaton, Sariputta taught Dhamma and Vinaya to many monks there and as a result he had many followers. From the Burmese sources it appears that the Sinhalese sect of Buddhist monks became established in Thaton,
because Sariputta and his followers were known among the people of Thaton as Sāhalapakkhahikkhusāṅgha while the sect of the Buddhist monks already there when Sariputta arrived from Pagan was known as the Ariyārahantapakkhahikkhusāṅgha. In fact Sariputta, too, would have belonged to the latter before he left Thaton to receive the higher ordination from Thera Ananda.

There have been found some inscriptions which refer to a Buddhist monk named Dhammavilāsa. These are engraved on the pedestals of seated Buddha images found among the ruins of a stūpa at Thiyibhitsaya, five miles from Pagan. The script of these inscriptions belongs roughly to the twelfth or thirteenth century and therefore it is possible that Dhammavilāsa mentioned in the inscriptions may be the same as the monk who came from Thaton.2 If this suggestion is accepted this would confirm the account in the Kalyāṇī inscriptions and in other Burmese sources. Thus Sinhalese influence spread as far as the Thaton region through the fraternity of Sinhalese monks which was established by Chappaṭa in Pagan.

The influence of the Sinhalese sect of Buddhist monks seems to have reached Martaban also. The repercussions of

1 IA, Vol.XXII, p.32; Bode, The Pali Literature of Burma, pp.31-2.
the dissensions that occurred within the Sinhalese sect in Pagan were felt even in that region. The Kalyāṇī inscriptions say that all the different sects founded by Tamalinda, Ananda and Śivalī were present in Martaban.\(^1\) Thus, though the monks belonging to these sects basically followed the Mahāvihāra in Ceylon, they were divided among themselves with regard to minor Vinaya rules. They interpreted these rules according to their own knowledge, and each sect believed that it was the closest to the original teachings of the Buddha.

According to Burmese sources there were two other sects of Buddhist monks in Martaban, one founded by Buddhavaṃsa Mahāthera and the other by Mahāśāmi Mahāthera, also known as Mahānāga. Both these monks were the preceptors of the Queen of Martaban and both had received their training in Ceylon. On their return to Martaban they started carrying out the ecclesiastical ceremonies separately, although the sources do not give any reason for this. It is probable that it was due to the different opinions entertained on Vinaya or disciplinary rules, which was the usual cause of such dissensions among the Buddhist monks in Burma.\(^2\)

\(^1\) IA, Vol.XXII, p.33.  
\(^2\) Sv, tr. Law, p.47.
The Pagan period (A.D. 1044-1287) was the heyday of Buddhism in Burma, when it spread more or less to every corner of the country. Though the Ari monks were powerful in Upper Burma before the accession of Anawrahta, after this event Theravāda Buddhism gradually made headway and triumphed with the support of the rulers of Pagan. Most of the rulers of Pagan followed Anawrahta with regard to religious policy and they always contributed to the promotion of the Faith. Furthermore, throughout the Pagan period the rulers as well as the Buddhist monks had close relations with Ceylon and as a result Sinhalese influence reached Burmese soil.

However, the Pagan dynasty had its day and from the reign of King Narapatisithu Pagan had to face much political trouble, which resulted in a considerable set-back to the religion. The successors of this ruler were feeble and the greatness of the Pagan dynasty gradually diminished. This provided an opportunity for foreign invasions which caused the final collapse of the kingdom.

The capture of China by the Mongol leader Kublai Khan had repercussions on the South-east Asian kingdoms. In order to revive the former relations with the Chinese emperors of the Sung dynasty, Kublai Khan demanded tribute from all these kingdoms in the Indo-Chinese Peninsula. Some of the envoys
sent by Kublai Khan came to Narapatisithu also, but the Burmese ruler imprisoned them and finally had them executed. However this action had other results than he expected. The Burmese army was no match for the Tartar army of Kublai Khan, which finally overran upper Burma.  

In the meantime, due to the political turmoil caused by the Tartars in Nanchao, the Shans started migrating southwards and one wave reached as far as Burma. Later, after the withdrawal of the Tartars, the Shans gained control of most of the territories in upper Burma. Their capital was first Pinya, then Sagaing and finally Ava. Because of these invasions and migrations, politically upper Burma was in a state of utter confusion until King Thadominbya, the founder of the capital Ava in A.D. 1364, united upper Burma into a single kingdom.  

All this political change and disorder affected Buddhism, as the patronage of the rulers was necessary in those days for the advancement of the religion, and without it the monastic Order deteriorated, and in time of warfare the monks found it difficult even to maintain their daily rounds. Though we have some reference to Shan rulers who were Buddhists and who tried 

---

1 Harvey, History of Burma, pp. 64 ff; Maung Htin Aung, A History of Burma, pp. 66 ff.
to promote the Faith, the unrest in the country would not have given them much opportunity to do so.

However, even after the fall of the Pagan kingdom we have a few instances of monks from upper Burma making contact with the Buddhist centres of Ceylon. Such relations were encouraged by rulers, who gave every support to the promotion of the Faith. During the reign of Mohnynthado of Ava (A.D.1427-40) we hear of two Buddhist monks, Siridhammālaṅkāra Thera and Sīhalamahāsaṃī Thera, who came in A.D.1430 with five relics from Ceylon to the kingdom of Ava. According to the Sāsanavamsa King Binnya Ran (A.D.1426-46) of Pegu did not allow these two monks to stay in Rāmaṇṇa when they first landed at Bassein, but sent them to Siriketta (Prome).¹ This action is inexplicable because of the interest taken in Theravāda Buddhism in the Rāmaṇṇa country, where the Sinhalese sect of Buddhist monks in particular was well known. It is possible that the king did not personally support that sect. However, the two monks were warmly welcomed by the ruler of Ava, who sent forty boats to Prome to bring them to his capital. There he built a huge monastery for them and also a stūpa to enshrine the relics brought from Ceylon.²

² Ibid.
The account given in the Sasanavamsa does not provide any evidence to show whether these two monks were Burmese returning from Ceylon after studying and receiving higher ordination, or Sinhalese monks who came to Burma. The Jinakalamalī gives an account of a higher ordination ceremony performed in A.D. 1425 on a raft in the Kalyāṇī river in Ceylon. This account says that six Burmese monks, together with some Thai and Cambodian monks, received higher ordination from the Sinhalese monks. Therefore it is possible that if they were not Sinhalese, the two theras were two of these Burmese monks.

Support for the Sinhalese sect continued even in the reign of the next king of Ava, Narapati (A.D. 1433-69), who appointed Mahāsāmi Mahāthera, a monk of that fraternity, as his teacher. This may be the same therā who arrived from Ceylon with five relics. Narapati also built a monastery called Thūpārāma, a name reminiscent of the famous monastery of that name at Anurādhapura. Furthermore, according to certain Burmese chronicles this king is said to have sent offerings of gold and precious stones to the Tooth Relic and bought some land in Ceylon for the support of the Burmese clergy visiting the shrine.

1 Sv, tr. Law, p. 102.
2 Ibid.
King Thihathura, Narapati's successor, continued religious contacts with Ceylon. He and his queen made their hair into a broom with a handle studded with gems, and sent it for sweeping the floor of the Tooth Relic Temple.  

In the fifteenth century there was in Ceylon a learned monk named Chappaṭa from Pagan in Upper Burma. Rev. Buddhadatta has rightly pointed out that this Chappaṭa was different from the Burmese monk of the same name mentioned in the Kalyāṇī inscriptions, who is said to have stayed for ten years in Ceylon. According to the colophon of the Saṅkhepavāṇṇa, Chappaṭa, the author of this work, came to Ceylon during the reign of Parākramabāhu of Jayavarmanapura in Ceylon. This Saṅkhepavāṇṇa account is as follows:

The elder who came from the prosperous city of Arimaddana to the noble island of Tambapanī, in the year 1990 after the demise of the Buddha, purified the sasana with the help of the king Parakkambāhu, and caused a sīmā to be consecrated, according to the vinaya rules and avoiding all unlawful acts, in the city of Jayavaṭṭhana, by the monk who had a thorough knowledge in vinaya-ceremonies and who had well subdued their senses. That elder, known by the name of Chappada, who was dear to the king, and well-versed in the three piṭakas which have many-sided meanings, having a heart cleansed by wisdom, kind to the

---

2 A.P. Buddhadatta, 'Were there two Elders by the name of Chappada?' UCR, Vol.IX (1951), pp.69-75.
people, of few desires, laudable for his virtue and perseverance, having devotion as his own wealth, with compassion on the pupils, taught Vinaya and Abhidhamma to many monks. The same Elder compiled this concise but descriptive commentary on the Abhidhammatthasāṅgaha, for the welfare of the religion of the Buddha.¹

Earlier this Chappaṭa was identified with the monk of that name mentioned in the Burmese sources.² But though the Kalyāṇī inscriptions have given a lengthy description of Chappaṭa they do not mention any literary work by this monk.³ Furthermore, chronology shows that Chappaṭa, the author of the Saṅkhēpavāṃnana lived in the fifteenth century, whereas the former Chappaṭa who visited Ceylon belonged to the twelfth century A.D. Another reason which prompts us to believe that they were not one and the same person is the mention of Jayavardhanapura (Kōṭṭe) in the colophon of the Saṅkhēpavāṃnana. Jayavardhanapura came into being long after the first Chappaṭa visited Ceylon, and therefore the Parākramabāhu mentioned here can be taken as Parākramabāhu VI of Kōṭṭe (A.D.1412-67). The chronology given in the colophon itself agrees with Parākramabāhu VI's reign. Therefore this second Chappaṭa was

¹ Quoted by Buddhadatta, UCR, Vol. IX, pp.71-2.
² Bode, op.cit., p.18; Malalasekara, The Pali Literature of Ceylon, pp.196-7.
a monk who came to Ceylon from Pagan in the fifteenth century.

One thing in the colophon which is not clear is the mention of Chappaṭa purifying the sāsana with the help of the Sinhalese ruler and establishing a duly constituted sacred boundary (sīma) at Jayavardhanapura and training pupils in Vinaya and Abhidhamma. Ceylonese sources do not record the visit of a Burmese monk during the reign of Parākramabāhu VI to purify the Order in Ceylon. However, this cannot be taken as a serious objection, because the Sinhalese chroniclers would not have liked to admit that a Burmese monk purified the Sinhalese Order. Therefore it is not impossible that they completely ignored the incident. Nevertheless, it is strange that a Burmese monk should purify the Order, because according to the Kalyāṇī inscriptions it was the Burmese who needed guidance and help with regard to religious matters during the fifteenth century.

From Chappaṭa's literary works such as Saṅkhelapavappana and the commentary on Mahāsāmi's Sīmālakārasaṅgaha, it would appear that he had a wide knowledge of Buddhism. He would have come to Ceylon like the first Chappaṭa and probably

---

studied the Dhamma and Vinaya under the Sinhalese monks and then, because of his learning and knowledge, would have been given the rank of a mahāthera and a number of pupils would have studied under him. The Rev. Buddhadasa has shown that the Mahā Vijayabāhū who requested him to write the Saṅkhepavānana could be Toṭagamuve Śrī Rāhula, who was head of the Vijayabā pirivena.¹ If this is accepted, Chappaṭa was attached to that Buddhist institution, which was a well known school of learning during the reign of Parākramabāhu VI.

Śrī Rāhula, the head of the Vijayabā pirivena had close relations with the royal family.² According to the Pañcikāpradīpa of Śrī Rāhula himself, this therā was brought up by Parākramabāhu VI as his own son.³ The Sālalihini-sandesaya, another work of Śrī Rāhula, says that he was the royal preceptor of the king.⁴ In the Buddhippasādini-tīka there is a reference to Śrī Rāhula as the primate of the Buddhist church in Ceylon.⁵ Thus as Śrī Rāhula had close relations with the royal family, Chappaṭa, who

¹ UCR, Vol. IX, p. 73.
² Sannasgala, Sinhala Sāhitya Vamsaya, p.256.
³ Pañcikāpradīpa, colophon.
⁵ Buddhippasādini-tīka, cited by Sannasgala, op.cit., p.256, note 11.
was attached to the Vijayabā pirivena, of which Śrī Rāhula was the principal, may have come into close contact with Parākramabāhu VI.

Parākramabāhu VI, too, being a patron of religion, was anxious to continue the stability of the Order. Therefore in his 45th regnal year, he promulgated a new set of disciplinary rules for Buddhist monks. Thus he attempted to purify the Saṅgha. In this task there is no doubt that the king received the help of eminent Buddhist monks and Śrī Rāhula, being the royal preceptor, would naturally have played a leading role in that task. If Chappaṭa was attached to the Vijayabā pirivena, as most probably he was, he would have assisted Śrī Rāhula and other Buddhist monks. If this was, in fact, the course of events, it explains Chappaṭa's statement in the Saṅkhhepavāpañña that he purified the sāsana with the help of King Parākramabāhu VI.

The Buddhist centres of Southern Burma also continued to maintain relations with Ceylon, although we have little evidence of such contacts. We hear of a mission, sent to Ceylon by Binnya U (A.D.1335-85) of Pegu obtaining Buddhist relics which were then enshrined in a stūpa built on the spot

where the king had defeated a hostile army from Chiangmai.\(^1\)
The colophon of the *Lokappadipakasāra* and the *Sasanavamsa* contain references to a Sinhalese monk named Medhaṅkara who lived in Martaban where he was appointed the religious preceptor of the Queen, the mother of Binnya U.\(^2\)

Again in the *Sasanavamsa* there is a reference to a well-known Buddhist monk named Sevāsusvaṇṇasobhana who went to Ceylon and studied under the Sinhalese monks. The chronicle goes on to say that he was admitted to the higher ordination at the water boundary set up at the lake called Kolamba in Ceylon. His preceptor was Vanaratana Mahāthera, and Mahāthera Rāhula was his teacher.\(^3\) The date of this monk's visit is not given but the Kalyāṇī inscriptions say that 26 years had already elapsed since his upasampāda when he was selected as preceptor at a higher ordination ceremony in A.D.1479 during the reign of King Dhammazedi.\(^4\) Hence he would have been admitted to the higher ordination in A.D.1453.

---

\(^1\) Harvey, *History of Burma*, p.112.

\(^2\) For details about this Medhaṅkara see infra pp.294 ff.

\(^3\) *Sv*, tr. Law, p.47.

\(^4\) *IA*, Vol. XXII, p.47.
The Sinhalese form of higher ordination was formally introduced into Lower Burma at the end of the fifteenth century during the reign of King Dhammazedī of Pegu (A.D.1472-92). Dhammazedī was a Buddhist monk and tutor of Queen Shin Saw Bu, and was selected by the queen to succeed to the throne as there were no males left in her family. When Dhammazedī was a monk he had been a witness to the corruption in the Saṅgha, and had observed how the various sects into which the Saṅgha had divided, were contending with each other. He had observed the disorganisation of these various sects and their gradual drifting away from the original teachings of the Buddha. Well versed in Dhamma and Vinaya, the ruler of Pegu was qualified to see things in clear perspective and to know the real state of affairs in the Saṅgha and its constituent parts. He came to the conclusion that bringing all these various sects together under one ecclesiastical authority was the only way of restoring unity. Hence he saw the necessity of introducing a standard and absolute upasampadā ordination in his country.

Through the contacts that Burma had had with Ceylon in the preceeding four centuries, it had by the fifteenth century built up a tradition that the religion in its pure and unsullied form existed in Ceylon alone and the Mahāvihāra of Ceylon was

---

1 Harvey, op.cit., pp.117-8; Aung, A History of Burma, pp.98 ff.
the main source of guidance and inspiration for the Burmese Buddhists. Therefore Dhammazedi turned to Ceylon for guidance when he was planning the re-organization of the *Sangha* in his kingdom. The *Kalyanī* inscriptions and the *Sasanavamsa* contain accounts of this great mission of the Pegu ruler.

According to these sources the king invited 22 *Mahātheras*, headed by Moggallāna of Rāmañña, to go to Ceylon and receive higher ordination afresh so that they could introduce it into Burma. Then he prepared valuable articles for offering to the Tooth Relic and at other Buddhist Sanctuaries, and also as presents for the *Mahātheras* in Ceylon and for the Sinhalese king. The letter addressed to the Sinhalese monks clearly stated the purpose of the mission and requested them to give their full co-operation and assistance so that the purpose of the mission could be achieved. A similar letter inscribed on a gold plate was addressed to the Sinhalese ruler Bhuvanaikabāhu.

The sources say that two ships were prepared for the journey. Eleven *theras* and their disciples embarked on one of the ships, which was under the care of an official named Rāmadūta. The other ship, which was in charge of one Cittadūta,

was for the other eleven *theras* and their disciples. The mission was sent in the 837th year of the Saka Era (A.D. 1475).\(^1\)

Chittadūta's ships arrived in Colombo without any troubles after a month's voyage and the party on board was received with honour by Bhuvanaikabāhu VI (A.D.1470-8); he was exceedingly delighted when the letter sent by Dhammazedi was read out. The king made offerings to the *theras* and made arrangements to have them looked after. The second vessel had a difficult voyage due to adverse winds, but ultimately arrived at Vāligama in the south of Ceylon after sailing for about five months. The monks who had travelled in it were directed to Jayavardhanapura (Kōṭṭe), where they also were warmly welcomed by the Sinhalese ruler.

The Burmese monks first visited holy shrines at Anurādhapura such as Ruvanvīlīsāya, Mirisavāṭīya, Thūparāma, Abhayagiri, Jetavana, Lohaprasāda and the sacred Bo-tree. On their arrival in Kōṭṭe the king exhibited to them the Tooth Relic, which was then in Kōṭṭe.

Having carried out all these meritorious pilgrimages the Kalyāṇī inscriptions say that the Burmese monks underwent the most important experience of their mission; namely, the

---

\(^1\) This is the Burmese Era beginning in A.D.638.
receiving of higher ordination from the Sinhalese monks who were the spiritual successors of the Thera Mahinda. According to the sources, the king instructed his ministers to construct a bridge of boats on the Kalyāñī river as a mandapa for the ceremony. Vidāgama Mahāthera was asked by the king to elect a chapter, and twenty-four mahātheras including well-known high priests were selected. This team of monks headed by Dhammakitti Mahāthera admitted to the sāsana forty-four monks from Rāmañña and they received higher ordination at the hands of the Sinhalese Elders.

Finally, having fulfilled all the necessary religious ceremonies, the monks started on their return journey. The theras who embarked in the ship which was under the charge of Rāmaduta arrived at Pegu safely. The other ship was wrecked, resulting in the loss of some lives; the survivors landed at Nāgapaṭṭana in South India and took another ship to Burma.

On their arrival in Burma large numbers of monks flocked to receive higher ordination from them. King Dhammazedi established a new sacred boundary (sīmā) called Kalyāñī sīmā after the famous place in Ceylon where the Burmese monks received higher ordination. The first ceremony started in the presence of the king himself, and, according to the sources, within four years more than 15,000 monks had received higher ordination and
become members of the Sinhalese fraternity. In this way the Sinhalese upasampada was once again introduced into Burma at the end of the fifteenth century, resulting in the purification of the sasana and the revival of Buddhism.1

Thus it appears that, from the eleventh century until the fifteenth century A.D., close religious contacts were maintained between Ceylon and Burma with only occasional interruptions caused by unsettled political conditions. It was only when she herself had been faced with the problem of obtaining duly ordained Buddhist monks for the purpose of reinstating the religion in the eleventh century, that Ceylon had turned to Burma for help. In other respects, Ceylon's contribution to Burma was by far the greater. As a result of the introduction of the Sinhalese form of higher ordination, many fraternities arose in the various kingdoms of Burma which, although differing from each other in some respects, all basically belonged to the same Sinhalese Order. In this way, there was created a widespread conviction that Ceylon was the great centre of Theravāda Buddhism, which preserved the religion in what was believed to be its original form. Consequently it was to Ceylon that Dhammazedi turned for help in reorganising the Order in Ramañña, and he finally achieved his goal with the assistance of Sinhalese monks.

1 IA, Vol.XXII, pp.34-53, 85-9; Sv, tr. Law, pp.48-51.
CHAPTER VI

Ceylon, Thailand and Cambodia: Religious Contacts

Throughout her religious history, Siam or Thailand as she is also called, had had contacts with other Buddhist countries; among them Ceylon figures prominently, because from about the eleventh century onwards she was regarded as the Mecca of Theravāda Buddhism by the Buddhists of South-east Asia. Therefore the religious contacts between Ceylon and Thailand make an interesting story, though sometimes we find it difficult to determine their exact nature owing to the lack of source material. On the other hand, we have very little evidence of religious contacts between Ceylon and Cambodia; nevertheless, it will be seen that Sinhalese influences were not without their effects in that country too from the thirteenth century onwards.

Although at the present time, almost all the other important religions are represented there, the majority of the population of Thailand is Theravāda Buddhist. As in Burma and other parts of South-east Asia, the early history of Buddhism in Thailand is obscure. From the archaeological remains that have been brought to light in Central Thailand, it appears that during the second half of the first millennium A.D. there were Mon people practising Theravāda Buddhism in Central Thailand. The name of the kingdom which flourished
there during this period has been identified as dvaravati. This Buddhist kingdom was responsible for most of the early Buddhist remains around the Gulf of Siam. With the sources available it is not possible to find any information about the political history of this kingdom, which from the point of view of the cultural historian who seeks to understand the development of the civilization of South-east Asia is of great importance. Though it appears that Theravāda Buddhism was known in the Dvaravati kingdom the sources do not permit us to conclude how this religion reached Thailand. All that we learn from literary sources on the subject is the Sopa-Uttara tradition from the Ceylonese chronicles.

Indians no doubt did contribute much towards the introduction and spread of Buddhism in South-east Asia, but

---


2 Coedès, The Indianized States, pp.76-7.

3 Quaritch Wales, JRAS (1966), p.40.

4 According to the Ceylonese chronicles Moggaliputtatissa Thera after the Third Buddhist Council in the third century B.C. sent Sopa and Uttara Theras to Suvannabhumi. Though Suvannabhumi has been identified as Lower Burma and Thailand respectively it had a wider meaning and included much of mainland South-east Asia.
the archaeological evidence shows that the Ceylonese too had a share in the dissemination of Buddhist culture even in the early centuries. We find some traces of Sinhalese influence among the early remains of P'ong Tük. Furthermore, Dupont found that Dvāravatī Buddha images owe their specific character to a fusion of Amaravatī, Ceylon and Gupta features.

After the Dvāravatī period we find no evidence of religious contacts between Ceylon and Thailand until the Sukhodaya period (thirteenth to fifteenth century). Before the Thais overran the whole of Thailand, a larger part of it was under the Khmer empire, which had captured it from the Mons of Dvāravatī. As the Khmers until the thirteenth century were interested in Mahāyāna Buddhism and Hinduism, we cannot find much evidence of close religious contacts between Ceylon and Thailand during their overlordship. Therefore only after the establishment of the Thai kingdom of Sukhodaya and the spread of Theravāda Buddhism religious contacts were resumed.

---

3 Le May, A Concise History of Buddhist Art in Siam, pp.53 ff.
The origin of the Thai race is shrouded in mystery. But it has now been more or less established that they were originally settled in Yunnan region and, even though their Chinese neighbours considered them barbarians, they had developed a considerable culture before they started their migrations. Being on the border of China they were subjected to Chinese pressure, and they started migrating southwards in several successive stages. The Thais who reached Thailand founded several centres such as Chiangsaen, Chiangrai, Chiangmai, Phayao, Sawankhalok (= Sajjanalaya) and Sukhodaya. The Thai rulers of Sukhodaya and Sawankhalok, who were at first under Khmer supremacy, revolted against it, and set up an independent kingdom under Śrī Indraditya in the second half of the thirteenth century. Śrī Indraditya expanded his kingdom and consolidated his power rapidly, a process which was carried further by his son and second successor, Rāma Khamhaeng. By the end of the thirteenth century he ruled most of present day Thailand.

The Sukhodaya kingdom is even more important for her culture than for her political history, and her foundation had far-reaching results in the field of religion. From the

---

Wood, History of Siam, pp.36-8; Coedès, The Indianized States, pp.194 ff; Hall, A History of South-east Asia, pp.158-63.
epigraphical records, the archaeological remains and the literary sources, it is clear that the religion practised in this kingdom was Theravāda Buddhism,¹ about which the Thais knew nothing before they migrated to Thailand.² Therefore we have to examine whence and how they received this Faith. According to Griswold they received it from the Mons of Dvāravatī.³ Though the brightness of Theravāda Buddhism faded away during the Khmer supremacy over the Dvāravatī kingdom there would still have been Mons who followed it. Therefore the Thais came to know about it when they met Mons who were its adherents. But the question arises whether this was the only reason for them to accept this new Faith or whether there were any other external forces or influence which caused them to accept it and work for its spread and promotion.

The Northern Mon kingdom of Haripunjaya (Lamphun) came under the influence of Theravāda Buddhism from Burma and this would have encouraged its spread to Sukhodaya. From the days of Anawrahta, the state religion of the Pagan was Theravāda

¹ Wood, op.cit., pp.52-3; Griswold, ACASA, Vol.VII, p.13; Dhaninivat Encyclopaedia of Buddhism, Volume of Specimen Articles, pp.70-1.
³ Ibid.
Buddhism and it spread far and wide through the patronage of Pagan rulers. Not only in Burma was its influence felt but also even outside its borders. It appears that because of the proximity of Lamphun it came under this Burmese influence. Coedès has pointed out that even during the Khmer rule over Thailand Lamphun was hardly influenced by Cambodia at all, but the traces of the early culture of this kingdom show Mon influence from Burma. The earliest inscriptions of Northern Thailand, which belong to the beginning of the thirteenth century and are from Lamphun, have affinities with the Mon inscriptions of Pagan both in language and palaeography. The palaeography especially is similar to that of Mon of the period after the reign of King Kyanzittha. Thus if Lamphun had had a close association with Buddhism and Buddhist monks from Burma, we could expect that inhabitants came to know about Sinhalese Buddhism because it was then well-established in Burma and the Sinhalese group (nikāya) of Burmese monks was well known for conduct and learning. The Burmese monks and the Pagan rulers had high regard for the Sinhalese fraternity and this would have led to the spread of their fame even outside Burma.

The influence of the Dvaravati style on the early sculpture of Lamphun shows the likelihood of contacts between the two regions. After the first influx of Buddhist inspiration from Burma there would have been increasingly close relations between Dvaravati and Lamphun as Theravada Buddhism in Dvaravati suffered under Khmer rule and the Mons of Dvaravati turned to Lamphun for help in matters of religion. Even after the migration of the Thais, this old friendship would have continued and thus the stream of Sinhalese Buddhist influence which reached Lamphum from Burma would have continued to Sukhodaya. Therefore, indirectly, the Sinhalese helped considerably to convert the Thai rulers and people to Theravada Buddhism.

Another possibility is that Theravada Buddhism and Sinhalese influence reached Sukhodaya through Nakhon Srit'ammarat. In this region and in Chaiya the remains of a number of Buddhist sanctuaries and many Buddhist images have been found. Wat Phra Tat of Chaiya is a site with very ancient monuments. The remains of a stupa which can be dated back to the eighth century have been discovered and a considerable number of Buddha images have been recovered from

---

1 See infra, pp. 330-31.
its vicinity. There was, in Chaiya, a local school of Buddhist sculpture between the eighth and the twelfth centuries A.D. This Buddhist sculpture shows Dvaravati influence and suggests that there were relations between Dvaravati and Nakhon Srit'ammarat.

Evidence is not lacking of a Sinhalese impact on Nakhon Srit'ammarat. According to Dupont, one of the major influences in the work of Chaiya school of sculpture, which belongs to a period between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries, was Sinhalese.

Furthermore the Kalyāṇī inscriptions of Dhammazedi of the fifteenth century have an indirect reference to Sinhalese influence in the Malay Peninsula. The inscriptions relate the story of Rāhula, the only Sinhalese monk who accompanied Chappaṭa when he returned to Burma from Ceylon. Rāhula, say the inscriptions fell in love with a Burmese dancing girl and decided to leave the Order. Chappaṭa and other Buddhist monks, after failing to change his mind, asked him to quit the Order.

---

2 Ibid. p.25, note.17.
3 See infra, pp. 440 ff.
4 IA, Vol.XXII, p.29 ff.
and leave Burma. Accordingly he left Burma and embarked for Malayadīpa, where he taught Vinaya to the ruler, with the help of whose presents he set up house as a layman.¹

Gunawardene, commenting on this, identifies the Malayadīpa mentioned here as Malayu, the island of Sumatra. He says:

It is evident from this that Buddhism was patronised by the king at Malayu who ruled during this period. Hence it is possible to accept that Rahula was welcomed in this kingdom; the result of this visit, however could not have been very impressive.²

It is our view, however, that the Malayadīpa mentioned here is the Malay Peninsula, where Nakhon Srit'ammarat is situated, and in which Theravāda Buddhism prevailed. In Malayu the Mahāyāna form of Buddhism was practised and it is very unlikely that Sinhalese Buddhism would have been held in high esteem there. Nakhon Srit'ammarat on the other hand was emerging as a Theravāda Buddhist centre. Its rulers would have been supporters of this Faith and the king of Nakhon Srit'ammarat would have welcomed a Sinhalese Buddhist monk, who was well versed in the Tripitaka. As it is situated close to Burma there would certainly have been

religious contacts with institutions in Burma. Therefore
the Burmese Buddhist monks, knowing about the conditions
prevailing there at that time, may have suggested that Rahula
should go to that kingdom. The word dīpa used here could
be used equally well to denote a peninsula. Thus there is
no serious objection to identifying the Malayadīpa mentioned
in the inscriptions as the Malay Peninsula, and Nakhon
Srit'AMMARAT in particular. If this suggestion is accepted,
Rahula would have helped to spread the Sinhalese influence
further in that kingdom.¹

Theravāda Buddhism and Sinhalese influence may have
spread towards Sukhodaya from Nakhon Srit'AMMARAT, as we
have some evidence of contacts between these two kingdoms.
According to one of the inscriptions, Rama Khamhaeng, the
third ruler of the Sukhodaya kingdom, invited a Buddhist
monk of the Forest-dwelling sect from Nakhon Srit'AMMARAT.
The inscription says:

To the west of this city of Sukhodaya there is a
monastery of the Forest Monks. King Rama Khamhaeng
founded and offered it to the Venerable Preceptor,
learned in all the Three Baskets, in erudition
excelling all other monks in the whole land. He
hailed from Nagara Śrī Dharmarāja. ²

¹ Grisvold identifies the king who welcomed Rahula as
Candrabhānu who invaded Ceylon twice, Buddhist Annual
(1964), p.76.
The Forest-dwelling or Aranṇavāsin sect was a group of Buddhist monks which was popular in the area at this time and which came into being as a result of direct influence from Ceylon. During the reign of Parākramabāhu I, these Forest-dwelling monks, especially those from the Buddhist centre of Dimbulagala, were active in purifying the Order and promoting the Faith. As a result their influence spread even to the countries of South-east Asia. Though this invitation of a monk to Sukhodaya is an isolated reference in our sources, undoubtedly other Buddhist monks would have travelled between these two kingdoms. The influence of the Dvāravatī style on the sculpture of Nakhon Srit'ammaraat suggests links between the two kingdoms which could have continued even after the establishment of Sukhodaya.

Thus Theravāda Buddhism reached Sukhodaya from three directions. One wave came from Burma via Lamphun, the second from Nakhon Srit'ammaraat, and the third from the Dvāravatī kingdom which was directly under the Sukhodaya rulers. All three waves were suffused with Sinhalese influence and brought knowledge of Sinhalese Buddhism to

---

the Sukhodaya rulers. From the interest these monarchs took in Sinhalese Buddhism it is evident that its impact was strongly felt and already exercised a powerful influence not long after the foundation of the kingdom.

The Jinakālamālī has recorded a legend in which we find some evidence of a link between Ceylon, Nakhon Srit'ammarat and Sukhodaya in the thirteenth century. According to this story, Rocarājā, the king of Sukhodaya, desirous of visiting the coast, came down to Siridhammanagara (Nakhon Srit'ammarat) whose ruler, King Siridhamma, gave him a warm welcome and informed him about a wonderful Buddha image which was in Ceylon. Narrating how this image originated, the story says that 700 years after the death of the Buddha there were in Ceylon 20 arahants. The Sinhalese ruler desired to see the form of the Buddha visited these arahants to ask them whether anyone was living at that time who had seen the Buddha when He thrice visited Ceylon. Through the powers of the arahants, a nāga king created a likeness of the Buddha. Having worshipped it for seven days, the Sinhalese king asked the sculptors to make a replica of this miraculous image of the Buddha out of an alloy of gold, silver and bronze.

1 Jinakālamālī (P.T.S.), pp. 86-91.
After completion of the image, it appeared bright and resplendent like the living Buddha himself. The Sinhalese king and his successors paid homage to this miraculous image from that time on.

It was the glory of this image that King Siridhamma had heard of and about which he informed the king of Sukhodaya. Rocarājā asked Siridhamma whether anybody could go to Ceylon but was told that it was not easy to get there because it was protected by four powerful divinities. However Rocarājā and Siridhamma sent an envoy to the ruler of Ceylon asking for the statue. The Sinhalese ruler handed it over to the envoy after paying homage to it for seven days and nights. Unfortunately the ship on which the envoy was travelling was wrecked on its return journey, but the Buddha image, somehow or other, miraculously reached Nakhon Srit ' ammarat, whose ruler, after having worshipped it for some time, sent word of its arrival to the ruler of Sukhodaya. Rocarājā once again came down to Nakhon Srit ' ammarat and took the image back to his kingdom.  

The story given in the Jinakālamālī is full of myth and legend, but it appears that there is some historical truth mixed with them. The story of the origin of the Buddha image

---

1 Jinakālamālī, pp.86-91. Sihīṅga-Buddharūpañidāna also gives the same story. Sihīṅga-Buddharūpañidāna, tr. Notton, pp. 7 ff.
is purely legendary. In Ceylonese sources we have no mention of such an image. Legends regarding the statue would have arisen due to the popularity of the image which was brought from Ceylon and these could have been incorporated in the story, to demonstrate its importance. There are two rulers mentioned in the narrative. But neither in the genealogy of Sukhodaya rulers nor in that of Nakhon Srit'ammarat as they stand at present can we find the names Rocarāja and Siridhamma. But this does not mean that these two kings are not historical figures; the history of Sukhodaya and of Nakhon Srit'ammarat has many gaps, because of the paucity of sources. In fact the history of the latter hardly gives us any genealogical information. Moreover, the rulers of these kingdoms would have used more than one name, and not all of them would have been recorded in our chronicles and inscriptions.

We have already seen that the Siridhamma mentioned in the Jinakālamālī has been identified with Candrabhānu alluded to in the Chaiya inscription and the Cūlavamsa. The historical basis of the story seems to be that Candrabhānu, after failing to gain some relics from Ceylon by force,
succeeded in getting them by peaceful means in association with the ruler of Sukhodaya. ¹

Paranavitana agrees with Coedès, who first identified Siridhamma in the *Jinakālamālī* with Candrabhānu, and tries to give further evidence to show that after Candrabhānu’s first invasion peaceful relations were resumed. He draws attention to a reference in the *Cūlavamsa* which mentions the Thera Dhammakitti who was invited from Tambarattha by King Parākramabāhu II. According to this chronicle the king is said to have sent costly presents to the ruler of Tambarattha together with his request for the thera. But the name of the king of Tambarattha is not mentioned anywhere. Paranavitana identifies the Tambarattha mentioned here with Nakhon Srit'ammarat, and says that the king to whom Parākramabāhu sent gifts was no other than Candrabhānu. Then he says:

... not long after the first armed conflict between Ceylon and Tambaliṅga, normal peaceful relations between the two countries were resumed. It was perhaps on the same occasion that, as stated in the *Jinakālamālī*... a sacred Buddha image was taken from Ceylon to Dhammarāja-nagara. This might even have been included among the "religious gifts" sent by Parākramabāhu II to Tambarattha.²

¹ See supra pp.177 ff.
² Paranavitana, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, pp.79-80.
Paranavitana's interpretation rests on the identification of the Tambaraṭṭha mentioned in the Cūlavamsa as Nakhon Srit'ammarat, the kingdom of Candrabhānu. But this identification is open to question. The references to Tambaraṭṭha do not permit us to identify it with Nakhon Srit'ammarat. A fragmentary slab inscription of Sundara-mahādevī, the consort of Vikramabāhu (A.D.1111-32) says that a great thera of the Ceylon Saṅgha by the name of Ānanda was instrumental in purifying the Order in Tambaraṭṭha.¹

The Paramatthavinicchaya, according to its colophon, was written by a monk born 'in the township of Kāvira in the land of the city of Kānci, who was living at the time of writing in Taṅjanagara in Tambaraṭṭha'.² According to the Jinālaṅkāra, its author had a high reputation among the learned men of Coliya-Tambaraṭṭha.³ This could be interpreted either as the Cola land of Tambaraṭṭha or as the Tambaraṭṭha in the Cola land.⁴ Gunawardene has discussed the difficulties involved in Paranavitana's interpretation:

---

¹ EZ, Vol. IV, pp.67-72.
² Paramatthavinicchaya, ed. Devananda, p.337.
³ Jinālaṅkāra, ed. Rakawa Palita, p.31.
Though it is possible that the Tambaraṭṭha of the Pāli works is identical with Tambraliṅga or the Ligor area of the Malay Peninsula, the difficulties involved in accepting the hypothesis induce one to consider other possibilities. Tambaraṭṭha occurs in all its known contexts in association with South India, particularly the Coḷa country. This would suggest that it was situated close to the Coḷa country. The Taṇja of the Paramatthavinicchaya could very well be identified with Tāncai in the Pāṇḍya country. It is easier to accept the suggestion that a monk who was born in Kāveri went to live in the Pāṇḍya country though it is not impossible as Paranavitana has suggested, that he went to the Malay Peninsula. The evidence before us seems to favour the view that Tambaraṭṭha was in South India. 1

Thus if we accept that Tambaraṭṭha was in South India and not in the Malay Peninsula, then this Čulavamsa account cannot be given as evidence of Candrabhānu resuming friendly relations with the Sinhalese ruler after his first invasion.

From the account given in the Jinakālamālī it appears that King Indrāditya of Sukhodaya, a contemporary of Candrabhānu had contacts with Parākramabāhu II, the Sinhalese ruler. Theravāda Buddhism which was their common Faith, brought them together and from then onwards much Sinhalese influence was felt in Sukhodaya.

1
During the reign of King Indrāditya and his son Rāma Khamhaeng, Theravāda Buddhism spread very rapidly in the kingdom of Sukhodaya. The Sinhalese influence was strongly felt and the Sinhalese monks and the Thai monks who had received higher ordination from them were held in high esteem. Lō Tai, the son and successor of Rāma Khamhaeng, was also a great patron of religion and during his reign we can trace Sinhalese Buddhist influences coming to Sukhodaya via Burma as well as directly from Ceylon.

The Jinakālamālī has recorded an interesting story of a monk who received higher ordination from a Sinhalese monk in Burma, and then proceeded to Sukhodaya where he introduced the Sinhalese form of higher ordination. According to this chronicle, during the reign of Kilana of Nabbiśipura (Chiangmai) a thera named Sumana, a native of Sukhodaya, went to Ayodhya where he learnt the doctrine of the Master and returned to Sukhodaya. In the meantime he had heard of the arrival in Pegu of a monk from Ceylon named Udumbarāmahasāmi and went there with a friend to study under him. Sumana not only studied under him but also received upasampada from him. Dhammarāja (Lō Tai) of Sukhodaya, who was interested in the religion, desirous of having a monk qualified to perform such Buddhist
ecclesiastical ceremonies, sent an envoy to the Mahāsāmi.
In compliance with this request, Udumbaramahāsāmi sent
Sumana, for whom the king prepared a monastery in his Mango
Grove, and with the help of the ruler Sumana spread the
Dhamma.¹

The story shows the high regard the Thai monks had
for their Sinhalese brethren who were well versed in the
Tripitaka. Udumbarasāmi's fame must have reached the Thai
kingdom, for Sumana to come to know about him. Furthermore,
Dhammarāja's request for a Buddhist monk to be sent to
Sukhodaya would seem to imply that he wanted the Thera
Sumana to return. Perhaps the Buddhist monks of Sukhodaya,
who could not afford to go and study under the Mahāsāmi
themselves, suggested that the ruler invite either the
Mahāsāmi or Sumana to come so that they could study under
him and receive from him the higher ordination which they
considered to be the most valid.

It is not easy to identify Udumbaramahāsāmi because
we have very little evidence about him. The story says that
he was a monk who came to Rāmaññadesa from Ceylon.² It does

¹ Jinakālamālī, pp.84-5.
² Tāḍā Uḍumbaro nāma mahāsāmi Laṅkādīpato Rāmāṇandesakam
    agato, Jinakālamālī, p.84.
not say whether he was born in Rāmaṇṇa or whether he was a Sinhalese monk who visited Lower Burma to propagate religion, though later we shall see that the latter was in fact the case. A Sinhalese sect of monks was well established in Burma, and such a movement of monks was not uncommon in those days. Nevertheless in the Burmese chronicles there is no mention of a Buddhist monk named Udumbaramahāsāmi, though the chroniclers have recorded the visit of other Buddhist monks to Burma. Nor do Ceylonese sources provide us with proof of a Udumbaramahāsāmi who visited Burma. ¹ Paranavitana has rightly pointed out that Udumbara was not the personal name of that particular monk, but that he could have been a member of the fraternity of Forest-dwellers which had for some centuries been established at Udumbaragiri (Dimbulagala), in Tamankaduva in Ceylon. ² We have already seen that Dimbulagala was a very important Buddhist centre from the twelfth century onwards. A visit of a monk from that monastery to Burma would show that it took an active part in spreading Theravāda Buddhism in foreign countries. If he belonged to that monastery, the

¹ Paranavitana, JCBRAS, Vol.XXXII, no.85, p.198.
Mahasami who went to Burma would have been known under its name. Thus Sumana came under the influence of Sinhalese Buddhism, which he would have introduced to Sukhodaya on his return.

From the inscriptions of the Sukhodaya rulers we have a fair knowledge of the Buddhism they practised at that time and the interest they took in the Sinhalese form of Buddhism. The object of the inscription at the Wat Maha Tat in Sukhodaya is to commemorate the rebuilding of the temple. The date is not given in any legible portion but in the light of the contents it has been dated between A.D. 1344 and 1346, which fall within Lo Tai's reign. This record mentions the names of Indraditya, Rama Khamhaeng and Indraditya's grandson Dharmaraja in such a way that it would appear that the last-named ruler was the author.

The inscription is important because it refers to a prince, a grandson of Pha Mu'ang, who became a monk and visited Ceylon from where he brought back two precious relics. The name of the monk is given as Mahathera.

---

1 Griswold, Towards A History of Sukhodaya Art, p.17.
3 Pha Mu'ang placed Indraditya on the throne of Sukhodaya.
Srīsradharājacūlāmuni Srīratanalankādīpa Mahāsāmi. The date of this monk's visit to Ceylon is not given, neither do we know whether he stayed in Ceylon for any length of time. It is possible that, like the Burmese monks, he went to Ceylon to study as well as to receive higher ordination there.

From the title Srīratanalankādīpa Mahāsāmi it appears that he belonged to the Sinhalese fraternity. Although we cannot give a definite date to his visit to Ceylon, he may have gone there during the reign of either Vijayabāhu V (A.D.1335-41) or Bhuvanaikabāhu IV (A.D.1341-51). The inscription gives a detailed account of the Mahāthera's conduct and learning and it appears that he was held in high repute. The ruler himself was impressed by him and had a very high regard for him. The relics brought back by the great Thera were received with veneration and the inscription has a lengthy description of the miracles performed by them at various places.

We can cite another inscription found at the top of the hill known as Khan Kap and now in the National Museum in

1 It was during the reign of Bhuvanaikabāhu IV that the great minister Senālankadhikāra convened an assembly of the executives of the Saṅgha of both Gramavāsī and Arannavāsī and conducted an inquisition to purify the Order. UHC, Vol.1, pt.2, pp.150-1. Thus the Sinhalese Order's reputation for purity continued during the Gampola period.

Bangkok. This record is a copy of an original inscription belonging to Lö Tai’s reign which has been lost. It gives an account of a person who visited some places in India and Ceylon in search of holy relics, and who has been identified as the same Mahāthera described in the first inscription. This confirms what is contained in the former inscription about the Mahāthera bringing relics from Ceylon.

The inscription from the Mahādhātu refers to Kesadhatu the Hair relics, and Gīvadhātu, the Collar-bone Relic, which may be the two relics brought by the Mahāthera. It also mentions the Dantadhatu, the Tooth Relic, and a ‘throng of other relics’, but we are not told where they came from. If the Mahāsami brought them from Ceylon none of the legible portions of the record say so. If the Dantadhatu came from Ceylon it may have been a replica, because there is no tradition in Ceylon that the original relic was taken to Sukhodaya and, as we have noticed, the Burmese rulers too had to be satisfied with such copies. The miracles performed by these relics are of a standard type, such as relics breaking out of their cetiyas and darting about in

---

1 Ibid., pp.148-9; Griswold, Towards A History of Sukhodaya Art, p.18, note 51.
the sky, emitting brilliant rays etc. After having seen all the miracles performed by the relics, the king made a vow to practise the religion of Lānkādīpa.

The inscription goes on to say that there were Sinhalese laymen living in five villages in Sukhodaya, and that they had been brought back from Ceylon by the Mahāthera in order to help him. They are mentioned as having close contact with the Araṇnaka monastery, which may have been a monastery for the monks of the Sinhalese fraternity.

All the evidence from these two inscriptions about Lō Tai's reign points to the fact that close religious contacts were maintained between Ceylon and Sukhodaya, whose princes and rulers set an example to the people by practising the religion.

Lō Tai, the son of Lō Tai, was also a great patron of religion. During his reign we have a number of inscriptions which contain evidence for religious contacts between Ceylon and Sukhodaya. Some of his inscriptions record the invitation of a monk from Ceylon to Sukhodaya and tell how he was received with honour and high esteem. The Khmer

inscription at Wat Jai in Sukhodaya says:

In Saka 1283 [A.D. 1361], the year of the Bull, His Majesty charged a royal pandit to proceed and invite one Mahāsāmi Saṅgharāja who resided in the island of Ceylon, who was an observant of the precepts, had studied the three Pitakas in full, and was a master of the subject-matter of the precepts like a Kṣīṇaśrava.¹

The inscription describes in detail the preparations made in Sukhodaya by the King and his ministers to receive this Mahāthera. As this is a contemporary account we may certainly expect it to be true in its description of the enthusiasm of the king and his subjects in welcoming him and the gratification and the reverence with which they received the Mahāsāmi. In the inscription there is reference to him as the Buddha.² Furthermore, this inscription and a Thai record say that in A.D. 1361 the King abdicated and joined the Order under the Saṅgharāja.³ This is confirmed by a Pāli inscription composed by the Mahāsāmi himself and further it says that Lū Tai received upasampada also.⁴

However, later the King resumed the responsibilities of state.¹

In none of these inscriptions is the name of the Sangharaja mentioned and in none of the Sinhalese or Pāli works is there any direct reference to this visit of the Sinhalese Mahāthera to Thailand. According to Paranavitana, the language of the inscription composed by the Sangharaja is similar in style to that of such works as the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa and the Samantakūtavannana, which were composed in Ceylon during the thirteenth and the fourteenth centuries, and therefore the Sangharaja mentioned in these inscriptions would undoubtedly have studied in Ceylon during this period. Like the authors of the above mentioned literary works the inscription is influenced by the Sanskrit Kavya style and the prose is alliterative.²

There are several references in Pāli works which would help us in identifying this Sangharaja. The colophon of the Lokappādīpakasāra, mentions that its author Medhaṅkara was in Burma and in Thailand. In Burme he resided in Martaban in a monastery named Sonnamayamahāvihāra which

¹ Griswold, Towards A History of Sukhodaya Art, p.37.
² Paranavitana, JCBRAS, Vol.XXXII, pp.201-2; Paranavitana 'Laṅkāve sīṭa Siyamaṭā vadiya Saṅgharājayo', Vidyodaya (1940), pp.33-49.
was built by the mother of Setukunjarādhipati. At the end of the colophon Medhaṅkara is described as the guru (teacher) of King Lidayya. Lidayya mentioned here could be identified as the king of Sukhodaya of that name who was also known as Dhammarāja (Lu Tai). We have no evidence of a ruler of this name in any other country than in Siam. Therefore since Lidayya of Sukhodaya invited a Buddhist monk from Ceylon and made him his teacher there is no serious objection to identifying this monk with Medhaṅkara, the author of the Lokappadīpakasāra.

We get further evidence from the Sasanavamsa which helps us to identify this Mahāthera who was invited by the ruler of Sukhodaya. This chronicle has an account of the same Medhaṅkara, the author of the Lokappadīpakasāra as follows:


2 Lokappadīpakasārappakaranam Mahāsaṅgharaṇṇa Lidaya rājassaguruna racitam samattham.

And after that when the Elder named Medhamkara, the teacher of king Setibhinda's mother in the town of Muttima (Martaban), had gone to the island of Sīhala, and had again received his training before the great Elders living in the forest in the island of Sīhala and had thoroughly studied the sacred texts and had stayed at the monastery that King Setibhinda's mother had built with gold and silver, with its top covered with lead, he helped the religion. He also composed the book called the Lokadīpakasāra.¹

Setubhinda was a title used by the Pegu rulers of Burma and the king mentioned in both the Lokappadīpakasāra and the Sasanavamsa has been identified with Binya U who ruled the kingdom of Pegu between A.D. 1353 and 1385. He also assumed the title Hsin-hpyu-shin (Possessor of a white elephant), and Martaban was his capital.² The name given in the Lokappadīpakasāra agrees in meaning with the title Hsin-hpyu-shin.

According to the Sasanavamsa Medhahkara was living in Martaban when he wrote the Lokappadīpakasāra. Therefore he would have completed the work before he became the teacher of the Sukhodaya king. The colophon of this work leads us to the same conclusion. The author does not say that he was the teacher of Lidayya in the main part of the colophon. It looks as if the last sentence of the book,

¹ Sv. tr. Law, p.47.
² Bode, The Pali Literature of Burma, p.35, note.2.
where he says that he was the teacher of Lidayya, was added later after he arrived in Sukhodaya. According to Paranavitana, after Saṅgharāja Medhaṅkara came to Sukhodaya his book would have been widely used, and when copies of it were made, the last sentence was added, as he was then the guru of the ruler of Sukhodaya.

Thus when we take all the evidence together it appears that the Sinhalese Saṅgharāja invited by Lū Tai of Sukhodaya was Medhaṅkara who was then in Martaban in Burma.

However, in arriving at this conclusion we have to face another problem. The Sasanavamsa says that Medhaṅkara was a monk who went to Ceylon from Burma. But the inscription of Wat Jai says that the Saṅgharāja who was invited to Sukhodaya was a Ceylonese monk. The Lokappadīpakaśāra would also support the inscription. Therefore, why did the Sasanavamsa say that Medhaṅkara was a monk born in Burma? With regard to this problem we agree with Paranavitana who says that when the Sasanavamsa was written about 500 years later (A.D.1861) the real facts

---

1 Paranavitana, Vidyodaya (1940), pp.33-49.
2 Ibid.
about this Medhaṅkara would have been changed to give credit to the country in which it was composed and therefore Medhaṅkara would have appeared as a Burmese monk who visited Ceylon.\(^1\) Hence we need not consider the Sasanavamsa account as a serious objection to identifying the Saṅgharāja who came to Sukhodaya during the reign of Lū Tai as Medhaṅkara, the author of the Lokappadīpakaśāra, who was then living in Burma, but who was actually a Sinhalese in origin.

Furthermore it is possible to identify Udumbaramahāsāmi referred to above as Medhaṅkara, the author of Lokappadīpakaśāra. The Lokappadīpakaśāra says that its author Medhaṅkara belonged to the Aranṇavāsī or the Forest-dwelling sect. In Ceylon there were two well-known centres of these monks, one in Palābatgala and the other in Dimbulāgala. The monks of the Palābatgala centre used the name Dhammakitti and those of Dimbulāgala used the name Medhaṅkara.\(^2\) Udumbaragiri was the Pāli name used for Dimbulāgala and therefore if Medhaṅkara, the author of the Lokappadīpakaśāra and the teacher of Lū Tai, belonged to the Forest-dwelling sect of Dimbulāgala, he would also have been known by the name of the monastery,

\(^1\) Paranavitana, Vidyodaya (1940), pp.33-49.
\(^2\) Ibid.
Udumbaragirimahasāmi. Thus the monk of that name mentioned in the Jinaṃkālamālī and referred to above may be the same as the author of the Lokappadīpakasāra. Therefore Sumana studied under the same Buddhist monk who later became the teacher of Lū Tai and this shows that though he was a Sinhalese monk he came to Sukhodaya from the Rāmaṇṇa country.

All the evidence shows that at this time Theravāda Buddhism was well established in the Sukhodaya kingdom, where Sinhalese influence was strong. From the inscriptions it appears that the culmination of the work started by Indráditya was reached during the reign of Lū Tai, who, as we have seen, himself became a Buddhist monk for some time. Furthermore the Traibhūmikathā, an Abhidhamma work written by Lū Tai, shows that the Pāli literature used in Ceylon was also current in Sukhodaya. In the preface to the Traibhūmikathā the author has given the sources which he consulted in writing his treatise. He says:

"On what authorities did he draw for (the composition of) this Traibhūmikathā? He drew some (material) from the four commentaries,

\[1\] Ibid.

\[2\] Dhaninivat, Encyclopaedia of Buddhism, Volume of Specimen Articles, p.73.
Some from the Commentary and Tika of the Abhidharmavatāra, some from the Abhidharmasaṅgaha, some from the Sumanāgalavilāsinī, some from the Papančasudāni, some from the Saratthapakāsinī, some from the Manorathapurāṇī, some from the Sinorathapakāsinī, some from the commentary and the Tika of the Vinaya, some from the Dhammapada, some from the Mahākathā, some from the Madhuratthapuranīvīlasinī, some from Dharma-Jataka, some from the Jinaśākara, some from the Saratthadīpanī, some from the Buddhavamsa, some from the Saratthasaṅgaha, some from the Milindapaṇha. Thus he had drawn little of each from all these treatises and combined the information into a whole to which he gave the name of Traibhūmikātha.

Most of the texts mentioned in this preface were Pali Buddhist works written in Ceylon and were widely used by the Buddhist monks there. Their use in Sukhodaya was probably a result of direct contact between the two countries.

From the inscriptions of Lu Tai we get further reference to religious contacts between Ceylon and Sukhodaya. One of these inscriptions, dated Śaka 1279 (1357) and found at Wat Śrī Jum, states that a shoot from the sacred Bo-tree in Ceylon was brought and planted in that temple. Further the object of the record is also to commemorate the

---

1 Quoted by Dhaninivat, op.cit., p.72.
installation at Wat Śrī Jum of a relic brought from Ceylon. From the date given in the previous inscription, where we have a reference to the invitation of the Mahāthera, it appears that these relics and the sprout of the Bo-tree were brought before the monk was invited. However, we do not know whether these relics were brought directly from Ceylon during Lü Tai’s reign or whether some of the relics were brought during that of his father Lō Tai. From the inscription which says ‘this Great Relic is not a common relic but is indeed a real and authentic relic (of the Buddha) which has been initially brought back from Lankādīpa’, it appears that the latter was the case. The Mahāthera who visited Ceylon during the reign of Lō Tai brought some relics from Ceylon and Lü Tai would have installed one of them in Wat Śrī Jum. Furthermore the inscription says that the King had impressions made of the footprint of the Buddha on the top of Sumanakūṭā in Ceylon and reproduced these footprints in Sukhodaya and Sajjanālaya.¹

Furthermore, this inscription is particularly interesting in that it shows the influence of Buddhist ideas which originated in Ceylon. In it the king assumes the role of

¹ Ibid.
prophet and tells how the Buddhist Faith will finally disappear, giving the dates, very much in the same manner as similar forecasts in the writings of Ceylon. Also it adds that all the Buddhist relics which were scattered in other countries would fly to the relic chamber of Ratanamali stupa at Anuradhapura when the light of Buddhism was about to be extinguished. Finally these would reach the Bodhi-tree under which the Buddha received enlightenment, and after assuming the form of the living Buddha, would go up in flames. From this it can be seen that in Thailand the sacred shrines of Ceylon were considered important and holy.

Thus the sources provide evidence that Sinhalese influence was strongly felt in the kingdom of Sukhodaya and that there were close cultural ties between the two countries. The simple Faith we can see in the earlier inscriptions gradually changed into a more and more elaborate one. Even the rulers, probably as a result of the contact with learned Ceylonese monks, became interested in the philosophical aspects of Buddhism, as is attested by Lü Tai's

1 Paranavitana, JCBRAS, Vol.XXXII, p.203.
2 Ibid.
Traibhūmikathā, which, according to the preface, he wrote to explain Abhidhamma to his mother.¹

Theravāda Buddhism and Sinhalese influence did not penetrate beyond Lamphun in Northern Thailand until the thirteenth century A.D. However it was well known in Lamphun through the Mons, who had come under the influence of Theravāda Buddhism which was spreading throughout Burma under the Pagan rulers.² Though there were Thai settlements far from Lamphun amidst the primitive tribes, we know absolutely nothing about their religion. They have left us no inscription or other monument before the thirteenth century.³ The foundation of the kingdom of Chiangmai after the unification of Lamphun and the northern Thai settlements by Mengrai in A.D. 1292 was the beginning of the real history of Buddhism in Northern Thailand. It was in Lamphun that King Mengrai and his followers first came to know about the Theravāda, which was served by an organised brotherhood of monks and equipped with a solid tradition of art and letters.⁴

---

¹ Dhaninivat, op. cit., p. 72.
² Griswold, JSS, Vol. XLI, p. 102.
³ Ibid.
⁴ Ibid.
From then on it was welcomed by rulers and people alike, and Buddhist monuments and sculptures bear witness to the progress it made throughout Northern Thailand.

Buddhism and Buddhist art received a new impetus in the middle of the fourteenth century when King Gu Na (Kilana, A.D. 1355-85) was ruling in Chiangmai. An inscription issued by this ruler and the Jinakālamālī, both contain an account of a Buddhist monk from Sukhodaya who visited Chiangmai at the invitation of Gu Na. This Thai inscription, the oldest that has been found anywhere in Northern Thailand, says that King Gu Na, who had heard glowing accounts of the Forest-dwelling monks who were active in the kingdom of Sukhodaya, invited one of these named Sumana. There is no doubt that this monk is the same as the Sumana mentioned above, since the Jinakālamālī, as we shall see, clearly identifies them. We have already seen how this monk received higher ordination in Burma from a monk belonging to the Sinhalese sect. Sumana hesitated for some time but finally accepted the King's invitation and came to Chiangmai with a sacred relic which he possessed. The king, who was in Lumphun, received him with deep respect and lodged him

---

in a monastery which he had specially prepared for him.
Not long after his arrival Sumana suggested to the king
that he should have large Buddha images cast in bronze for
religious purposes. The king gave every support to the
monk to propagate Buddhism.

The same story is narrated in the *Jinakālamālī* with
slight modifications. According to this chronicle, the
King Kilana (Gū Na), desirous of having a Buddhist monk
who was qualified to perform all the Buddhist ecclesiastical
ceremonies, dispatched an envoy to Udumbarasāmi in Rāmaṇa,
who sent Ānanda Thera in compliance with the request. But
the *Jinakālamālī* says that he was not willing to perform
the ceremonies as his teacher had not sanctioned him to do
so. He suggested that the king should invite Sumana Thera,
who was then in Sukhodaya. But the latter was at first
reluctant to come to Chiangmai and the envoys brought with
them another monk named Saddhatissa. But unfortunately
Ānanda Thera did not want to perform *Vinayakamma* in
association with Saddhatissa and the ruler of Chiangmai had
to send envoys once again to Sukhodaya inviting Sumana.
Finally he arrived, and brought with him some sacred relics.¹

¹ *Jinakālamālī*, pp.85-6.
The main theme of the narrative in the Jinakalamali is similar to the account given in the inscription. But curiosity is aroused by the statement that the monk Ānanda, who was sent by Udumbaramahāsāmi himself, did not want to perform the Saṅghakamma without the sanction of his master. Here the reader is puzzled, since he has read that Kilana had sent envoys to the Mahāthera especially to request a monk who could perform all the ecclesiastical ceremonies. If in fact the Mahāthera sent Ānanda in compliance with Kilana’s appeal, it is not clear why he sent him without sanctioning him to perform such Vinayakammās. It may be that the monks of Chiangmai questioned his authority to perform such functions.

Perhaps the king had invited the Mahāthera himself and the monks were not satisfied with Ānanda and would not co-operate with him. They might therefore have suggested that the king invite a second important monk who was well known and active in Sukhodaya. The reluctance of Sumana to visit Chiangmai is natural, because the Forest-dwelling monks were treated very well and much honoured in Sukhodaya, and he would naturally have preferred to stay there. Perhaps the monks of Sukhodaya did not want him to leave them.

---

1 Griswold, JSS, Vol. XLI, p.104.
The arrival of Sumana in Chiangmai had far-reaching results. When he received his higher ordination from a monk belonging to the Sinhalese sect, he too became a member of that fraternity. His visit was the first official introduction of Sinhalese Buddhism to Northern Thailand. That his mission was a great success is proved by the enormous quantity of Buddhist sculpture and Buddhist monuments scattered all over the region. Thus Sinhalese Buddhism became well-known in Chiangmai and the Order of Forest-dwelling monks was established there. The activities started by Sumana reached their culmination when a group of monks went to Ceylon in the fifteenth century and brought back the higher ordination afresh to Chiangmai, an act which had far-reaching results.

The spread of Sinhalese Buddhist influence in Northern Thailand is manifested in the story of the Sinhalese Buddha image narrated in the Sihiṅga-Buddharūpanidāna and in the Jinakālamālī. This image which had been brought to Sukhodaya from Ceylon was highly venerated by the Sukhodaya rulers and its fame reached every corner of Siam, so that a number of princes in various kingdoms in Thailand went to war in order to possess it. According to these chronicles, the Sinhalese Buddha image fell into the hands of Paramarāja
of Ayodhya when he invaded Sukhodaya. He removed it to Ayodhya, but he was deceived by the mother of the ruler of Kamphaeng Phet (Vajirapakara), who succeeded by a trick to send it to her son. The ruler of Chiangrai, having heard the story of this miraculous image from a Buddhist monk, secured it and brought it to his brother Gū Na's kingdom in Chiangmai. Then it was taken to Chiangrai, where a replica was made, and finally the original image found a resting place in a monastery at Chiangmai.  

These accounts of the Sinhalese Buddha image were written several centuries after its arrival in Siam. But the traditions about it would have been handed down from generation to generation until they were put into writing. Hence there would have been confusion, additions and deletions, and we are not sure how far the legends have preserved the genuine traditions. In these accounts the chronology is completely forgotten. Perhaps by the time the traditions reached the authors of the texts they had no chronology at all. As some of the kingdoms mentioned in the account were small and insignificant, we have very

1 Jinakālamālī, pp.89 ff.; Sihiṅga-Buddharūpanidāna, tr. Notton, pp.31 ff.
2 JSS, Vol. XLI, pp.130-31, note 5.
little information about their history. Therefore we are not in a position to check or elucidate the account given in the Jinakālamālī and the Sihīṅga-Buddharūpanidāna. Griswold has rightly pointed out the possibility that duplicates and even triplicates of the image were made in order to prevent the original falling into other hands.¹ Therefore the images possessed by some of the princes would not have been the original but replicas. In the account it is mentioned at least once that a copy was made. Hence the stories of such copies too would have been incorporated in the narrative as it would not have been known whether the legend referred to the original or a counterpart of it.² Therefore what appears to relate to a single image may really refer to a series of replicas or substitutes.

However, the account is important because it symbolically represents the spread of Sinhalese influence in various parts of Thailand. Further it indicates the interest the rulers of those small kingdoms took in Sinhalese Buddhism and in sacred relics brought from Ceylon. Thus Sinhalese Buddhist influence was felt in most of the regions of Thailand.

---

1 Ibid.
2 Ibid.
Though the religion spread far and wide, the boundaries of Sukhodaya gradually diminished. After Lü Tai's reign Ayodhya emerged at the expense of Sukhodaya and finally the latter came under the dominance of the former. However, religious contacts with Ceylon continued to be maintained and Buddhist monks still continued to visit Ceylon to quench their thirst for knowledge. On their return, they contributed much to the promotion of the sasana and learning. The colophon of the Saddhammasaṅgaha says that its author was a pupil of a Sinhalese monk. According to this work there lived in Ceylon a very learned monk by the name of Dhammakitti who was famous for his knowledge of the Pitaka and grammatical works. Dhammakitti Mahāsāmi was his pupil. The latter came to Ceylon, and after obtaining higher ordination, returned to Ayodhya, where he resided at the great monastery, Lāṅkārāma built by King Paramarāja. It was while he was residing here that he composed the Saddhammasaṅgaha.1

In this colophon two theras named Dhammakitti are mentioned. The author of the work was known as Dhammakitti

and his teacher was also of that name. The identification of the author's teacher is not easy because there were a number of Dhammakitti Therās during the fourteenth century A.D. This teacher Dhammakitti has been identified as one of the two Dhammakittis, both of whom held the office of Saṅgharāja and flourished one after the other.¹

Bhuvanaikabāhu IV ascended the throne of Gaṅgasiripura (Gampola) in A.D. 1341 and ruled until 1351. At this time a monk named Dhammakitti was the Saṅgharāja. He had a pupil of the same name who also held the office of Saṅgharāja in the reign of Bhuvanaikabāhu V (A.D. 1372-1408). The Nikāyasamgrahaya, the Bālavatāra Sanne and the Saddhammāḷāṅkāra are the work of this second Saṅgharāja Dhammakitti. During the Gampola period the line of Dhammakittis was well-known and therefore the account given in the Saddhammasaṅgaha could well fit one of these theras who held the office of Saṅgharāja.

In the colophon of the Saddhammasaṅgaha it is said that he returned to the city of Ayodhya. This has been identified by Malalasekera² with Ayodhya in India, but we agree with

¹ Malalasekera, The Pali Literature of Ceylon, p.245; Paranavitana, JCBRAS, Vol.XXXII, p.204.
² Malalasekera, The Pali Literature of Ceylon, p.245.
Coedès, who identified it as Ayodhya in Thailand, since the Ayodhya in India was not well known during the fourteenth century and had hardly any significance as a Buddhist centre at that time. Thus the Paramarāja mentioned in this Pāli work, who built the Lāṅkārāma for Dhammakitti, should be taken as a ruler of Ayodhya in Thailand. There were two rulers named Paramarāja (Boromarāja). One ruled from A.D. 1370–88 and the other from A.D. 1424–48. The Dhammakitti who was the Saṅgharāja during the reign of Bhuvanaikabāhu IV belongs to a period well before even the first Paramarāja and therefore the Dhammakitti mentioned in the Saddhammasaṅgaha as the teacher of its author could be the Saṅgharāja of Ceylon during the reign of Bhuvanaikabāhu V. Now it is easy to identify the Paramarāja of Ayodhya because only the first Paramarāja was a contemporary of the Dhammakitti who lived during the reign of Bhuvanaikabāhu V (A.D.1372–1408). Thus we can conclude that the author of the Saddhammasaṅgaha studied under this second Dhammakitti before he returned to Ayodhya.  

The account shows that Dhammakitti received higher ordination in Ceylon, which leads us to believe that at

1 Coedès, BEFEQ, Vol.XV, p.43.
2 Paranavitana, JCBRAS, Vol.XXXII, p.204.
the end of the fourteenth century the Thai monks still considered Ceylon to be a great centre of Theravāda Buddhism. The name Laṅkārāma suggests that this was named after the monasteries of that name in Ceylon and undoubtedly this would have served as one of the centres of the monks of the Sinhalese fraternity in Ayodhya. Furthermore from the encouragement given by the ruler, it appears that the kings of Ayodhya were supporters of this sect.

The Sinhalese form of upasampāda was introduced into Thailand in the fifteenth century by a team of Thai monks who returned from Ceylon after having received higher ordination from the Sinhalese monks. The Jinakālamālī and the Sasanavamsa have accounts of this mission and they are supported by the epigraphical evidence.

According to the Jinakālamālī, in the year 1967 of the Buddhist Era (A.D.1423) 25 theras from Chiangmai and 8 theras from Cambodia decided to visit Ceylon to receive higher ordination and to study the Buddhist scriptures. There they met Vanaratana Mahāthera and started learning the scriptures prevailing in Ceylon and the correct manner of reciting and chanting these texts. Then because of their desire to become members of the Sinhalese fraternity of monks, they requested the higher ordination from the
Sinhalese theras. In 1968 of the Buddhist Era (1424) a ceremony of higher ordination was held on a raft which the Sinhalese king had had moored on the Kālyāṇī river. The upasampadā was received by 25 Thai, 8 Cambodian and 6 Burmese monks from a chapter of 20 Sinhalese mahātheras headed by Vanaratana who himself acted as the Kammavācācarīya.

After the ordination was over the South-east Asian monks visited various sacred places in Ceylon and worshipped the Tooth Relic and the footprint of the Buddha on the Sumanakūṭa. Thus, having acquired much knowledge and merit, they started their journey home with precious relics, accompanied by two senior Sinhalese monks named Vikramabāhu and Uttamapāṇṇā, who had spent 15 and 10 years respectively after receiving the higher ordination. Such senior monks were needed to act as upajjhāya and Kammavācācarīya when they performed the higher ordination on their return.

The account says that on their way they met two monks who were ordained in the middle of the ocean. Here the account is not clear. Most probably the returning team met two other monks on their way to Ceylon, whom they ordained then and there. On their arrival in Thailand the theras held the first higher ordination ceremony at Ayodhya. Mahāthera Silavisuddhi, the tutor of the chief
queen of Boromarāja II (A.D. 1424-48), the ruler of Ayodhya, and another therā named Saddhammakovida received upasampadā. From then on the team travelled far and wide and performed ecclesiastical ceremonies in various cities, and thousands of monks were admitted to the Order. In 1974 of the Buddhist Era (A.D. 1430) these mahātheras headed by Mahādhammagambhīra and Mahāmedhaṅkara arrived in Chiangmai, where the Rattavana mahāvihāra became their centre of activity. Vinaya rites were performed in various places in Northern Thailand and the Sinhalese fraternity became well known there.¹

The Sāsanavamsa also records the introduction of the higher ordination in Thailand. When giving an account of the history of Buddhism in Yonarattha and Maharattha,² the chronicler says that Mahādhammagambhīra and Mahāmedhaṅkara visited Ceylon and on their return established the religion in the Yonaka and Syāma countries.³ Thus the two theras mentioned in the Jinakālamāli as the leaders of the monks who visited Ceylon are referred to in the Sāsanavamsa also.

¹ Jinakālamāli (P.T.S.), pp.91-95.
² Yonakarattha is identified by the chronicler as Kamboja, Haribhuṛja and Ayodhya. Maharattha as a place near Thailand. Sv, tr. Law, pp.54 and 169.
³ Sv, tr. Law, pp.56 and 170.
These Thai, Cambodian and Burmese monks visited Ceylon during the reign of Parākramabāhu VI (A.D.1412-67). During his reign there were a number of well-known mahātheras there who took an active part in religious affairs. They had a high reputation for their religious life, as well as for their scholarship and intellectual attainments. The Mahāthera Vanaratana mentioned in the Jinakālamālī was the famous Saṅgharāja, the head of Kāragala pirivena, whose praises are sung in the Sinhalese poem Hamsa-sandesaya.

An inscription belonging to the reign of Mahādhammarāja IV (A.D.1419-38) supports the account in the chronicles. According to this inscription, dated in A.D.1426, two footprints of the Buddha were carved on the same stone at Sukhodaya at the request of the Mahāthera Medhāṅkara. The record says that in both dimensions and form the two feet exactly resemble the footprint of the Buddha found on the summit of the Sumanakūṭa. The Medhāṅkara mentioned in the inscription must be one of the leaders of the monks

who visited Ceylon. The Jinakālamālī says that these monks spent their sixth vassa since their ordination and return from Ceylon in the city of Sukhodaya (A.D.1429). The inscription is dated about two years after the monks returned, therefore Medhāṅkara must have visited Sukhodaya before they went together to spend their sixth vassa there.

Through their activities in Northern Thailand these monks admitted many recruits to this new fraternity of Sinhalese monks. The rulers of Northern Thailand contributed much towards its promotion. At the instigation of the monks of the Sinhalese fraternity, in A.D.1455 King Tilokarāja (A.D.1441–87) had planted at a monastery in Chiangmai a Bo-tree which had been brought from the sacred Bo-tree at Anurādhapura by the monks when they returned from Ceylon. As a result this monastery received the name Mahābodhārāma. In A.D.1478 the same ruler deposited a sacred relic brought from Ceylon by Mahādhammagambhīra in a shrine called the Rājakūṭa in Chiangmai.

---

4. Ibid.
From the foregoing discussion it would appear that Sinhalese Buddhist influence had been felt in Thailand as early as the Dvāravatī period. At the time when the Thais arrived in their present habitat, indirect Sinhalese influence had already reached Thailand from three directions - Burma, Nakhon Sritammarat and Dvāravatī - and from the thirteenth century onwards they came into direct contact with Sinhalese Buddhism when there were movements of Buddhist missions between the two countries culminating in the introduction of the Sinhalese form of higher ordination by a team of monks in the fifteenth century A.D.

Sources are lacking for a study of religious contacts between Ceylon and Cambodia. Although there is some scanty evidence from Cambodia about the spread of Theravāda Buddhism from the thirteenth century onwards, the sources are not very helpful in enlightening us as to how this Faith arrived in a country which had formerly patronised Hinduism and Mahāyānism. Hence it cannot be stated whence, how and by whom Theravāda Buddhism was introduced into Cambodia and only tentative suggestions can be made.

We first hear of religious contacts between Ceylon and Cambodia during the reign of Parākramabāhu I of Ceylon. Among the four monks who accompanied Chappaṭa to Burma at
the end of the thirteenth century, there was one from Cambodia named Tamalinda, who is said to have been the son of the Cambodian ruler. Coedes identified this monk as a son of Jayavarman VII (A.D. 1181-1219).

The establishment of the Sinhalese fraternity in Burma took place in A.D. 1181 and therefore if Tamalinda was indeed a son of Jayavarman VII, he would have come to Ceylon before his father became the ruler of Cambodia. The Burmese sources are not clear as to whether Tamalinda went to Ceylon with Chappaṭa and his companions or whether he was already in Ceylon when the Burmese monks arrived there.

Jayavarman VII was a Mahāyāna Buddhist and we are not certain how his son became interested in Theravāda. In fact the rulers of Cambodia patronised Mahāyānism from the reign of Dharanindravarman II, the father of Jayavarman VII. Theravāda Buddhism was known in the Dvāravatī kingdom which partly came under the Khmers, and from the eleventh century onwards Burma became a strong centre of that religion.

---

1 For this mission see supra, p.243.
2 Coedes, The Indianized States, p.178.
3 Coedes, The Indianized States, p.173.
Direct contact between Burma and Cambodia is attested by the appointment of a Brahmin scholar from Burma as the chief priest (purohita) of Jayavarman VII. Buddhist monks also would have visited Cambodia during this time and Tamalinda probably learnt of Ceylon as an important centre of Buddhism from them. On the other hand, we have already seen that there were close political contacts between Ceylon and Cambodia during the reign of Parakramabahu I (A.D.1153-86) and it may have been through such contacts that the Khmer prince came to hear about the Buddhist activities in Ceylon and went there to study the Buddhist scriptures.

However, Tamalinda's visit had no effect on Cambodia because Burmese sources leave us to believe that he never returned to his own country. He spent his entire life in Pagan promoting religion there and died in Burma. If he had returned he might have received his father's support.

From then until the receiving of higher ordination by eight Cambodian monks in A.D.1426 we do not get any evidence of Ceylon having religious contacts with Cambodia. However it is quite obvious that from the thirteenth century onwards

---

2 See supra, p. 247.
Theravāda Buddhism gradually gained support in Cambodia. The rulers, who had formerly been Hindus and Mahāyāna Buddhists, turned to Theravāda, and this resulted in its spread.

Theravāda Buddhism must have been known in Jayavarman's reign (A.D.1243-95) because Chou Ta-kuan, a Chinese envoy who visited Cambodia immediately after his reign in A.D.1296, leads us to believe that it was well established there. Chou Ta-kuan was assigned to duty with a Chinese embassy which spent nearly a year in Cambodia. Returning to China he wrote an account of the conditions of that kingdom at the time of his visit.¹ When describing various religions practised by the Khmers, Chou Ta-kuan mentions three religious groups and his description of Buddhist monks is as follows:

The Buddhist monks (ch' u-ku) shave the head, wear yellow robes, bare the right shoulder, knot a strip of yellow cloth round the waist and go bare-foot. Their temples, which are often roofed with tile, contain only one statue, closely resembling the Buddha Sākyamuni, which is called Po-lai (Prah).... The food of the bonzes is universally fish or meat, which is also set as an offering before the Buddhas; but no wine may be drunk. They content themselves with one meal

¹ Chou Ta-kuan, Notes on the Customs of Cambodia, tr. J. Gilman D'Arcy Paul (Bangkok, 1967).
a day, which is partaken of at the home of a patron, no cooking being done in the monasteries. The numerous holy books that they scan are made of strips of palm-leaf, neatly bound together. These strips are covered with black characters, but as no brush or ink is used, their manner of writing is a mystery. To certain monks is given the right to use palanquins with golden shafts and parasols with gold or silver handles. These men are consulted by the King in matters of serious import. There are no Buddhist nuns.1

From this account it appears that the worship of Buddha was known everywhere2 and he goes on to say that each village had its temple, or at least a stupa.3 The description of the monks as wearing yellow robes with bare right shoulders shows that they were Theravādins and hence it appears that that religion was widely accepted in Cambodia among the commoners.

From Indravarman III's reign on we see that the language of Theravāda is used in place of Sanskrit in the inscriptions of the Khmer rulers. The oldest Pāli inscription in Cambodia has reference to this king. According to this inscription, dated A.D.1309, Indravarman abdicated the throne in A.D.1307. Further it says that one year after

---
1 Ibid., p.24.
2 Ibid., p.25.
3 Ibid., p.38.
the king abdicated he granted a village to a mahāthera
and that the next year a upāsikā (lay-woman) erected
there a statue of the Buddha by order of the king and
made donations to it. The king assigned four villages
for the maintenance of the monastery. Coédès suggestion
is that, as the king was still young, he abdicated and
retired to the monastery. Thus this Khmer ruler, like
some Thai rulers, seems to have devoted himself to studying
the scriptures and practising Theravāda Buddhism. In this
connection Chou Ta-kuan's observation that 'for the most
part, his objective was a little golden pagoda in front of
which stood a golden statue' can be given as evidence of
the king's devotion to Theravāda Buddhism.

Jayavarman Parameśvara (A.D.1327-53) was a patron of
Buddhism and during his reign Theravāda Buddhist influence
even spread as far as Laos. Fa Ngum, a prince from Lan
Chang was brought up in the Cambodian court where a Buddhist
monk was his teacher. The Cambodian ruler gave his daughter

3 Chou Ta–kuan, op.cit., p.41.
in marriage to Fa Ngum and helped him to regain the throne which had been lost by his father. Finally Paramesvara advised his son-in-law to follow the precepts of the Buddha. Shortly after Fa Ngum's accession in A.D.1353 he sent a mission to Cambodia headed by his tutor monk and they brought back to Lan Chang some Buddhist scriptures and Buddha images.¹ This incident shows that by the middle of the fourteenth century Theravāda Buddhism was well established in Cambodia from which it was passed on to other neighbouring countries.²

Thus the evidence shows that Theravāda Buddhism was well known in Cambodia from the thirteenth century on, but it is difficult to decide how the Faith reached there. The association of Cambodians with the lower Menam valley would have given them an opportunity to learn about Theravāda, as inscriptions found in this region show that it was under Khmer supremacy.³ One inscription dated A.D. 1022 tells us that in Lavo (Lopburi) at the beginning of

the eleventh century there were monks belonging to both the Mahāyāna and Theravāda sects. Furthermore the Buddhist monuments and images of that region show that even under Khmer domination Buddhism preserved the importance it had had there since Dvāravatī times. When the Thais overran the Lower Menam valley in the thirteenth century, it is probable that some Cambodians who were there fled to Angkor, and helped to spread this new Faith in Cambodia. The expansion of the Sukhodaya kingdom under Rāma Khamhaeng in the thirteenth century towards the Khmer dominated Menam valley would also have accounted for the spread of Theravāda Buddhism as far as the borders of the Cambodian kingdom.

The sudden change in the religious beliefs of the people and the rulers of Cambodia in the thirteenth century was undoubtedly due to the religious activities that were taking place in the adjoining kingdoms. Burma had become a strong centre of Theravāda Buddhism under Sinhalese influence and so had Thailand including Nakhon Srit'hammad. Northern Thailand also shared this Faith and much religious

---

1 Ibid., pp.10-12.
2 Coedes, The Indianized States, p.137.
activity was taking place there too; so we might conclude that the Theravāda Buddhist influence reached Cambodia from all these regions.

Being simple and democratic in form as well as in outlook, Theravāda Buddhism would have appealed to the Khmers who had for centuries known only ritualistic religions. They would have been impressed with the simplicity of the Buddhist monks who embraced poverty and occupied themselves with teaching and other good social work. Now the people had the opportunity of establishing direct contact with these monks, and it would have been the Khmer people themselves who turned to this new Faith first, followed by the rulers. Chou Ta-kuan's account shows that most of the people were believers in Theravāda by the end of the thirteenth century.

As the Sinhalese form of Buddhism was known in Burma and Thailand, the spread of Theravāda Buddhism to Cambodia meant that the Sinhalese influence was at work there too. It is likely that Buddhist monks belonging to the Sinhalese fraternity reached Cambodia. The Jinakālamālī supports such a suggestion when it describes the visit of Thai and Cambodian monks to Ceylon. According to this chronicle
they wanted to visit Ceylon because of her importance as a centre of Theravāda Buddhism. The Jinakālamālī says:

The Blessed Buddha, whilst he was alive, thrice visited the island of Laṅkā, knowing that His religion would flourish in that island. We, too, shall go to the island of Laṅkā and, acquiring a complete knowledge of the religion, shall establish the same in our country.¹

Thus in Cambodia also there developed a tradition that Ceylon was a great centre of Theravāda Buddhism. This must have been brought about by the Sinhalese Buddhist influence which had infiltrated into Cambodia.

Evidence for direct religious contacts between Ceylon and Cambodia comes from the Jinakālamālī. We have already seen that according to this chronicle, eight Cambodian monks visited Ceylon with a team of Thai monks to study the Buddhist scriptures and receive the higher ordination from the Sinhalese theras.² Although the chronicler leads us to believe that the Cambodian monks returned with the Thais we are not told whether or not they went back to Cambodia. However, since they were eager to introduce upasampada to their country it is probable that they did so. Unfortunately there are no sources giving any idea

¹ Jinakālamālī, pp.92-3.
² Ibid., pp.92 ff.
of their religious activities and the progress they made on their return. Since Theravāda Sinhalese Buddhism was well-known and regarded with much esteem they would undoubtedly have received a warm welcome. Thus in the fifteenth century Sinhalese Buddhism was introduced directly from Ceylon to Cambodia.

To summarize the results of the foregoing discussion, religious contacts between Ceylon and Cambodia are not well documented and we have very little evidence of such relations. Tamalinda's visit to Ceylon and the introduction of the Sinhalese form of higher ordination into Cambodia in the fifteenth century are the only proof we have of direct contact between these two countries; however, we are to a certain extent justified in assuming that as early as the thirteenth century, Sinhalese Buddhist influence reached Cambodia through Burma and Thailand.
Architectural Cross-currents

The political, commercial and religious contacts between Ceylon and the countries of South-east Asia resulted in mutual influence in art and culture. We have already seen that these relations were friendly and cordial for the most part, and such mutual contact normally produces very interesting results. According to Bartlett, friendly external relations are always beneficial for the development of any culture. He says:

Supposing two groups come into contact one with the other, and friendly relationships ensue neither side being markedly superior. This is the case in which true blending of cultures is most likely of all to follow... elements of either culture will be assimilated by the other ....¹

The Ceylonese and the people of some South-east Asian countries appreciated each other's culture; whenever they found particular aspects interesting and useful for the promotion of their own society they adopted these and in this way each was influenced by the other.

When we survey the relations between Ceylon and South-east Asia it becomes quite obvious that the contacts which were the

¹ F.C. Bartlett, Psychology and Primitive Culture (Cambridge, 1923), pp.140-41.
closest and most effective were religious in character. Theravāda Buddhism was the medium through which mutual influence in art and culture took place. 'Organised religion has a way of being influential in the overturn and the reconstruction of major civilizations. It works first towards cultural change and then for conservation'.¹ Thus Theravāda Buddhism could transmit various cultural elements, and in South-east Asia, where this Sinhalese form of Buddhism was prevalent, numerous traces of Sinhalese influence in art and architecture can be seen. Because of Buddhism various regional and self-sufficient art traditions were able to make contacts one with the other, and ensuing cross-fertilization produced delightful results.²

If two cultures meet, of which one is more highly developed and powerful than the other, the stronger may supersede the weaker one. This can be seen when one examines the cultural relations between Ceylon and some parts of South-east Asia. We have already examined the expansion of Theravāda Buddhism into Cambodia and Burma from Ceylon and how it took deep root, especially in Burma. Nevertheless, Sinhalese influence on the art and architecture of those countries was so small as to be

almost negligible. This was either because those countries
already had highly developed art traditions of their own, or
because they were subjected to subsequent waves of influence
in art which superseded the Sinhalese influence on it.

Burma, situated very close to India, received cultural
inspiration from the Indian Sub-continent from early days.
These waves of cultural influence were very strong and they
formed and shaped the Burmese culture, tempered of course by
the local genius. From the eleventh century onwards, when
Burma began to look towards Ceylon for religious guidance, her
own cultural traditions were ripe enough to be used in the field
of religious art and architecture. Moreover, simultaneous
contacts with the Indian Sub-continent brought some cultural
influence and this process was accelerated when Eastern India
was overrun by Muslim invaders. Nevertheless, when the Sinhalese
sect in Burma was at the peak of its influence certain traces of
Sinhalese influence on art and architecture are visible.

We do not find much influence in the art and architecture
of Cambodia, mainly because Cambodia had very little direct
contact with Ceylon. We have already noticed the political
relations between these two countries during the reign of
Parākramabāhu I of Polonnaruva. However, not much Sinhalese
cultural influence seems to have resulted from such contacts.
Theravāda Buddhism came to Cambodia via Thailand and Burma, in the thirteenth century as a result of Khmer association with those countries. By then Sinhalese Buddhism was well established among the Mons, Burmese and Thais, and hence the Cambodians undoubtedly learnt of it from them. However, we get no direct evidence of close religious contacts until the middle of the fifteenth century, when the Cambodian Buddhist monks, accompanied by Thai monks, returned from Ceylon after having received higher ordination at the hands of the Sinhalese brethren. Thus it was only in the fifteenth century that Ceylon had direct religious contacts with Cambodia, a fact which would explain the absence of Sinhalese influence on the art and architecture of the period of our survey.

At the time when religious relations between these two countries did start, in the middle of the fifteenth century, the art and architecture of Ceylon were at a low ebb and not attractive enough to draw the attention of the foreigners. Even the famous temples and other monuments at Anurādhapura and Polonnaruva were in a ruined state, though some Buddhist monks with much difficulty tried as far as possible to protect them. Therefore there was nothing much in the field of art and architecture to be passed on to the Khmers.

1 For this mission see supra, pp. 328-29.
Another factor, perhaps the most important reason for the absence of Sinhalese influence on the art and architecture of Cambodia, was the cultural heritage of Cambodians themselves. They were such marvellous builders and artists that there was nothing left to be borrowed, even though they turned to the fountain-head of Theravāda Buddhism for guidance in matters of religion. Cambodia had been a centre of Indianized culture from the early centuries of the Christian Era. Hinduism and Mahāyānism were the main religions until Cambodia embraced Theravāda Buddhism. Magnificent buildings like those of Angkor demonstrate the highly developed nature of this Khmer school of art and architecture.¹ It was so advanced that its influence was even felt in other countries of South-east Asia.² Thus any faint ideas reaching Cambodia from Ceylon either direct or through Thailand, were superseded by the superior Cambodian traditions themselves and failed to make any appreciable impression on Cambodian art and architecture.

Except in the very early centuries, Theravāda Buddhism did not gain any support in Java, Sumatra, Borneo and other islands.

² Le May, A Concise History of Buddhist art in Siam, pp.142 ff.
of South-east Asia and there is very little evidence of Ceylon having cultural relations with them after the eleventh century A.D. The Mahāyāna Buddhist kingdom of Śrīvijaya and the Hindu kingdom of Majapahit had nothing to borrow from Ceylon, a centre of Theravāda Buddhism, but received much cultural inspiration from India. However, there are a few traces of Sinhalese influence in these islands prior to the eleventh century.

Thailand welcomed Sinhalese influence on its art and architecture more than did any other South-east Asian country, mainly because of the Thai cultural background. When the Thais migrated to Siam they were a nomadic people without an advanced culture of their own. After settling down in Thailand they came under the influence of the Khmers, who were then politically and culturally at the peak of their glory. However, when the Thais freed themselves from the Khmers, at first they tried as far as possible to be culturally independent.


also, and the Sukhodaya art and culture show how far they attempted to break away from Khmer traditions.¹

In the meantime they were drawn towards other cultures such as those of the Indians, the Mons, the Burmese and the Sinhalese, and the final result was a Thai culture which is a synthesis of various elements.² Thus the Thais provided fertile ground for the reception of foreign influences and Sinhalese ideas were readily and comfortably assimilated in their art and architecture.

This influence was not a one-way flow. Ceylon too sustained certain cultural influences from South-east Asia through such contacts. This mutual influence becomes apparent by a comparison of the art and architecture of Ceylon with that of countries like Thailand, Burma, Cambodia and the Malay Peninsula.

The stūpa was and still is one of the important features of the Buddhist monastery in Ceylon, Burma, Thailand and Cambodia. Its origin was even earlier than that of the Buddhist image house, because originally the Buddhist cult had no images.³ Ever since

its introduction to Ceylon in the third century B.C. with Theravāda Buddhism from India, the stūpa has been the most important feature of the monastery. It continued developing in Ceylon until the appearance of certain parts of this monument differed from that of the original Indian stūpa.

Some of the stūpas in South-east Asia show greater affinity with the stūpas of Ceylon than with those of India. Almost all these South-east Asian monuments which have features common with those of Ceylon were built at a time when these countries had close religious contacts with Ceylon. Even though a few pilgrims from this region continued to visit the sacred places in India after the fall of the Pālas of Bengal, Buddhism was no longer very active in the country of its origin. No stūpas were being built and the attention of the Indian people was drawn first towards Hindu revival and later towards Muslim expansion. Ceylon, on the other hand, was still an active centre of Theravāda Buddhism and the Buddhist sanctuaries of Ceylon were considered by South-east Asians almost as sacred as the Buddhist temples in India. Hence some of the people of South-east Asia became increasingly familiar with the Buddhist monuments of Ceylon and tried to build similar monuments in their own lands.

The most interesting evidence of Sinhalese influence on the stūpa of South-east Asia comes from Thailand, which has a
long tradition of stūpa-building, and where the most famous type is called the 'Sinhalese' type. This type of stūpa has four main parts, the plinth, the bell-shaped structure called the dome, the platform on the dome and the spire. The base is a square platform on which circular terraces are built. The lowest tier is sometimes widened to form a path for circumambulation. The dome, which is often bell-shaped, rests on these circular terraces, and above the dome is a small quadrangular platform which is called in Thai banlang. This is the harmika of the stūpa. Over this square structure there is a slender tapering spire, the lower part of which consists of circles of diminishing diameter superimposed one above the other. The Thai word for this part of the stūpa is plong chanai.

The main features of this type of Thai stūpa are the same as those of the Sinhalese stūpa (Plates 1-4). The square platform, the circular terraces, the dome, the harmika (hatarūskoṭuva in Sinhalese) and the conical spire (Kotkārallā in Sinhalese) are the general components of a stūpa in Ceylon. Broadly speaking, the same features can be seen in early Indian

---

2 Ibid.
3 Paranavitana, The Stūpa in Ceylon, pp.12 ff.
stūpas like that of Sāndhi,\(^1\) of the second century B.C. except for the square structure above the dome or ḥatarāśkotuva and the conical spire or the kotkārālla (Plate 5). This evolution in the form of the superstructure of the stūpa of the later Anurādhapura period\(^2\) in Ceylon was, however, not very similar to that of the contemporary Indian stūpa.

The square structure which is above the dome seems to have evolved in Ceylon from the harmikā of the Indian stūpa. This four cornered structure may be an evolution of the railing on the summit of the dome enclosing the harmikā, which was in the form of a heavy stone box. In Ceylon the railing became a solid structure on the top of the dome. The quadrangular platform of the Thai stūpa is similar to the hatarāśkotuva of the Sinhalese stūpa rather than to the harmikā of the Indian one.

The most striking similarity lies in the slender tapering spire of the stūpas of Ceylon and Thailand. The idea of the kotkārālla seems to be Indian,\(^3\) but it acquired its present shape in Ceylon. This feature was originally unknown in Ceylon, but by the eleventh century every stūpa in Ceylon had this spire above the hatarāśkotuva.


\(^2\) Anurādhapura period was from the sixth century B.C. to the eleventh century A.D.

\(^3\) Paranavītana, *The Stūpa in Ceylon*, p. 44.
Originally in India the top of the stupa was covered with a chattra (umbrella) or with a chattravali (series of umbrellas). The Sānchī stūpa had such umbrellas. Similarly in Ceylon when the Mahāthūpa at Anurādhapura was completed by Saddhatissa it was surmounted by an umbrella. Thus when the art of stūpa building was introduced into Ceylon from India this feature, too, was brought over. However, in the superstructure of stūpas like Abhayagiri and Jetavanārāma at Anurādhapura, and the Rankotvehera and the Kirivehera at Polonnaruva, the chattra or chattravali has been replaced by a circular drum of brick-work springing from the centre of the stūpa, above which rises the conical brick structure known as the kotkārālla or the conical spire. Paranavitana explains this evolution as follows:

An examination of the superstructure of the Kirivehera will make it plain that the devata-kotuva and the kot-kārālla of the mediaeval stūpas of Ceylon are a development of the yasti and the chattravali of the ancient stūpas of India and also of this Island. When these members, which were originally of wood or stone, were translated into brick masonry, constructional reasons required that the yasti should assume a greater diameter, in order to support the chattravali which, in brick work, could only be represented as a grooved cone. The projecting cornice of the devata-kotuva, which

---

1 Longhurst, op. cit., pp. 135 ff.
2 Mv., XXXII, 5 ff.
3 Paranavitana, The Stūpa in Ceylon, pp. 31 ff.
is structurally unsound, represents the lowermost of the series of umbrellas, and the tapering conical spire with its grooves is meant to represent the other umbrellas, gradually diminishing in size, placed one above the other. The circular bands of cut stone which are inserted in the brick work of the spire of the Abhayagiri serve no structural purpose; and must have been meant as actual stone umbrellas. The moulding of the face of the spire gives it the appearance of a series of superimposed umbrellas of gradually diminishing size. In a chaṭṭāvalī constructed of wood or stone there was naturally some space between one umbrella and another; but this was not possible in brick construction and the conical spire is the natural outcome of these spaces being filled in with masonry. 1

This development, according to Paranavitana, would have taken place by the late Anurādhapura period and by the Polonnaruva period this was an accepted feature of the stūpa in Ceylon. 2 When the Thais became interested in Theravāda Buddhism and Buddhist monuments, the Indian stūpa was not very familiar to them. Therefore the similarity between the stūpas of Ceylon and Thailand is probably due to Sinhalese influence. This is confirmed when we contrast the resemblance between the superstructure of the stūpas of both these countries with their difference to that of the Indian stūpa.

---

1 Ibid., p.42.
2 Ibid., p.43.
After the migration of the Thais, Thailand became an important centre of Theravāda Buddhism and innumerable monuments were built which still show the glory of the past. Among these ruins, too, there are a number of stūpas of Sinhalese style. The best example of such a stūpa of Sukhodaya period is the Wat Chang Lom in the middle of Sajjanalaya (Plate 6). According to an inscription of Rāma Khamhaeng, dated A.D. 1286, a chedi which took six years to complete was erected in the centre of the city of Sajjanalaya. As Wat Chang Lom is in the centre of the city the scholars believe that this was the stūpa referred to.

This stūpa stands on three fifty-five feet square terraces and is bordered by balustrades. It consists of another three circular terraces, a bell-shaped dome, a square structure above the dome (hatarāskoṭuva) and a tall spire. The dome is rather slender and the hatarāskoṭuva is comparatively large. The superstructure is typically Sinhalese. The top square terrace is decorated by niches containing seated Buddha images in brick and stucco.

2 Le May, A Concise History of Buddhist Art in Siam, p. 122.
After the migration of the Thais, Thailand became an important centre of Theravāda Buddhism and innumerable monuments were built which still show the glory of the past. Among these ruins, too, there are a number of stūpas of Sinhalese style. The best example of such a stūpa of Sukhodaya period is the Wat Chang Lom in the middle of Sajjanālaya (Plate 6). According to an inscription of Rāma Khamhaeng, dated A.D. 1286, a chedi which took six years to complete was erected in the centre of the city of Sajjanālaya.\(^1\) As Wat Chang Lom is in the centre of the city the scholars believe that this was the stūpa referred to.\(^2\)

This stūpa stands on three fifty-five feet square terraces and is bordered by balustrades. It consists of another three circular terraces, a bell-shaped dome, a square structure above the dome (hatarāskotuva) and a tall spire. The dome is rather slender and the hatarāskotuva is comparatively large. The superstructure is typically Sinhalese. The top square terrace is decorated by niches containing seated Buddha images in brick and stucco.

---


\(^2\) Le May, A Concise History of Buddhist Art in Siam, p. 122.
However, the most interesting section of this stupa is the middle storey, which is supported by stucco-coated elephants (Plate 7), which stand on the lower one.¹

This is one of the many examples of elephants being used to decorate the terraces of a stupa. This elephant wall is a typical Sinhalese feature and even today the Mahāthūpa at Anurādhapura has a beautifully-decorated elephant wall (Plates 8 and 9). The origin of this feature seems to be Ceylonese since we have no evidence of any Indian stūpa having such walls. Paranavitana gives an account of the elephant wall of the Mahāthūpa at Anurādhapura as follows:

The retaining wall of the platform of the Ruvanvāli has, on its face, the foreparts (the heads, forelegs and trunk) of elephants shown in relief, the figures being separated from one another by a distance of 4 ft. 7 in. The sides of the platform thus having the appearance of being supported on the backs of elephants standing in a row. The votive stūpas on the platform ... have their platforms supported by elephants.²

In the Mahāvamsa, too, there is a reference to an elephant wall which was built by King Saddhatissa when completing

² Paranavitana, The Stupa in Ceylon, p.66.
the Mahāthūpa at Anurādhapura. However, according to Paranavithana the remains of the old elephant wall suggest that it was constructed between the ninth and the twelfth century A.D. Though at present we have no other archaeological evidence of them, from the Mahāvamsa it appears that both the Jetavana and the Abhayagiri stūpas did in fact have such elephant walls. Thus this was a common architectural feature of Sinhalese stūpas, and the elephant wall of the Wat Chang Lom may well be a result of cultural contact between Ceylon and the Sukhodaya kingdom of Thailand.

Another interesting example of the Sinhalese type of stūpa is to be found in the Wat Sra Śrī (Plate 10). Standing on the shores of lake Traphang Trakuan, this chedi rests on a fifty-seven feet square base. It has a number of circular terraces and the dome is bell-shaped. The hatarūskojūva in this stūpa also is comparatively large and disproportionate, and the monument has a tall conical spire rising from the hatarūskojūva.

---

1 My, XXXIII, 5; This feature is also referred to in the later portion of the chronicle. Cv, XXXIX, 30.
3 Cv, XXXVIII, 10; XLI, 95.
Though the kingdom of Sukhodaya came under Ayodhyān supremacy, the political upheaval did not have much effect on the religious and cultural activities of the Thais. Cultural relations with Ceylon were continued, and more and more Buddhist sanctuaries were erected. During this period stūpas were still built in the Sinhalese style with the typical features of the circular terraces, the dome, the hatarāśkotuva and the kotkārālla, but the proportions and the contours became rather un-Sinhalese.¹

The Wat Phra Śrī (Śrī Sarvajña), the chapel Royal of Ayodhyā, was built by King Boromatrailokanath (A.D.1448-88), on the site of the royal residence of Rama I, the founder of Ayodhyā. Two stūpas were added to this shrine by Rama II (A.D.1491-1529), the son of King Boromatrailokanath, and tradition says that the eastern stūpa contained the ashes of the latter.² The stūpas at this site have been called Sinhalese in style (Plate 11). They were copied from Sinhalese-style stūpas in Sukhodaya or perhaps from fresh models brought from Ceylon.

Among the ruins of this Wat, a miniature stūpa was found in a small stūpa. The height of this miniature is nearly three feet and its base is about one-and-a-half feet. This was a particularly interesting discovery because inside the stone model were tin-alloy, iron, gilded bronze, silver, gold and crystal models, one inside the other. The innermost crystal model contained Buddhist relics. In appearance these models reflect the Sinhalese style, but we do not know whether they were made in Ayodhya or were imported from Ceylon. Laung Boribal Buribhand's suggestion is that these relics were brought from Ceylon by a Sinhalese monk who was invited by Boromatrailokanath to Ayodhya, and when the king died the relics possessed by him were buried in the stūpa by his son.¹

If this suggestion is accepted, we might assume that some, at least, of these models must have been brought from Ceylon with the relics. Normally, Buddhist relics are moved from one place to another in a reliquary, and it is possible that the Mahāthera who came over to Ayodhya with the relics brought some of these miniature stūpas with him as well. Even the outer stone one with the square base, the circular terraces, the dome, the hataraskotuva and the conical spire with mouldings, appear to be like the Sinhalese. Unlike

¹Ibid.
some of the Sinhalese-style stūpas built in Thailand, these models are well proportioned. If the Sinhalese monk brought some at least of these models, the rest may have been made in Ayodhya under the supervision of the Mahāthera himself, and some of the large stūpas built during this period may have been based on such miniature models imported from Ceylon. Another stūpa of the Ayodhya period at Wat Nung Paya of Sajjanalaya, is of the Sinhalese style and this evidence demonstrates that even as late as the end of the fifteenth century Sinhalese influence was still operative in stūpa building in Thailand.

The Sinhalese style reached even as far as Northern Thailand. From the early thirteenth century until it was captured by the Burmese, Northern Thailand was the seat of the independent kingdom of Lan Na. We have already pointed out how it became a centre of Theravāda Buddhism at the end of the thirteenth century. With the expansion of Theravāda in Northern Thailand, came also cultural traditions from Sukhodaya; and these are quite conspicuous in the art and


2 See supra, pp. 304 ff.
architecture of that region. The stūpas show a fusion of Sinhalese and Burmese styles, sometimes with the Burmese style dominating but with some Sinhalese influence.

The old city of Chiangsaen was re-established by Sean Phu the grandson of Mengrai in A.D. 1325 or 1328, when he made it his capital. In Chiangsaen there is a stūpa at a temple site which has a few Sinhalese features (Plate 12). However, the angular corners and successive tiers show that the stūpa is closer to the Burmese style than to the Sinhalese. The date of the stūpa is unknown; it may belong either to the fourteenth or the fifteenth century A.D. Since Burma adjoins Northern Thailand, with which it had close cultural contacts, the Burmese influence on the art and architecture of this region is natural, and sometimes we find it superseding the earlier Sinhalese influence. Wat Phra Tat Cóm Kili and Wat Pa Sak, both in Chiangsaen have stūpas which show Sinhalese influence.

Wat Chiangman was built by King Mengrai, the founder of the city of Chiangmai, in the second half of the thirteenth

---

2 Le May, A Concise History of Buddhist Art in Siam, p.130; Le May, The Culture of South-east Asia, p.185.
3 Claeys, op.cit., pl. LXXIX, p.427; pl. LXXX, p.428.
In this temple there is a stūpa of Sinhalese style, the base of which is surrounded by a row of life-size elephant heads and fore-legs in high relief, on each face of the terrace (Plate 13). According to Le May, the present stūpa is not the original one built in the thirteenth century, but is as restored by King Tilokarāja in A.D. 1471. He believes that the original base did not have the elephant-wall which was added later. Probably this too was added when Tilokarāja restored the whole building. The stūpa rests on a pyramid-like structure and this may be a combination of the pyramid common in Mon times and the bell-shaped stūpa of Sinhalese style. This elephant wall shows Sinhalese influence clearly and this is confirmed when we take into consideration the religious contacts between Ceylon and Chiangmai during this period.

Le May has illustrated a stūpa model belonging to the Sukhodaya period which, according to him, represents the stūpa

---

3 Le May, The Culture of South-east Asia, p.168.
4 See supra, p.318.
of Chang Lom at Savankalok (Plate 14). It has a row of elephants supporting the square terrace, a disproportionate bell-shaped dome and a square harmika, and the kotkàrálla or conical spire is tall. The whole model is about twelve inches high and provides a very good example of how these ideas travelled from region to region. It is possible that some of the stūpas of Northern Thailand were built from models such as this from Sukhodaya.

In Northern Thailand there is a famous temple called Wat Phra Singh Luang in which a Sinhalese Buddha image brought from Ceylon is said to have been installed. In this monastery also, there is an interesting stūpa built on a very high square base bordered by balustrades and adorned in the centre of each side by a protruding elephant head (Plate 15). On the square base there are three circular terraces on which the bell-shaped dome rests. The conical spire is tall, and on the whole the stūpa is of Sinhalese style.

1 Le May, A Concise History of Buddhist Art in Siam, p.128, fig.151.
2 Ibid.
3 Claeys, op.cit., pp.439 ff; Le May, The Culture of South-east Asia, p.173.
The Sinhalese style stūpa was known in the Malay Peninsula also. In Nakhon Srit'ammaram there is an old stūpa of this style in the temple of Phra Tat. The harmika or the hatarāskoṭuva of the stūpa is disproportionately large and the dome is bell-shaped. Though the conical spire is modern, the dome and the harmika, in spite of repairs, preserve the form of the early thirteenth century (Plate 16).\(^1\) Griswold compares this with the Chappaṭa stūpa in Pagan, which is of the Sinhalese style, and believes that this stūpa at Wat Phra Tat too was built according to the same style. Further, he suggests that this was built by Candrabhānu after the arrival of the Sinhalese monk Rāhula\(^2\) from Burma.\(^3\) If we accept his suggestion, it explains the Sinhalese influence on the stūpa. Even otherwise there is good evidence to show religious contacts between Ceylon and this part of the Malay Peninsula.\(^4\)

The stūpa of Wat Phra Tat is somewhat similar to famous Ceylonese stūpas such as Kirivehera and Rankotvehera at Polonnaruva.

---

2. About Rāhula and his connection with the Malay Peninsula see supra, pp. 276-79.
4. See supra, pp. 276 ff.
Though Burma, because of her proximity to India received most of her cultural inspiration from the Indian Sub-continent, Sinhalese influence also has contributed towards the formation of certain features of her architecture, as a result of the expansion of Buddhism from Ceylon. This influence can chiefly be seen in the stūpas which were built during the Pagan period when the Sinhalese monks were at the peak of their influence there.

One type of Burmese stūpa is similar to the Sinhalese stūpa and historical evidence shows that it was copied from stūpas in Ceylon. This stūpa has a bell-shaped dome standing on a circular base of several atrophied storeys without usable terraces. It has a heavy hataraskoṭuvā and it is surmounted by a slightly concave parasol ringed with mouldings. A typical example of this type is the Chappata Pagoda in Pagan (Plate 17). This stūpa rests on a raised 88 foot square platform with two stairways, one on the eastern and one on the western side, giving access to it. From the platform rise three circular terraces and the bell-shaped dome rests on them. The

---

square capital on top of the dome and the conical spire ornamented with seven concentric mouldings are main features of the monument.  

The name of the stūpa undoubtedly suggests that the plan of the monument came from Ceylon. Chappaṭa was a Talaing monk who returned after studying in Ceylon for ten years and inaugurated the Sinhalese sect of the Buddhist monks in Pagan.  

His ten years' stay in Ceylon would have given him the opportunity to study the Buddhist monuments and therefore when he introduced the new sect he may have introduced the Sinhalese style, and the Chappaṭa stūpa may be a result of such activities. This stūpa has similarities to some of the Polonnaruva stūpas.

After its introduction, a fusion took place between the Sinhalese style and the existing methods of stūpa-building. Hence some of the later stūpas do not exhibit pure Sinhalese features but only some traces of Sinhalese influence. There is a type of stūpa in Pagan which has a bell-shaped dome, a superstructure which is somewhat similar to the Chappaṭa stūpa. However the base is either circular or octagonal, and the hatarāskotuva is quite different from that of Sinhalese stūpas.

1 ASIAR (1906-7), p.31.
2 See supra, pp.243 ff.
The best example is the Seinnyet Nyima Pagoda built in the twelfth century A.D. (Plate 18). This stūpa shows the influence of a number of artistic traditions, for example Indian, Chinese, Tibetan and Ceylonese. The bell-shaped dome and the conical spire are modelled on the Sinhalese style, but the stūpa taken as a whole is unique and differs from Sinhalese ones. The richly modelled sixteen-sided base, the decorations of the dome with its encircling band and four niches with Buddha images facing in the four directions have no relations whatsoever to the Sinhalese style but unite many styles in one example.

In both Petleik Pagodas we see some traces of Sinhalese influence (Plate 19). Though the exact dates of these stūpas are unknown they may be roughly estimated as belonging to the eleventh century A.D. The domes are bell-shaped and the hatarāskotuva and the Kotkārūlla have Sinhalese features. However, on the whole these stūpas too are out of proportion and represent a fusion of various ideas. Another stūpa which shows Sinhalese influence is the Bepingyaung Pagoda (Plate 20) at Pagan.

---

1 ASIAR (1906-7), p.30.
2 RSASB (1908), p.11; Louis Frédéric, The Temples and Sculptures of South-east Asia, p.59.
3 Frédéric, op.cit., p.76.
From the foregoing discussion it can be seen that Sinhalese influence is to be found in stūpas of Burma, Thailand and the Malay Peninsula. The question arises as to how these ideas reached South-east Asia, whether directly or indirectly, why these South-east Asian stūpas are different from the Sinhalese ones and how this difference occurred.

We have evidence of trade relations and no doubt some of these ideas were carried by traders. But the development of religious contacts would have brought most of these ideas connected with religious monuments. The pilgrims and missionaries would have brought models of stūpas from Ceylon and they would have described Sinhalese stūpas to the local architects to give an idea of the monuments before they started construction.

In Ceylon we have evidence to show that there were manuscripts of a canon describing all the necessary techniques used in building stūpas. Parker has drawn attention to such a manuscript, and quoted a passage which gives the various shapes and proportions of the stūpas and other parts of these monuments. The passage is as follows:
Having divided the width across the dagaba into five parts, (out of them) three parts are the height (of the dome). Bell-shape, Chatty-shape, Bubble-shape, Heap-of Paddy, Lotus-shape, and Nelli (fruit) are the six kinds (of dagabas). Having divided the width across the dagaba into five parts, the length (of the dagaba) is subdivided into twenty-four parts. For the three stories (or necklaces, take) five and a half; the chamber (dome) eight; the four-sided enclosure of the Celestials (devatās) a couple and a half; the (other member of the enclosed) pair (one and a half); the last six for the spire; a half more for the chatta. The sage of old prescribed (these proportions) as usually practised.

The original manuscript in which the above passage occurs is no longer extant and this canon is corrupt and largely theoretical. However, this evidence would suggest that there were texts to guide stūpa builders in Ceylon, and sometimes builders would have preserved these canons orally from father to son. We do not know whether such traditions also reached South-east Asia through the Buddhist monks. There is some evidence of Sinhalese artists working in Sukhodaya and some of them may have brought such ideas. So far no manuscript containing a record of such oral traditions has been found from South-east Asia and not even an oral tradition as such. Furthermore, the shape, contours and proportions of such

3 See infra, p. 376.
stūpas as have Sinhalese features do not indicate the systematic use of Sinhalese techniques in their construction. Most of them are out of proportion, according to Sinhalese standards, for South–east Asian artists were not successful in faithfully imitating Sinhalese models. Perhaps they did not want to do so.

If the architects used miniature models of stūpas for guidance when they constructed their monuments, the difference between the Ceylonese stūpas and the stūpas of Sinhalese style in South–east Asia could be explained. When a Buddha image or a stūpa was made as a copy of an older model, it was aimed not so much at obtaining a convincing visual likeness of the original as at preserving as far as possible its characteristic features. Therefore artists or architects took some licence in modelling the image or stūpa according to their own knowledge and experience.

The models which they used in building their stūpas did not represent exactly the proportions or the shape of the original stūpa. These reliquaries or miniature stūpas from Ceylon normally would not have been the products of architects or made according to any canon. They were made by jewellers

1 Griswold, Buddhist Annual (1964), p.75.
2 Ibid.
and metal workers who did not have proper knowledge of the proportions or the contours of Ceylon stupas, but used such little knowledge as they had, augmented by personal observation. They would not have known that their reliquaries were destined to be models for artists in South-east Asia. They included in their miniatures the essential features of a stūpa like the dome, the harmika, and the kotkārālla but they did not know their proportions. When such models were used as patterns by South-east Asian architects they therefore provided little guidance. Sometimes they combined various styles into one model because they knew of different styles of stūpas. This is clearly seen in some of the Burmese stūpas, where a combination of Indian, Tibetan, Chinese and Sinhalese styles can be seen. That was how the difference occurred between the Sinhalese stūpas and those stūpas of South-east Asia which were built according to the Sinhalese style.

Ideas of unusual types of stūpas unknown locally, reached Ceylon through her cultural relations with South-east Asia. At Polonnaruva there is a solid structure known as Sat-mahal-prāsāda, which has been identified as an uncommon stūpa (Plate 21). The origin of the building is unknown, hence various writers have advanced their own theories as to its derivation. The monument stands at the north-eastern corner
of a raised quadrangle on which are most of the shrines connected with the cult of the Tooth Relic.¹

The Sat-mahal-prāśāda is a single tower with seven storeys, the seventh of which has collapsed. This pyramidal building rises from a low basement which is 39 feet 2 inches square at ground level. Each storey diminishes in width and the height of each becomes less stage by stage. Altogether the height of the tower is 53 feet.² The topmost stage has disappeared and we are therefore unable to trace how the structure terminated.³ In the centre of each of the four faces above the ground level was inserted a niche projecting from the wall face. In these niches can be seen the remains of a standing figure of stucco which appears to be a deity.⁴

The Sat-mahal-prāśāda is unique and its architectural features are a departure from tradition. Various suggestions have been put forward as to its origin and identity. Because of its present name, which means seven storeyed palace, Wickramasinghe identified it with a seven storeyed palace.

---

¹ Paranavitana, The Stūpa in Ceylon, p.98.
⁴ Ibid.
said to have been built and inhabited by King Nissāñkamalla of Polonnaruva. Paranavitana has rightly pointed out the difficulty in accepting this, as it is impossible to imagine a king living in such a pyramidal tower, especially as it is a solid structure without doors or windows. According to Coomaraswamy, it is a representation of Mount Meru. Benjamin Rowland, too, accepts this suggestion and says 'its shape conforms to what in the Śastras would be designated as Meru temple, with the seven successive storeys of the terraced structure representing the imagined hieratic configuration of the world mountain.'

Fergusson says that this is one of the most perfect representations existing of the seven storeyed temple in Assyria and goes on to compare it with the Cambodian Prasāts. Bell, who made a thorough study of the building, also tried to find a

1 Ez, Vol.II, no.15, p.92. 'Thereafter having beheld a palace which had been erected in the capital formerly in seven years and seven months, and thinking "it befits us to sit in a palace built by a king like ourselves" he erected within forty-five days a palace of seven storeys.' Ibid., p.95.
3 Coomaraswamy, History of Indian and Indonesian Art, p.165.
5 Fergusson, History of Indian Architecture, p.246.
The Sat-mahal-prāsadaya offers an analogy well nigh perfect with the less ornate Khmer pyramid edifices. It stands as an architectural link between the simplest form of rectangular pyramid such as Ka Keo with plain vertical walls and straight staircase up the middle of each side and the elaborate towers at Mi-Baume and other similar shrines. ¹

The only monument which bears satisfactory comparison with this one is to be found in Northern Thailand. Coedès was the first to notice the similarity between the Sat-mahal-prāsadaya and the Wat Kukut monument in Northern Thailand (Plate 22). ²

This brick edifice rises from a 75 feet square platform. It has five diminishing cubic storeys reaching a height of 92 feet. Each façade of every storey is decorated with three niches containing three terracotta Buddha images. The topmost part of the building has collapsed but scholars suggest that it was mounted by a pinnacle. ³

The Wat Kukut was originally built by Adiccarāja (A.D.1120-1150) and later it was altered to its present state by Sabbādhisiddhi in A.D.1218. ⁴ However, it is not the only

¹ Bell, ASCAR (1903), p.16.
² Coedès, BEFEQ, Vol.XXV, p.83.
⁴ Dupont, op.cit, p.93; Le May, Concise History of Buddhist Art in Siam; Frédéric, op.cit, p.376.
monument of that type in Thailand. In Chiangmai there is a chedi known as Si Liem situated about four miles south-east of Chiangmai city (Plate 23). It has also five recessed storeys and was probably built by Mengrai in A.D.1276, though the present appearance of the stupa is a result of repairs in later times. This chedi is more decorated than the Wat Kukut monument and the decorations show both Burmese and Khmer influence. Another monument of this style is the Wat Phra Tat Hariponchai in Northern Thailand (Plate 24).

Even in Sukhodaya there is evidence that this type of monument was known. All that remains of Wat Mahā Tat Square Chedi is its laterite and brick base, and the facing and the stucco decorations have already vanished (Plate 25). It is not exactly similar to the Wat Kukut but basically the plan of the building is more or less the same with terraces of decreasing size. This style goes back as far as the Dvāravatī period. The Wat Pa Deng and the Wat Phra Pathon, both at Nakhon Pathom and both belonging to the Dvāravatī period, seem to have the same

1 Frédéric, op.cit., p.376.
2 Ibid., p.41.
3 Ibid., p.360.
plan. From the ruins it appears that both buildings were in the Wat Kukut style.¹

From these examples it appears that this style was common among the Mons of Thailand. When the Thais adopted Mon traditions, they inherited this one also and hence it appears in Sukhodaya. The Sat-mahal-prasāda belongs to about the twelfth or thirteenth century A.D., and it is quite certain that well before that date this particular style of architecture was known in South-east Asia, especially among the Mons.

Since little research has been done on early Mon architecture, the origin of this Mon 'Chaitya-tower' is also obscure. Dupont, who did a thorough study of Dvāravatī art and architecture, used the term Chaitya to differentiate it from the ordinary stūpa, and suggested some affinity between this type of building and the Khmer Temple-mountain.² The same affinity was seen by Bell when he compared the Sat-mahal-prasāda with the Khmer Prasāts.³ However, any similarity is more apparent than real.⁴ The Cambodian Prasāts, both in

² Ibid., pp.134-35.
³ Bell, ARASC (1903), p.16.
appearance and in plan are different from the Wat Kukut Chaitya and the Sat-mahal-prasāda. The Prasāts are not solid structures like 'Chaitya-towers' and they have shrine rooms on top of their pyramidal bases (Plate 26). Furthermore, the steep staircase in the middle of each face of the Prasāt makes the monument quite different in appearance from the Mon chaityas and the Ceylon monument, which have niches on each face of each storey. This is very evident when we compare Baksei Chamkrong of Angkor with the Mon chaityas. According to Quaritch Wales, the sloping roof-like character of the terraces of the Mon chaitya is different from that of the Khmer buildings of stepped pyramid design. Furthermore, as this type of architecture was known to the Mons in the Dvaravatī period they must already have been familiar with it before Khmer influence reached them.

Secondly, the similarity between the Chinese pagodas and Mon chaityas may tempt one to suggest that the latter were the result of the influence of the former. The reliefs at Yünkang and Lungmēn in Northern China would demonstrate that pagodas were well known in China by the fifth century A.D. The literary sources speak of multi-storeyed wooden pagodas from the same

---

3 Seckel, op.cit., p.111.
period, and during the sixth and seventh centuries a number of pagodas were built in China, Korea and Japan. Since we have multi-storeyed towers in India much earlier than the Chinese pagodas, it is quite likely that this idea was brought back to China by pilgrims who had visited India, though in China it developed in a different form. The Chinese pilgrim Sung Yung, who was impressed by the Kanishka stūpa in Peshawar, which was a thirteen-storeyed tower, engaged skilful artists to make an engraving of it on a copper sheet, which he took back to China. Thus early Chinese pilgrims and even Indian Buddhist monks who went to China, may have taken the idea of the 'tower stūpa' from India. In addition, during the Dvāravatī period we have more evidence of Indian influence on Mon culture than Chinese. Therefore we have to turn to India, the original source of the stūpa to look for any solution to the problem of the origin of Thai 'chaitya-tower'.

When we examine the archaeological remains of India we get earlier evidence for the 'chaitya-tower' than we do from any

---

2 Ibid.
other country. The remains from Mathura and Amaravati show that this type of architecture was known in India from the second or the third century A.D.¹ It existed independently along with the stūpa proper as a Buddhist cult building.² The terracotta plaque of Kumrahar near Patna, which belongs either to the first or the second century A.D., shows a tower structure topped by a superstructure just like the eastern pagodas.³ This terracotta plaque represents a storeyed tower plus a stūpa and it shows a number of niches which would have been meant to hold Buddha images.⁴ It is likely that there were many such towers in India.

India and the Mon region were closely linked and the archaeological remains show how far the art traditions of India had influenced the Mon art and architecture of the kingdom of

¹ Gisbert Combez, 'L'évolution du stūpa en Asie', Mélanges Chinois et bouddhiques, deuxième volume (1932-33), pp.187 ff.; fig.11 shows the tower from a torana relief from Mathura.
² Franz, op.cit., pp.22 ff.; Seckel, op.cit., p.112.
³ Coomaraswamy, History of Indian and Indonesian Art, pl.62; Seckel, op.cit., pp.113-14, plate next to p.292.
⁴ Seckel, op.cit., pp.112-15.
Dvāravatī. Therefore the conception of the 'chaitya-tower' would have come from India and the architectural remains show that its realization was widespread in the Mon region.

How did the idea of the Sat-mahal-prāsāda come to Ceylon? The difficulties in accepting Bell's suggestion that this was a result of Khmer influence on Sinhalese architecture have already been pointed out. According to Paranavitana, the idea of the tower was introduced into Ceylon from India by the Mahāyānists. However there is no special evidence to show that the Sat-mahal-prāsāda was a Mahāyāna monument. This type of architecture was not very well known in Eastern India, though Ceylon had direct contacts with Buddhist centres there during the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Therefore it seems likely that, though the idea was indeed Indian and it came to the Mons directly from India, the Sinhalese acquired it indirectly.

The Sat-mahal-prāsāda is closer to the Wat Kukut of Northern Thailand than to any similar chaitya tower in India, China, Korea or Japan. Therefore it is not unlikely that the


Mons passed on the idea to the Sinhalese architects. That the plan of this type of architecture was not familiar to the architects of Ceylon is quite obvious when we carefully compare the two monuments. The Wat Kukut is in proportion and its merits have been described by Griswold as follows:

As the eye travels upwards the storeys decrease in height, with their niches and images and stupas diminishing in proportion. A happy optical illusion results, which increases the apparent height of the monument.

Such artistic expression is lacking in the Sat-mahal-prasāda which clearly shows that its creators were still experimenting with the plan. Thus it seems that we have here an example of South-east Asian influence on Sinhalese architecture.

Even after the eleventh century A.D., when religion brought Ceylon and South-east Asia into close contact, very little Sinhalese influence is apparent on South-east Asian architecture apart from the stūpa. It is only in Thailand that we find traces of Sinhalese architectural influence.

---

3. Claey's suggested that Wat Kukut could be a result of Sinhalese influence but the recent archaeological discoveries show that this style was known in Thailand well before the period of Sat-mahal-prasāda. Claey's, op.cit., p.435.
Thailand is situated among the regions on the periphery of Indian culture whose peoples had only a limited cognizance of Indian cultural patterns.\(^1\) By the time the Thais had reached Thailand the cultural impact of India was waning, as India itself was plunged into political chaos as a result of the Muslim invasions, whereas countries such as Cambodia, Burma and some of the South-east Asian islands received inspiration from India when it was at the peak of its cultural efflorescence.

When the Thais, with little experience of their own in erecting large and permanent buildings, arrived in their present habitat they experimented in various ways in order to evolve an architectural style in which to construct these. They were thus eager to learn and displayed a great capacity for assimilating outside influences.\(^2\) The principle of response to stimulus is one of the most effective factors in cultural change, and in this case it led to innovations resulting in superb creations. This process is clearly discernible in the field of Thai architecture.\(^3\) The assimilation of foreign ideas was no mere imitation, because they were fused, either consciously

\(^1\) Quaritch Wales, 'The Origin of Sukhodaya Art', _JSS_, Vol.XLIV, pt.2 (1956), pp.113 ff.
\(^2\) Ibid., p.116.
\(^3\) Percy Brown, _Indian Architecture_, p.226.
or unconsciously with the local genius. Among foreign ideas reaching Thailand at a time when it was seeking inspiration abroad, those from Ceylon played a considerable role during the Sukhodaya period, the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, when there were close religious ties between the two countries.

There is a striking resemblance of certain monuments in Sukhodaya to Sinhalese Buddhist buildings at Polonnaruva, in plan as well as in detail. One example is Wat Maha Tat in Sukhodaya. It seems that this was originally built by King Indraditya, the founder of the kingdom of Sukhodaya of which it became the spiritual centre.\(^1\) The present form of the Wat is not the original one, however, being the result of repairs and alterations ordered by King Lō Tai of Sukhodaya, and mentioned in one of the inscriptions.\(^2\)

This inscription adds, however, that the repairs were put into effect at the instigation of a Mahāthera named Śrivardhārajacakulāmuni Śrīratanalāṅkādiṇa Mahāsāmi on his return from a sojourn in Ceylon, where he received the title mahāsāmi from the Sinhalese king, and whence he brought back with him two

\(^{1}\) Griswold, *Towards A History of Sukhodaya Art*, p.3.

precious relics.\textsuperscript{1} His close association with this monument would therefore explain how the Sinhalese influence crept in.

The central lotus tower dominated Wat Maha Tat. This was created when Lö Tai encased the central tower already there, which was perhaps the original tower built by King Indraditya, in a tall pyramid basement surmounted by the lotus-bud tower or stūpa which we see today. According to Griswold, this stūpa was of a type unfamiliar in Thailand and had been copied from Ceylon.\textsuperscript{2} However, there are no exactly similar examples of lotus-bud domes to be seen in Ceylon today, although there are lotus mouldings at the base of the domes of some stūpas at Anurādhapura.\textsuperscript{3} On the other hand, in a canon which is said to have guided the stūpa builders of Ceylon,\textsuperscript{4} the lotus shape is mentioned as one of the six shapes of stūpa known in Ceylon. Owing to later repairs or the complete disappearance of certain monuments, however, there are no examples of this type in existence.

Buddhist relics installed in temples or in reliquaries sometimes rested on lotus flowers of silver or gold. If the relics brought by Mahāsāmi from Ceylon were placed in a reliquary

\textsuperscript{1} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{2} Griswold, Towards A History of Sukhodaya Art, p.21.
\textsuperscript{3} Prematilleke and Silva, op.cit., p.68.
\textsuperscript{4} See supra, p. 356.
shaped like a lotus-bud, it could have influenced the king in his choice of a model for the stūpa he built to enclose the existing Khmer tower, which may thus be cited as an example of Sinhalese influence on the architecture of the Sukhodaya period.¹

Further Sinhalese influence may be seen in the ornamentation of the axial towers (Plates 27-29), described by Griswold as follows:

The torana-arches terminate in pairs of aquatic or celestial creatures — makara or kinnari — which face towards each other, while throwing their tails outward and upward in a swirl of foliated scrolls. At the top of the arch a kirtimukha disgorges wealth and vitality, strings of jewels which stream down the flame-tipped extrados, and lotus-stems which wind into volutes to frame fantastic flowers.... At the first false-storey the torana-arches were repeated on a smaller scale, while the corners were occupied by antefixes in the form of garudas struggling with nāgas.²

The principal feature in the decoration of the towers of the Maha Tat is the simhamukha or kāla head from which hang bands which enter the mouths of the inward-facing makaras. Claeys thought this feature was inspired by Khmer decorative themes,³ and this theory was accepted by Le May.⁴ Parmentier, who had noticed that by then the makara had been replaced by the nāga

¹ Griswold, Towards A History of Sukhodaya Art, p.21.
² Ibid.
³ Claeys, op.cit., p.417.
⁴ Le May, Concise History of Buddhist Art in Siam, p.121.
in Khmer architecture, still thought that there was Khmer influence on the makara-toranəs, but that it came rather from primitive Khmer art and ancient Indian arches.¹

Thus, although Wat Maha Tat distinctly shows Khmer features such as the base and the shaft, as well as the antefixes, and though it is not impossible that primitive Khmer ideas were revived by the Thais in their architecture, it may well be that inspiration for this makara-torana decoration came from some other source. Quaritch Wales considered Sinhalese influence as a main component of Sukhodaya architecture, pointing to this use of makara-torana decoration as an example because of its close resemblance to certain Sinhalese arches.²

The makara-torana and the Kirtimukha originated in India, where there is plenty of evidence of this embellishment both from north and south,³ and then spread to Ceylon and South-east Asia. In Java the general construction of the torana underwent a change, for example at Borobudur, where the flowing curved movement of the torana became angular. At Candi Kalasan in

¹ Parmentier, L'art architectural Hindou dans l'Inde et en Extreme-Orient, pp. 189-90.
² Quaritch Wales, JSS, Vol.XLIV, pp.119 ff.
³ Ganguly, 'A Note on Kirtimukha; being the life history of an Indian architectural ornament', Rupam, Vol. X, pp.11-18; Srinivasan, Cave Temples of the Pallavas, pp.38, 74 and 180.
Java even the *makaras* terminating the *toranas* lose their identity and become more fantastic floral forms. There were slight modifications of this idea in Cambodia also, where we see the arched form 'decorated with water vegetation, springing from the tail of the *makara*, rather than from its mouth'. At a later stage in Cambodia we see how the *makara* has been replaced by a multi-hooded *nāga* at the spring end of *toranas*. Therefore it appears from the available evidence that the Wat Maha Tat *makara-torānas* resemble the Sinhalese ones more than they do any other examples from India, Cambodia or Java. As there was little contact between India and Sukhodaya during the fourteenth century, it is all the more unlikely that the *makara-torānas* reached Sukhodaya from India.

The *makara-torana* was a well-known ornamental motif in Ceylon from early times. As in India, it was used as a decoration above Buddha images. A number of seventh and eighth century examples have been published by Coomaraswamy, and William E. Ward has drawn attention to two more Sinhalese Buddha images.

2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
4 Coomaraswamy, *Bronzes from Ceylon, Chiefly in the Colombo Museum*, pl.xiv, figs.33 and 35; pl.xv, fig.39.
images with makara-toranas at Cleveland Museum, the first belonging roughly to the eighth century and the second to about the eleventh.\(^1\) Amongst examples used architecturally are two toranas in one of the gateways at Yapahuva.\(^2\)

The Lankatilaka monastery at Kandy provides the best example of makara-toranas for comparison with those of Wat Maha That (Plates 30-32). The main entrance to the shrine is an arched passage, allowing for a makara-torana on the exterior wall. It is crowned by the heads of gandharvas, 30 feet above ground level. Both ends of the torana terminate in makara heads with gaping mouths and conventional peacock tails.\(^3\) Similar toranas can also be found in the temple of Vijayotpaya, Gadaladeniya, where the central cube of solid stone masonry has makara-toranas on all four sides over niches containing Buddha images.\(^4\) Both the Lankatilaka and the Vijayotpaya shrines are contemporaneous with the Sukhodaya monument, and the Buddhist monk who went to Sukhodaya seems to have been the contemporary of Bhuvanaikabahu IV (A.D.1341-1351) of Gampola, during whose reign these two monuments were constructed.

---

2. ASCAR (1911-12), p.65, pls.LXXVII and LXXX.
4. Ibid., pp.55-56.
Quaritch Wales compares the *makara-toranas* from the *Mahā Tat* and the *Laṅka-tilaka* monastery as follows:

In the Sukhodaya pediment border the main decorative features are the rosette in the centre and, running along the band, the spiral design with the volutes forming expanded flowers. One may also mention that the double spiral below is well known in mediaeval Sinhalese art. Now, if we turn to the *Laṅka-tilaka* temple of A.D.1342 in Ceylon we see that the *sīhamukha* and the *makaras*, the latter retaining more fishy tails, are very similar.... It may therefore be that *makara* arches decorated in the way we find at Sukhodaya are also known in Ceylon, not necessarily in architecture. Or it may be that we owe the pleasing combination to Siamese initiative. Actually in the *Laṅka-tilaka* temple the band is decorated with small *kinnaras* in human form. But the floral volute design is certainly familiar in mediaeval Sinhalese art, for example in book covers.¹

Such striking similarities would suggest Sinhalese influence here, especially when the inscription of Lō Tai mentioning the monk recently returned from Ceylon, would suggest the channel through which this influence arrived. Moreover, the same inscription mentions that Sinhalese laymen living in the five villages had been brought for some purpose (the wording is illegible here) and to carry up bricks to complete the towers of the Wat *Maha Tat*.² These laymen would not have been brought all the way from Ceylon without any special reason; therefore it seems likely that they were trained craftsmen brought over by the *Mahāthera*, in which

¹ Quaritch Wales, *JSS*, Vol.XLIV, p.120.
case they would obviously help the local people to rebuild the Maha Tat, contributing detailed decorations such as the makara-toranas.

The long low wall enclosing the assembly hall, image house and stupa at Wat Maha Tat in Sajjanālaya is formed of vertical laterite blocks topped by horizontally placed blocks (Plate 33). According to Claeys, this wall is similar to the wall of the Sānchi stupa in India. However, there can have been no direct connection between Sānchi and Sukhodaya during the second half of the fourteenth century, and hence this Indian type of railing must have come via an indirect route. The idea of putting railings round stupas and vihāras was current in Ceylon from early times and no doubt came there from India. Excavations revealed a railing surrounding a rectangular monument near the Abhayagiri stupa at Anuradhapura. This railing consisted of square pillars a foot apart, with three cross-bars surmounted by a coping, and was more or less similar to the Sānchi one; it was undoubtedly inspired from India. There is another type of railing found at Bharhut and Amaravati, which

---

1 H. Parmentier, L'art architectural Hindou dans l'Inde et en Extrême-Orient, p.192, fig. 234.
2 Claeys, BEPEO, op.cit., p.411; Le May agrees with Claeys, A Concise History of Buddhist Art in Siam, p.81.
differs from the one at Sānchi. The cross-bars of this type are not separate pieces socketed to posts either side, but made of blocks of stone fitted together and carved in the form of a post with cross-bars projecting from it.¹ There were such railings around the stūpas at Anurādhapura and even at Polonnaruva.² At Mādirigiriya a portion of the railing is still to be seen.³ Thus the railing was well known in Ceylon at the time it came into contact with the kingdom of Sukhodaya, and this Indian feature could therefore well have reached Sukhodaya via Ceylon.⁴

Sinhalese Buddhist vihāras may have provided the plans for some of the Buddhist monuments at Sukhodaya, although these would have been adapted to suit local conditions and the technical skill available. The image house of Wat Śrī Jum is one such monument, with an affinity with Buddhist shrines at Polonnaruva (Plan 1).⁵ It would appear to have been built in the middle of the fourteenth century during the reign of King Lū Tai of Sukhodaya, the grandson of Rāma Khamhaeng.⁶

¹ Ibid.
² Ibid.
³ Paranavitana, The Encyclopaedia of Buddhism, Specimen Articles, p.17.
⁴ Quaritch Wales, JSS, Vol. XLIV, p.119.
⁵ Percy Brown, op.cit., p.229; Quaritch Wales, loc.cit.
⁶ Le May, The Culture of South-east Asia, p.117.
The exterior dimensions of this image house are about 91 feet long by 74 feet wide with a projection to the west. At the entrance to the shrine in the east steps lead to a vestibule. From a narrow, vaulted passage joining the vestibule with the inner shrine room, the central feature – a massive seated Buddha image screened by a high, solidly-built wall – is dimly visible.¹

The stucco brick walls of the shrine are about 10 feet thick and they carried a lofty roof or tower. At the height of 32 feet from the ground the brick courses commenced to recede, to come to a point at the top, thus forming in sections a pyramidal tower.² The interior buttresses at the corners prove that the roof was of corbelled masonry.³ Although there is no sign of an upper storey, a stairway taking one to the roof level is built into the thickness of the wall of the left-hand side of this inner sanctuary. Here 'built into the tunnel-like stairway whose ceiling they form, is a series of stone slabs engraved

³ Griswold, Towards A History of Sukhodaya Art, p.49.
with elegant drawings of the Jātakas, which were doubtless originally polychromed'.

The plan of the shrine is similar to that of monuments such as Thūparāma (Plan 2), the Tivaṅka-%pātimā-ghara and the Laṅkātilaka at Polonnaruva, which all have square cells with a projecting base vestibule. Their walls, too, are very thick, making the internal space in these shrines relatively small in relation to the exterior dimensions. Another feature they have in common with the Sukhodaya sanctuary is the passage through the thick front wall which serves as an entresol between sanctum and vestibule.

Although the roofs of the Laṅkātilaka and the Tivaṅka-%patima-ghara have collapsed, the Thūparāma gives some idea of the vaulted roof common to all these monuments. It is described by Hocart as follows:

The roof can only by courtesy be called an arch since it violates the principles of an arch. As it thus failed to achieve its purpose of spanning wide spaces the builders had first of all to reduce the width of the nave from 13 feet 7 inches to 8 feet 8 inches; this was done laying each course so as to project beyond that underneath it beginning 7 feet 5 inches above the floor and continuing to a height of 15 feet 6 inches, at which point begins the true arch. We thus have a combination of the true and

1 Quaritch Wales, JSS, Vol. XLIV, p.119.
of the corbelled arch. In the true arch the bricks, which as usual are very irregular in size, are laid vertically end to end with their long edges outward; bonding is utterly disregarded. ¹

A seated Buddha image was in the inner shrine of the Thūparāma, while the Laṅkātilaka and the Tivaṅka-paṭimā-ghara contained standing Buddha images in brick and stucco.

The most striking similarity between Wat Śrī Jum and the Polonnaruva monuments is seen in their staircases. Bell describes the staircase of the Thūparāma as follows:

Through the thickness of its south wall a steeply stepped stairway, only 2 feet 9 inches in breadth, gave access to the roof. The ascent started at the south-west corner of the vestibule wall, through an opening which immediately turns at right angles eastward, and mounting to a landing masked by the south-east inside angle of the outer wall. From here the final ascent on to the flat roof was directly west, and only separated from the tunnelled staircase by the thin crust of part of its roof. The staircase is roofed in by pointed corbelled vaulting of five successive horizontal stretches, rising one above the other, 8 feet in height from soffit to step tread. ²

When the similarity of the cellas and vestibules and of the passage joining these, of the vaulted roofs and their method of construction, the staircases and thickness of the walls is taken into account, it is reasonable to conclude that the Wat Śrī Jum sanctuary derived its inspiration from these earlier Sinhalese

² ASCAR (1903), p. 29.
monuments, which were of a plan extensively used during the Polonnaruva period.

Doubtless the Sinhalese craftsmen, whose presence in Sukhodaya during the reign of Lō Tai (A.D.1317-1346) has been referred to above, continued to work in the time of Lū Tai (A.D.1347-1370), during whose reign this Wat Śrī Jum shrine was built. Furthermore a Thai inscription of Lū Tai dated A.D.1357, which was found in the Wat Śrī Jum monastery, mentions a sprout from the sacred Bo-tree in Ceylon having been brought to Sukhodaya and planted in this same monastery. Another inscription found there, also belonging to the same reign, mentions Čūḷāmuni of Ceylon, although it is not clear in what context, due to the fragmented nature of the record. Then again, some of the paintings from this shrine show Sinhalese influence in that they resemble frescoes found at Polonnaruva.

Thus both epigraphical and artistic evidence shows that there were close contacts between Ceylon and Wat Śrī Jum during the Sukhodaya period. Either Buddhist monks from Ceylon or

1 See supra, p. 376.
2 Fournereau, op.cit., pp.10-29.
3 Ibid., pp.35-42.
4 Coomaraswamy, History of Indian and Indonesian Art, p.177.
Sukhodaya, or the craftsmen already residing in Sukhodaya, could have produced plans of the Polonnaruva monuments which were used as a basis or prototype in building the shrine of Wat Śrī Jum.

Sinhalese architecture, too, appears to have been affected by the mutual contacts between Ceylon and South-east Asia. Certain monuments are unique in Ceylon but seem to have an affinity with various monuments in South-east Asia; this gives some evidence of South-east Asian influence.

To the south of the city of Polonnaruva are the ruins of the Potgulvehera. This monument seems unique in Sinhalese architecture and Bell, who surveyed it, found traces of Cambodian influence in its plan.¹

The ground plan of this monument shows that it was laid out in perfect symmetry (Plan 3). A mound-like area of about 120 yards square was enclosed by an outer wall pierced in the east by a main entrance under a porch. On the south and west sides two subsidiary gateways gave further access to the monastery. Within this outer wall, and on a higher level, was an inner wall surrounding the detached pirivenas and the raised platform on which the main shrine stood. The external measurement of this inner quadrangle was about 75 yards square.² Some monks'...
cells were situated in the 20 yard wide space between the outer and the inner walls. In addition, there was another piazza of about 15 feet and 6 inches in width between the inner wall and the walled-in pirivenas and the central temenos which the monks would have used as a place for exercise.¹

Next to this piazza was the enclosure containing the pirivenas or monks' dwellings, which were arranged in rather an interesting way. The original plan contained only eight pirivenas, four on the north side and four on the south facing the central shrine. The larger ones were in the middle opposite each other, and the smaller ones at the corners.² It appears that a somewhat bigger pirivena was later added to the eastern side, but originally there were no buildings on either east or west.³

The uppermost tier supporting the main monument, the Potgulvehera, was constructed of bricks. Although it is in a ruined condition, the remains of an 'elephant rampart' are still visible. This upper temenos was slightly oblong, being about 130 feet by 112 feet, and it was raised about seven feet above

¹ Ibid.
² Ibid., p.13.
³ Ibid.
the level of the quadrangle containing the pirivenas. Upon it there was a central shrine balanced by four small stupas at each corner of the quadrangular peribolus. These four stupas are of the same size and would have been added 'to approximately balance and set off the important shrine located in the middle of the temenos'.

Thus this sacred temenos, with the main shrine in the middle and the four small stupas at the corners, is arranged with the symmetry shown in the placing of the pirivenas. The central shrine (the Potgulvehera) was planned as a rotunda with an oblong vestibule and a mandapa on its eastern side.

The main entrance porch in the eastern wall of the monastery could be called a murage or guardhouse. A flight of steps led up from it to the second enclosure, and a further flight with brick balustrades gave access to the pirivenas. From the pirivena level to the highest platform there was a stairway with unornamented balustrades.

From the general layout of the various edifices, it would appear that this monastery was the only one of its kind in

---

1 Ibid., p.14.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
4 Ibid.
Ceylon in the Polonnaruva period. Although some of the features of the Potgulvehera appear in monuments found among the Anurādhapura shrines, taken as a whole it is unique.

A number of monasteries at Anurādhapura had large quadrangles surrounded by wide moats and were approached by broad avenues on one or all four sides. The important monuments – the stūpa, the image-house, and the assembly hall, for instance were on a central terrace supported by retaining walls. Between this terrace and the moat was a lower platform containing the monks' living quarters. Beyond the moat was yet another platform, and the whole monastery was enclosed by an outer boundary wall. Various monasteries, including the Vijayārāma and the one at Puliyankulama, had similar plans.¹ Thus, although these monasteries had three tiers like the Potgulvehera, their whole layout seems to be different, leading Bell to remark:

Whatever uncertainty may exist as to the identification of the "Pot-gul Vehera" itself, there can hardly be any regarding the source of inspiration for the laying out of the Monastery as a whole on lines unique even at Polonnaruwa, and markedly divergent from the nearest approximation discovered at Anurādhapura; viz., the Monasteries at Puliyamkulam ... and "Vijayārāma".

¹ Prematilleke and Silva, op.cit., p.64.
² Bell, ASCAR (1906), p.16.
In searching for foreign influence on its architecture, Bell came to the conclusion that the Potgulvehera was a transplantation, on humbler lines, of the temple of Mebon (Mébon).¹

Cambodian monuments such as the temple of Mebon and Pre Rup resemble the Potgulvehera in plan. The temple of East Mebon (Plan 4), erected in A.D.952, was an example of the early Khmer pyramid temple built on three tiers of artificial terraces.²

The base of the topmost tier of Mebon is a 95 feet square platform about 6 feet 7 inches high, and is made of moulded sandstone.³

It supports five towers arranged in quincunx, the central tower being further elevated on a foundation about four feet high.⁴

This arrangement of the towers is thus similar to that of the central shrine and four stupas on the top tier of the Potgulvehera.⁵

Below the central pyramid tower are two more levels enclosed by walls with entrance pavilions. Each side of the uppermost of these two tiers is occupied by small brick towers, all eight of

---

¹ Ibid., p.17.
³ H. Parmentier, Angkor-guide, p.100.
⁵ This was not an arrangement entirely new to Sinhalese architecture, since some of the stupas at Anuradhapura have small stupas at each of the four corners of the platform supporting the main one.
them facing east. Four rectangular buildings at the corners face east and west.¹ The wall surrounding this level is low, with a laterite foundation, and it has a small gopura and a stairway on each side leading to the lower level.

The third and lowest level is also surrounded by a low wall with a small stairway and a gopura on each side. This tier is about 316 feet square.² It is occupied by an almost continuous row of halls with porches.³ At the corners of each tier are sandstone elephants harnessed with ropes with bells.⁴ An identical plan was used on a smaller scale for the Pre Rup monument, which was built about fifteen years afterwards.⁵

Thus there are striking resemblances between both these buildings and Potgulvehera, all having three tiers, a similar arrangement of the pirivenas, and a symmetrical placing of the five monuments on the uppermost tiers.

However, certain differences are also evident. The layout of the terraces at Potgulvehera is not so regular as at Mebon,

⁵ Ibid., pp.98 ff.
and the entrances are simpler than those of the Cambodian temples. Whereas in Mebon there are four main entrances, the Potgulvehera had only one, plus two subsidiary entrances for access to the lower two tiers from the south and west. Finally, the temple of Mebon was a Hindu temple and the Potgulvehera was a Buddhist saÃ«ghârama. ¹

These minor differences, however, may be regarded as the natural divergence of Sinhalese and Khmer architectural forms, the important features in common being more significant. Archaeological evidence has revealed that Cambodian craftsmen were familiar with both the general plan and the details of this type of building, of which there are several other examples in Cambodia. Therefore it is not impossible that the Potgulvehera monument was inspired by Cambodian architecture, and modified in accordance with the needs and interest of the Sinhalese Buddhists of the Polonnaruva period.

From an inscription found at Potgulvehera it appears that the monument was originally built by Parãkrâmarâhu I and then improved by two of his queens.² According to the Cûlavâmpâ, Parâkrâmarâhu I built a mandalamandirâ as a place in which to

¹ Bell, ASCAR (1906), p.17.
listen to the Jātaka stories. Bell suggested that this mandalamandira could have been the Potgulvehera monument. Geiger does not agree with Bell, but has given no reason for his disagreement. Although we cannot say whether the Potgulvehera was indeed the mandalamandira or not, epigraphical evidence proves that it belongs to the reign of Parākramabāhu I.

As mentioned above, relations between Ceylon and Cambodia during the reign of Parākramabāhu I were so close as to be one of the causes of conflict between Ceylon and Burma. We have suggested the arrival of a Cambodian mission during his reign. Bell has gone as far as suggesting that the Kāmbājavāsala mentioned in one of the inscriptions of Niśāmikamalla was to the south of the city of Polonnaruva, in which case it is not impossible that the Potgulvehera was built there in commemoration of the arrival of this mission. If the Cambodian emissaries had provided the general plan of the Cambodian prasāts at the request of the Sinhalese king, Ceylonese craftsmen who followed it would

1 Cv, LXXIII, 72.
2 ASCAR (1906), pp.10 ff.
3 Cv, LXXIII, 72, note 1.
4 See supra, p.49.
5 See supra, p.46.
have used their own knowledge of Buddhist architecture in carrying it out, thus creating the fusion of Cambodian and Sinhalese architecture found in the Potgulvehera. It would not be out of place to quote Bell on this:

In the erection of the 'Pot-gul-vehera' monastery, Ceylon and Cambodian architecture joined firm hands, each yielding somewhat to the idiosyncrasies of a people mostly foreign by blood, but united in bonds of faith and close friendship.¹

Cambodian influence on Sinhalese architecture is to be seen in yet another place: the fortress of Yapahuva, a former capital of Ceylon. Here there is a stairway resembling a staircase which gave access to certain prasāts in Cambodia (Plate 34). It leads to a porch on a terrace at the foot of the rock which gives access to a building which has been identified as a palace.²

This palace, or rajamāligāva, was approached on the east by three flights of steps separated by terraces. The first of these, with 24 steps and plain balustrades, led to a broad terrace retained by a stone wall. There were about 50 feet between the top of this flight and the bottom of the next, which consisted of 40 steps and brought one to another terrace from which the third and the most interesting flight of steps

¹ Bell, ASCAR (1906), p.17
² ASCAR (1910-11), pp. 57 ff.
commenced. This last flight led to the porch of the palace.  

It is this third flight which has been compared to Cambodian staircases. Its 35 steps were flanked by heavy balustrades, the top of which were profusely ornamented with wonderfully carved figures. This flight gave on to a narrow terrace in front of the doorway of the palace itself. The lower steps of this flight were flanked by pedestals, the first of which supported huge simhas or lions, the next two rākṣasas or demons, and then a pair of gajasimhas or creatures with the heads of elephants and the bodies of lions. 2 Bell further described it as follows:

The side walls, forming the abutment of these stairs, rise vertically, with moulded outline for the most part, in series of stepped platforms externally. In plan, the staircase shows the outlines of a gangwayed portico with recessed bay projecting from the face of the porch vestibule. The terraced platform, which the staircase pierces, juts out 11 ft. 8 in. from the vestibule and, after a right-angle return of 4 ft., is extended for a further 6 ft. giving it a projection of 17 ft. 8 in. altogether.

Flights of steps featuring, for example, balustrades, moonstones and guard-stones were quite usual in Sinhalese architecture from the early centuries of the Christian Era. The third staircase at Yapahuva is, however, different from any

---

1 ASCAR (1910-11), p.57.
2 Ibid., p.58.
3 Ibid.
staircase still extant. Hocart\(^1\) thought it had been influenced by the Pāṇḍya or Vijayanagara styles of India, but no exactly similar type of stairway has been found in either place. Victor Goloubew was the first to notice the affinity between the Yapahuva staircase and those of the Khmer prasāts, although he did not believe this resemblance was due to contact between Ceylon and Cambodia.\(^2\)

When one examines some of the Cambodian staircases, it would appear that Goloubew's opinion is correct. The Bakheng temple, built in Yasodharman's reign (A.D. 889-900), has axial staircases with seated stone lions flanking each flight. Another Bakong temple of Indravarman's reign had similar staircases, as did the Pre Rup temple.\(^3\) The best Cambodian examples for comparison with the stairway of Yapahuva are the Phimeanakas stairways at Angkor Thom (Plate 35), belonging to the reign of King Jayavarman V (A.D. 968-1001).\(^4\) The resemblance shows that the Yapahuva stairway is another example of Cambodian influence on the architecture of Ceylon.

The Cambodian influence may have reached Yapahuva through the Jāvaka association of the place. First it came into contact

\(^2\) JCBRAS, Vol. XXXI, p. 461.
\(^3\) Philip Rawson, The Art of South-east Asia, pp. 48, 54, 65, 75.
\(^4\) Groslier, Indo-China, p. 119.
with the Jávakas when Candrabhānu marched there and demanded the Buddhist relics from Parākramabāhu II. Although the Culavamsa does not mention that Candrabhānu captured Yapahuva, from the account given it appears likely that he had in fact captured the fortress and kept it for himself for some time. The chronicle describing his subsequent defeat by the Sinhalese army, mentions that the latter captured the royal paraphernalia, the women of the harem, horses, elephants and the royal treasure, etc., and that Candrabhānu's defeat took place near the fortress of Yapahuva. The likelihood that the Jávaka kingdom was extended under Candrabhānu's son has been referred to above, and it is even possible that he may have captured the kingdom of Yapahuva after the death of Bhuvanaikabāhu I (A.D.1272-84).

Thus it would appear that Yapahuva was twice under the Jávakas - during the reign of Candrabhānu and that of his son. If they had the fortress for some time it is feasible that Cambodian influence could have reached Yapahuva through them, as they came from the Malay Peninsula where we have evidence of Cambodian impact on the local art and architecture.

1 Cv, LXXXVIII, 64 ff.
2 See supra, pp.192-93.
The Lankatilaka-vihara in Kandy (Plan 5), dating from the Gampola period, is another monument which exhibits South-east Asian characteristics. It is built on the hill of Pahangala in Handessa, close to Gampola. It would appear from the Sinhalese inscription found there that Senālaṅkādhikāra, chief minister during the reign of Bhuvanaikabāhu, was the founder of this shrine and it was built in A.D. 1344.¹

The ground plan of this shrine is cruciform. It has a 35 feet square sanctuary enclosed by an outer casing wall making a circumambulatory passage along three sides. Paranavitana describes it as follows:

On ground plan, the Lankatilaka consists of an inner shrine which on the exterior measures 35 ft. square with a projection 22 ft. by 8 1/2 ft. on the east. Internally this inner shrine comprises a garbha 19 ft. square, and an antechamber 16 ft. by 10 ft. with a communicating passage between the two. As originally designed, the building appears to have been intended to consist of these parts only, for the walls of the garbha-grha have, on the exterior, the base mouldings, pilasters and cornices which, in Indian or Sinhalese buildings, are usually found only on a wall exposed to view. This inner shrine, however, has been enclosed by an outer wall, about seven feet in thickness, on all the four sides, so that the shrine, when completed, formed on plan a square measuring 60 ft. each way, with projections on all the four sides. The projections on the north, west and south measures 26 ft. by 10 ft., while that

on the east, where the main entrance is, measures 30 ft. by 20 ft. Doorways with flights of steps had been provided at the front of each projection.

Thus the interior of this shrine is similar to Polonnaruva monuments such as Thūpārana and Laṅkātīlaka. In the inner cella of the Laṅkātīlaka-vihāra at Kandy there is a colossal brick and stucco image of the seated Buddha. There is a devāle, or niche containing popular gods and their spouses, in the middle of each exterior wall of the shrine.

The plan of this shrine is unparalleled in the architecture of the period, though that of a building excavated at Anurādhapura somewhat resembles it in having a cella, a circumambulatory passage and four projections. This latter was a result of Pāla influence, but was not repeated in Sinhalese architecture during the Anurādhapura or Polonnaruva periods. In fact the only other building at all similar - the Laṅkātīlaka - was constructed about five centuries later, and it is therefore not impossible that foreign influences were responsible for its plan. As there was not much contact with India during the Gampola period, it is

unlikely that the Paharpur temple in Bengal which has a similar plan would have been used as a model this time. There is no similar example in South India, and therefore we must look for a source of inspiration elsewhere.

Nandadeva Mudiyanse has drawn attention to the similarity of the Ananda temple in Pagan, which he thinks may have provided some inspiration for the Sinhalese temple. The distinguishing feature of the Ananda temple is also its cruciform plan (Plan 6). The main temple consists of a 175 ft. square basement about 30 ft. in height. A large porch projects from each side of the basement. Facing the four cardinal points are four huge standing Buddha images, one in the centre of each side of the basement. 'Two circumambulatory and parallel corridors run round it covered with lofty vaults and communicating with the deep recesses in the central block ... and the porches outside by transversal corridors.' This monument was built during the reign of Kyanzittha of Pagan (A.D.1084-1112), and the traditional date of its foundation is A.D.1090.

Thus a comparison between the two temples reveals differences as well as similarities. Where the Ananda temple has a solid

3 Ibid.
square basement instead of a central cella, the Lankatilaka shrine had a garbha-grha, a familiar feature of Sinhalese architecture. Then the Ananda temple has two circumambulatory passages instead of the one at Lankatilaka, and the latter had deities, not Buddha images, facing the four cardinal points as at the Ananda temple. However, apart from these disparities, there is a striking similitude in the ground plan, vaulting, roofing, and wall-treatment of both monuments, all of which make it not impossible that a building so unusual in Ceylon as the Lankatilaka could have been in some part inspired by the Pagan temple. The close religious contacts between Ceylon and Burma from the eleventh century on, discussed above, would suggest that this is not mere surmise. As the Ananda temple in Pagan was a very important one, known all over Burma, it is most probable that Buddhist monks and pilgrims visiting Ceylon would have been able to produce a plan of it which, when fused with Sinhalese ideas on Buddhist viharas, could have resulted in the Lankatilaka.

Thus we can conclude that whereas the design of stupas in Thailand, Burma and the Malay Peninsula was affected by Sinhalese influence, as was other religious architecture in Thailand from

---

2 See supra, pp.220 ff.
the thirteenth to the fifteenth century, there was also a movement in the opposite direction as Burmese and Cambodian architecture began to influence that of Ceylon.
The Effects on Sculpture

With the spread of Hinduism and Buddhism in South-east Asia, the art traditions of these Faiths, too, reached this part of the world from the Indian Sub-continent. The archaeological remains show that the worship of Hindu and Buddhist images, widely known among the people of South-east Asia from the early centuries, was undoubtedly due to Indian influence. However, when Ceylon became the fountain-head of Theravāda Buddhism, she also passed on some of her Buddhist art traditions to the countries with which she had religious contacts for a considerable period. Hence it is not surprising to see some Sinhalese influence in Buddhist sculpture and even some images imported from Ceylon in South-east Asia.

The spread of ideas about sculpture was faster than that of architectural ideas because it was quite practical for missionaries, pilgrims and even traders to carry with them images of gods or the Buddha which they worshipped. The missionaries needed them for religious purposes, and pilgrims returned with statuettes or votive tablets after visiting the sacred places in India or Ceylon. The traders, who were great
believers in their own Faith, would have carried with them idols which they worshipped to ensure the success of their journey.

As far as architecture was concerned, whenever the craftsmen of South-east Asia wanted to build a monument inspired by either an Indian or a Ceylonese model, they had to depend chiefly upon the memories of the people who had visited these lands or the missionaries who described the buildings that they had seen and remembered. Though some of the pilgrims, such as the Chinese, took back with them miniature drawings of the buildings which impressed them, the final form of the monument would have been left to the imagination of the craftsmen who worked on them.

The case was slightly different with sculpture because the direct importation of images from India and Ceylon guided local artists in successfully creating their own art traditions. With such images actually in front of them to be studied carefully before they started making images themselves they had a clear picture in their minds which helped them to create superb results.

The direct importation of images from India and Ceylon is well attested by archaeological finds, but since here we are interested in Sinhalese influence on the sculpture of
South-east Asia and vice versa, attention will be confined to such finds as are evidence of that influence.

A number of Buddha images recovered from various countries in South-east Asia have close affinity to some of the Indian images and therefore one could suggest that they were imported from India itself. However, when an image which appears to be Indian is recovered anywhere, very seldom can we determine whether it was imported direct from India, or from another place where the dominant factor in the art tradition was Indian influence, or whether it was a local production by Indian craftsmen already working in the particular country in which it is found. Alternatively, it could also be the product of local artists who themselves were fully under the influence of Indian art or had even been trained in India.¹

In some countries of South-east Asia a few bronze Buddha images have been found, made in the Amaravati-Sinhalese style and dated in the middle of the first millennium A.D. They are some of the earliest Buddha images recovered in the region. A standing Buddha image from Khorat in Thailand (Plate 36), one from Sikendeng in Celebes (Plate 37), and

two images from Java, one seated (Plate 38) and one standing, fall into this category.¹

Although all these images broadly represent the familiar features of the Amarāvatī style, a careful examination reveals that they have characteristics which are somewhat different from the original Indian Amarāvatī statues. These peculiar features are common in various Buddha images made in Ceylon which exhibit some Amarāvatī influence, and therefore a comparison would suggest that some of these images were made in Ceylon and then taken to South-east Asia.²

Unlike its clearly visible effects on the architecture of the Sukhodaya period, Sinhalese influence is not easily discernible in its sculpture, where the skill and imagination of the experienced Sukhodaya artists fully absorbed foreign influences. They transformed the foreign art traditions from which they derived inspiration into a new school of sculpture of their own. Therefore it is not surprising to discover that there are no exact resemblances to images in Ceylon, and only

² Ibid.
by a careful comparative study of the iconography of this school of sculpture can one notice the Sinhalese contribution.

The Sukhodaya period, the first flowering of Thai culture, was also culturally one of the best periods of Thai history. Hundreds of bronze and stucco Buddha images were produced in Sukhodaya and artistically some of them can be grouped among the best statues produced in any Buddhist country in the world.

When the anatomy, costume, and posture of the Sukhodaya Buddha images are examined, one notices different elements at work in the formation of this school of sculpture. According to Griswold, who made a thorough study of it, the iconography of the old images in the Dvāravatī and Khmer styles, together with the Pāli texts which describe the features of the Buddha, were the main influences on the Sukhodaya school. Additional, though secondary, the inspiration came from the accounts of Buddha's various marks in Sanskrit Buddhist texts, from the small clay tablets imported from India, Burma and Ceylon, and from the unconscious imitation of nature by Sukhodaya artists.¹

A close analysis of the iconography of Sukhodaya Buddha images shows that Sinhalese influence indeed contributed to

the formation of this school of sculpture. This is more
apparent in the seated images of the Sage than in the Standing
and Walking Buddhas. The most common posture of the seated
figures is the viśāsana, the 'hero pose', also known as the
classic paryaṅkāsana. Here the legs are not interlocked, but
the right foot lies on top of the left calf with the sole
turned upwards while the left foot is only partly visible
beneath the right calf (Plates 39-40). This arrangement of
the legs of the Sukhodaya Buddhas is different from the
lightly-interlocked position used in North Indian sculpture,
and even the Amarāvati pose of South Indian examples is
slightly different as regards the crossing of the legs at the
ankles.¹

The commonest pose of the seated Buddhas of Ceylon is the
viśāsana. The legs of these images are shown without any
semblance of rigidity and they are placed in an easy position
(Plates 41-42). The images of the eleventh and twelfth
centuries, which are closer in date to the Sukhodaya statues,
show some rhythmical movement of the legs, which are slightly
curved upwards. The difference is very apparent for example
in the twelfth century seated Buddha image of the Galvihāra

at Polonnaruva (Plate 43), which belongs to the reign of Parākramabāhu I (A.D.1153-86). This same rhythmical posture is noticeable in the Sukhodaya Buddha images and could be a result of Sinhalese influence.

Another feature that could have been copied from the Sinhalese Buddhas is the flame-like usnīsa which is very prominent in the Sukhodaya Buddhas (Plates 44-46). This idea no doubt originated in India, where it is referred to in literary sources. The following reference to the usnīsa appears in the Saddharma-pundarīka in the form of a question.

By reason of what jñāna is it that the Tathāgata's cranial protuberance (murdhny-usnīsa) shines? In the Lalitavistara this question is answered as follows:

When the Buddha is in samādhi, a ray, called the ornament of the Light of Gnosis (jñāna) proceeding from the opening in the cranial protuberance (usnīsa) moves above his head.

There was a belief that this rasmi proceeded from Buddha's head and in some of the images of the Gupta period

---

2 For example figs. 129, 131, 142 in Le May's A Concise History of Buddhist Art in Siam. Chand and Yimsiri, Thai Monumental Bronzes, figs. 46-54.
4 Lalitavistara, ed. Lefmann, p.3.
took the form of a halo around the head of the Buddha. That
this idea of a halo reached South-east Asia also is apparent
from the back of the heads of certain statues which show
vestiges of a halo which was once attached. Bronzes of
standing Buddhas from Sungai Golok, an image from Nakhon
Pathom in Thailand and the statue of the seated Buddha from
Java, all have a lug behind the head which may have been meant
for holding a halo.¹

Other early Buddhas had only an usnīṣa on the top of the
head. The flame was absent and the protuberance or usnīṣa
arose from the idea of a turban, though later it became the
special mark or laksana of a person who is destined to become
a universal monarch, or the Buddha, the Enlightened One.²

We have no clear evidence to show the evolution of the
usnīṣa into a flame-like object in Indian sculpture. However,
Buddha images from Buddha Gaya, Nalanda and Nagapaṭṭanaṁ in
India have a flame-like usnīṣa on the top of the head.³ This

¹ Griswold, 'Imported Images and the Nature of Copying in the
Art of Siam', Essays Offered to G.H. Luce, Vol.II, figs.8, 9,
12 and 14.
² Coomaraswamy, 'Buddha's Cūda, Hair, Usnīṣa, and Crown', JRAS
(1928), pp.815-41.
Nagapaṭṭanaṁ and other Buddhist Bronzes in the Madras Museum',
Bulletin of the Madras Government Museum, NS, General Section,
Vol.VII, no.1 (1965), pp.28 ff; pl.II, fig.1, pl.III, figs 1-2;
pl.IV, figs 2-4, pl.V, figs.1-4.
modification did not gain any ground in South-east Asia until the Thais started making images of the Master in the thirteenth century. The Dvāravatī and the pre-Khmer images of Buddha have no flame-like usṇīṣa. In fact, from an imported image found in Thailand belonging to the Dvāravatī period, it appears that, though the idea was known in Dvāravatī, it was ignored by the artists there. The image from Khorat which appears to have been imported from Ceylon and approximately belongs to the fifth century A.D., has a small three-branched rāśmi or flame finial (Plate 36). This feature next appears in the thirteenth century and it would seem that the idea of a flame-like finial first appeared during the Sukhodaya period.

Since Sukhodaya had closer relations with Ceylon than with India, it is not impossible that the flame-like usṇīṣa was introduced to Sukhodaya from Ceylon, where it was well-known and widely accepted in Buddhist iconography by the time Ceylon and Sukhodaya came into contact. Although absent in the early Sinhalese Buddhas of the Anurādhapura period, by about the eighth century this flame begins to appear, as is instanced by the bronze image from Kankanodei (Plate 47), Batticaloa (presently in the Colombo National Museum). The colossal statue of Buddha at Avukana too has such a flame (Plate 48), although it is difficult to give a definite date to this image other than
placing it before the tenth century A.D. The flame is noticeably lacking on the famous images of Galvihāra dating from the Polonnaruva period but it is possible that it was originally there and was later broken off.¹ For by the end of the Polonnaruva period this flame-like usnīsa had become well-known, and during the Gampola period (A.D.1341-1415), when Ceylon and Sukhodaya had close religious links, it had become more or less the rule (Plates 49-53).² Thus the flame-like usnīsa which became a very prominent feature in the Sukhodaya Buddha images would have followed the introduction of the Sinhalese Buddhism into Sukhodaya.³

Most of the Sukhodaya Buddhas wear the robe in the open mode with the end of the material thrown over the left shoulder, an arrangement which would have been in accordance with that practised by Buddhist monks of Sukhodaya (Plate 54). In Ceylon Sinhalese artists always followed the open mode (41 and 43), leaving the right shoulder bare in accordance with monastic practice of the Sinhalese monks.⁴ Since the Sukhodaya monks

¹ Le May, A Concise History of Buddhist Art in Siam, p.119, note 1.
³ Le May, The Culture of South-east Asia, pp.174
⁴ Devendra, op.cit., p.70.
were influenced by the Sinhalese form of Buddhism they also
would have preferred the open mode and therefore the Sukhodaya
artists who worked from nature presumably copied the fashion
they saw around them.

The spiritual, serene and graceful expression of the
Sukhodaya Buddha images (Plates 39-40) has been commented on
by Silpa Bhirasri as follows:

A typical Sukhothai image represents the Gautama
Buddha after His Enlightenment. The body is in
complete rest, the muscles are relaxed, and the
face is serene with a faint smile reflecting a
state of deep inward contentment. After His
Enlightenment, the Buddha belonged more to the
sphere of Nirvana than to the Earth and therefore
the Thai conceived an image in which this ethereal
quality is perfectly realized. The Sukhothai
images of the Buddha, whether sitting, walking or
reclining all have a particular undulating and
soaring character which seems to render immaterial
the heavy bronze of which they are made. Yet this
spirituality does not destroy the qualities of the
statues. 1

This quality would have been mainly through the Theravāda
Buddhist influence in Sukhodaya. This same serene expression
is to be seen in the Sinhalese Buddha images which in this
respect surpass those of India. The Ceylon Buddhist, too,
considers the teacher to have risen above any inclination to
fit into a special situation. His teaching is that man must

1 Silpa Bhirasri, An Appreciation of Sukhothai Art, Thai
Culture, New Series, no.17, p.5.
conquer both love and joy in the emotional sense. So that it was a lofty serenity, unruffled by human passion, which the Sinhalese sculptor most associated with the Buddha, and the face of the Buddha reflects dignity and a complete triumph over emotion of which never a trace shows. Sinhalese artists were able to represent the master with the passionlessness typical of a Buddha who has conquered this earthly life, and this quality can be seen in most of the Buddha images in Ceylon, whether seated or standing, from the early centuries of the Christian Era (Plates 41 and 55). As this quality is also found in works from Sukhodaya, it seems likely that Buddhist monks who were from Ceylon or had studied in Ceylon instructed the local artists on how to achieve this expression. Thus it appears that there are features which show that some Sinhalese influence contributed to the formation of Sukhodaya art.

This Sinhalese influence reached Sukhodaya through several channels, one of the most significant ways being the curious description of the Buddha's person given in the Pali canon and commentaries written in Ceylon. The Sukhodaya artists

---

1 Devendra, op.cit., p.71; plates I-XVIII.
took these descriptions as their authority; they were convinced that these marks were essential in any portrayal of the Buddha and they must have felt them deeply and seen them in their imagination when they made the images of the Master.

The Lakkhana Suttanta of the Dīghanikāya gives an account of the thirty-two marks of a superior being destined to be a rāja Cakkavatti, a universal monarch, or Sammasambuddha, the Enlightened One. Projecting heels, long fingers and toes and long hands were among these thirty-two marks. According to this account, such a one can touch and rub his knees with either hand when standing without bending. He has concealed male organs and a golden complexion. The account says that this superior being does not have a furrow between shoulders, and that the hairy mole between the eyebrows known as the ūrṇa was one of the thirty-two marks. These were the most important of the thirty-two marks added by the sculptors when they made Buddha images. These marks also have been referred to in various other Buddhist texts, and the great commentator Buddhaghosa tries to give more meaning to them in his commentaries.

---

2 Suttanipāta (P.T.S.), 547 sq; Paramatthajotikā (P.T.S.), Vol.II, 547 sq.
The description given in the Pali canon and commentaries would have been known to the artists, who had either studied under Buddhist monks or had been Buddhist monks themselves at some stage of their lives. Furthermore the monks who visited Burma, Ceylon and Nakhon Srit'ammarat would have been well versed in the canon and the commentaries composed in Ceylon, and would have guided the artists in the light of the description given in those texts.

The influence of these texts can be seen in the images themselves. For example, since the Buddha's colour is given as gold the statues were covered with lacquer or gold leaf. Furthermore, the soles of the feet were engraved with a wheel, and the network of lines on the palm were also in the form of a wheel. The broad shoulders, bulging breast, narrow waist, long arms, concealed sexual organs, and long and projecting heels of the feet are noticeable in any of the Sukhodaya Buddhas. Thus the Pali text introduced from Ceylon had some share in the formation of the Sukhodaya school of sculpture.

In addition to these Pali texts, there were in Ceylon certain other texts which contained formulas for the construction or drawing of Buddha images, giving detailed dimensions.

---
Coomaraswamy has drawn attention to one such work, known as the Sāriputta, which deals with the dimensions of images in general and of Buddha images in particular. The text is in Sanskrit and it has a Sinhalese gloss which explains it in detail. The first part of this work deals with images in general and the second part is confined to the making of images of the Buddha. From the text it appears that the Sinhalese gloss was composed during the Polonnaruva period; however the date of the original text is hard to determine. ¹

The following passage from the Sāriputta shows the nature of this work.

According to this scale the length of the face is three bhāga. The ushnisha is equal to eight yava. The length of the part just above the brow, covered by hair is three angal. From the centre of the forehead to the centre of the space between the eyes, and from the end of the nostril to the jaw is one bhāga. The piece of flesh projecting beyond the chin is half an angala. From the base of the throat to the top of the neck is three and one-half inches, and from thence to (the end of the breast and thence to) the end of the navel, and from thence to the end of the penis is one tala in each case. ²

² Coomaraswamy, Mediaeval Sinhalese Art, p.155. Coomaraswamy mentions measurements both in inches and angalas. We presume he refers to the same unit in each case; a little less than the standard inch.
Such are the contents of these texts which deal mainly with the technical aspects of image-making and would undoubtedly have helped the artists to overcome technical difficulties.

We are not certain whether these particular texts were introduced into Sukhodaya. At present we have no evidence of such texts in Thailand. However, it is not unlikely that the Sinhalese artists who worked in Sukhodaya\(^1\) were familiar with these works and shared the knowledge they gained from them with the Sukhodaya artists. Furthermore, Buddhist monks from Ceylon or Thai monks who had studied in Ceylon may also have instructed the artists in making images in accordance with the texts.

Another indirect way in which Sinhalese influence reached the Thais was through Dvāravatī sculpture which clearly received some inspiration from Ceylon. The most common classic paryaṇkāsana pose of these Dvāravatī Buddha images (Plates 56–58) probably resulted from the spread of Theravāda Buddhism from Ceylon, for this posture (one leg superimposed upon the other) was the one most commonly found in Ceylon.

The most popular pose of the Dvāravatī seated Buddhas was the dhyāna-mudrā.\(^2\) Since the dhyāna-mudrā is the position of

---

\(^1\) See supra, pp.376-77.

the hands most commonly found in association with the classic paryāṅkāśana pose (Plates 56 and 58), it is likely that it was inspired from Ceylon.¹ The Dvāravatī period Buddhas seated on a nāga clearly show Sinhalese influence. The seven hoods of the nāga, the dhyāna-mudrā and the paryāṅkāśana of these images show that they belong to the Sinhalese-Amarāvatī style (Plates 59-62). However, the Sinhalese aspects of these images are more conspicuous and it is not impossible that even their Amarāvatī features were introduced through Ceylon, for, apart from early images from Amarāvatī itself (Plates 64-65), we do not get evidence of such Buddha images on nāgas from India belonging to a later period than Amarāvatī.² The very idea of making these images in the round was Sinhalese and from the available evidence it would appear that in Ceylon Gupta and post-Gupta influence from India modified the shape and form of these Buddha images on nāgas (Plate 63).³

A striking similarity can be seen when one compares Buddhas on nāgas from Dvāravatī with those of Ceylon. The hoods of the nāgas in the Dvāravatī images are similar to

¹ Ibid., Vol.I, p.239, note 1.
² Ibid., p.258.
³ Ibid., pp.253-54.
Sinhalese ones, as can be seen from a comparison of nāgas from Prachinburi (Plate 59) and the nāga images from Anurādhapura (Plate 66), Tirukkāvi (Plate 67) and Seruvila (Plate 63) in Ceylon, and this is corroborated by other images in the Dvaravatī style from Dong Si Maha P'ot (Plate 62), Lopburi which are all now in the National Museum in Bangkok.

The upper robe leaving the right shoulder bare, the dhyāna-mudrā and the paryāṅkāsana show that they belong to the Amarāvatī-Sinhalese style, although the smoothness of the robe more closely resembles those Sinhalese images showing Gupta influence. According to Dupont, this fusion of Amarāvatī and Gupta characteristics took place in Ceylon before being introduced into Dvaravatī.1 Thus after comparison of these images with Indian and Ceylonese models, Dupont's conclusion is as follows:

Si l'on veut récapituler les apports d'Amarāvatī et de Ceylan qui entrent dans la composition du Buddha môme sur nāga, on notera d'abord la représentation du Buddha lui-même, en dhyāna-mudrā et paryāṅkāsana, avec la samghāti couvrant une seule épaule, et ensuite plusieurs particularités propres au nāga, tenant au nombre des têtes, à leur groupement et à leur forme. Mis à part le type spécial de paryāṅkāsana, les rapprochements auxquels on aboutit concernent Ceylan. 2

---

1 Ibid., p.259.
2 Ibid.
Images imported direct from Ceylon have been discovered among Dvaravati finds, and Griswold writes about them as follows:

Iconography is more adventurous: it travels from one place to another whenever an image makes the trip and inspires a copy. Imported Buddha images must have played a crucial role in the formation of the various schools in Siam. ¹

A case in point is the fifth-century Buddha from Khorat (Plate 36) which could have been a Sinhalese import that guided some of the local artists. ² This image is similar to Sinhalese standing Buddha images and represents Amaravatī-Sinhalese style. The regularity of the pleats of the drapery, the sweet expression of the face, the flat locks of hair and small mouth are the special features of this statue. On top of the head there is a small three-branched rasmi or flame-finial. The lack of an urna which is a prominent feature of Amaravatī images brings the Khorat Buddha closer to Sinhalese ones. The treatment of the drapery too supports such a suggestion.

The Amaravatī Buddha images show fluid rhythm and freedom of lines in the folds of the robe. Pedantically clear lines and rigid parallelism are the main characteristics of the Sinhalese Buddhas of Amaravatī style, and the grooved folds

² Ibid., p.55.
of this garment are distinctly marked. A comparison of one of the Sinhalese images with examples of Nagarjunakonda clearly demonstrates this point. The robes of the Nagarjuna images drape more or less diagonally from over the left shoulder to under the right arm, with the indentation of the folds hardly noticeable from the front. On the other hand a seventh century image from Medavacchiya (Plate 69) in the North Central Province showing the main characteristics of a Sinhalese image of the Anuradhapura period, together with some Amaravati influence, has a robe which is draped in such a way that the folds fall downwards from the left shoulder before making a graceful sweep to the right-hand side.¹

The Buddha image from Amaravati in the Madras Government Museum (Plate 68) has folds running diagonally from the left shoulder to a lower position on the right side under the arm, whereas a Buddha from Ruvanvalisaya (Plate 70) in Ceylon has drapery similar to that of the Medavacchiya image. The drapery of the image from Khorat has folds similar to the Sinhalese statues. The folds show systematic and rigid parallelism, which is not the case with the Amaravati Buddhas, but is similar to the Sinhalese images. Another standing image

unearthed among Dvaravati antiquities at Nakhon Pathom (Nagara Pathama) belongs to a period from the sixth century onwards (Plate 71). The robe is similar to that of the Khorat Buddha and the rest of the features show that this too could be a Sinhalese import.¹ Then there are two Dvaravati copies of Sinhalese models, judging by the Sinhalese characteristics they display, which may belong to the seventh and eighth centuries respectively (Plates 72-73).²

The Sinhalese influence on Dvaravati art is thus very apparent, as is the fact that the Sukhodaya artists were guided by Dvaravati sculpture. When the Thais migrated to Thailand, long before they started to make statues themselves, they learnt to worship Buddha images as their subjects and neighbours had been doing for centuries. Some of these images were old ones made by Mon artists centuries before, some were made by Mon artists who had not come under the influence of the Khmer at all, others were made by various schools that carried on the Dvaravati tradition during the long years of Khmer occupation.³ In fact, even the Thai

¹ Griswold, Essays Offered to G.H. Luce, Vol.II, p.57.
² Ibid., p.58.
rulers were very interested in these old images as is confirmed by the following inscription:

When the great brick sanctuary (of Wat Maha Tat) was finished and solemnly opened, a search was made for ancient stone images of the Buddha. Homage was paid to them and they were collected together in the great sanctuary. In one place a neck or a bust had been found; in another place the hair or an arm or a breast; sometimes the head had fallen and was far from the body and it needed four men to carry it; sometimes a leg or a thigh had been found, sometimes a hand or a foot. All these stone statues of the Buddha were of large size. They had to be placed on a barrow or a cart to be transported to the Great Sanctuary where they were joined together with lime (cement). Some of these statues were magnificent and beautifully decorated, just as if Indra had made them himself. Once restored, they became large, durable, and extremely fine statues of the Buddha. The Great Sanctuary was filled with them and they were placed together in groups or ranged along the galleries. 1

Thus when the Sukhodaya artists started making images themselves they would have remembered these images and known from them what a Buddha image should be like, and thus inherited the Sinhalese inspiration inherent in the Dvaravati tradition.

Certain religious traditions prevailing in Ceylon may have accounted for some of the trends in Sukhodaya art. An example is seen in the Walking Buddhas representing the

---

missionary Buddha, which were so popular during the Sukhodaya period and after. In these, one of the Buddha’s hands is in the gesture of exposition and the other arm swings at His side. One leg is bent with the knee slightly forward and the toe on the ground. The other leg is straight, ‘with the foot planted firmly as if with the deliberate intention of imprinting its shape on the ground’. Sometimes the hand performs the gesture of dispelling fear (Plate 74). ¹

Various symbols represent various aspects of the Buddhist religion. In Buddhist art a seat or a bo-tree represents the enlightenment, the wheel the first sermon, and the footprint the peregrination, all three being important events in Buddha’s life. ² Griswold’s account of the Walking Buddha clearly explains its symbolic value:

The Walking Buddha represents the missionary aspect of the religion. If he performs the gesture of exposition as he moves forward, he is obviously converting someone. If he performs the gesture of Dispelling Fear, he has just completed a conversion. But he is also doing something else: he is pressing one foot to the ground as if pressing a seal into sealing-wax, exactly as he did on Adam’s Peak. ³

Thus the Walking Buddha represents the pressing of the Master's footprint into the ground.

In Ceylon the footprint of the Buddha is highly venerated and Adam's Peak, where the Buddha's footprint is to be seen, is visited by thousands of devotees. The Mahāvamsa tells why Sinhalese Buddhists venerated this mountain. In this chronicle it is said that the Buddha, foreseeing that his doctrine would take firm root in Laṅkā, consecrated the Island by making three visits to it. On his third visit in the eighth year after the enlightenment, at the invitation of the nāga king Maniakkhika, He left the traces of his foot on the Sumanakūṭa.\(^1\) Buddha is also said to have left his footprint in other places which he visited.\(^2\)

We have no other mention of the footprint on Adam's Peak in literary sources until the Polonnaruva period. However, from then onwards it became an important place of worship for

\(^1\) Mv. I, 77

\(^2\) Bidyalankarana, op.cit., pp.39-41.
the rulers of Ceylon, made various donations towards its upkeep. Thus the footprint of Ceylon had become sacred by the time Sukhodaya and Ceylon came into contact, and the Mahavamsa account of Buddha's visit to Ceylon and the leaving of this footprint was well-known and had taken firm root. The kings of Sukhodaya would have been very eager to follow the example of Ceylon in all religious matters and must often have wished that the Great Sage had favoured their country as he had favoured that Island by visiting it and leaving his footprint as a record of his peaceful conquest. The footprint represented either the Master's visit to a place, or later on, the fact that his teaching had reached it. Thus in Thailand

1 Vijayabāhu I (A.D.1055-1110), after seeing the difficulties encountered by pilgrims on their way to worship this footprint, dedicated a village called Gilimale to provide for their needs. Cv, LX, 64-67. Nissānākamalla is said to have gone on a pilgrimage to the peak and worshipped the footprint. Cv, LXXX, 24; CJSG, Vol.II, 20-21. Parakramabāhu II, too, according to the Culavamsa, went on a pilgrimage to this sacred mountain and dedicated to it the revenues of a region measuring ten gāvutas in length. Cv, LXXXV, 118-20; Paranavitana, The God of Adam's Peak, p.15. In addition, a minister named Devapatiraja built bridges, rest houses, and a pavillion enclosed by a wall on the summit, installed iron chains to make the ascent easy, and conducted a great festival celebrating the worship of the footprint. Cv, LXXXVI, 20-33. Vijayabāhu, the son of Parākramabāhu II, also undertook a pilgrimage to the mountain. Cv, LXXXVIII, 48.


3 Bidyalankarana, op.cit., p.48.
where there was no evidence to show that Buddha himself left his footprint, they had to be satisfied with replicas of it, representing the spread of the religion.¹

According to their inscriptions, the rulers of Sukhodaya took impressions of the traces left by the Master's foot on Adam's Peak and had exact copies made, and the worship of the copies of footprint became very important in Sukhodaya. Some of the places where footprint were carved were named after the Sumanakūṭapabbata, which shows that the importance of footprint worship owed much to Ceylon.²

The Walking Buddha, which was not very well known in India, Ceylon or Burma became popular in Thailand because He represented the leaving of a footprint. Griswold says:

So when the Walking Buddha wishes to signify that a land is his inheritance he places this prodigious seal upon it. And when a ruler wishes to signify that in his land Buddha's religion will flourish he can hardly do better than to install such seals on hill-tops near his principal cities, at the same time ordering his sculptors to make images of the Lord of the World himself converting the people and impressing his footprint. ³

Thus Buddhist traditions popular in Ceylon, when introduced into Sukhodaya, gave rise to the popularity of the Walking Buddhas which are a special feature of Sukhodaya sculpture.

Just as during the Dvaravati period, the Buddha images were brought from Ceylon during the Sukhodaya period when religious contacts between the two countries became close. These imported models would have guided the sculptors in the creation of their own works. Unlike recent European artists who are mainly concerned with originality, Buddhist artists prided themselves on their ability to copy. Griswold explains this as follows:

There are good reasons for this. The patron who commissions an image is usually not a connoisseur: he is either a prince offering a handsome gift to religion, or else merely a citizen wishing to "make merit"—perhaps in connection with his sixtieth birthday or some other occasion. So when the sculptor asks him what he wants the image to look like, the line of least resistance is for him to say: "or, make it look like such-and-such", naming one of the best known statues in the community. In any case, unless the patron is a severe rationalist (and rationalists must have been in the minority in mediaeval times), he hopes to produce a miraculous device. In order to inherit some fraction of the infinite power the Buddha himself possessed, an image must trace its lineage back to one of the legendary "authentic" likenesses, such as the sandalwood figure carved at Kosala by artists who knew him personally. But how can the patron be certain that the statue he chooses as a model is really in the true succession? The safest course is to choose one that has proved itself
by displaying unusual magic power. Since by that very fact it will have already become illustrious, there is every reason to copy a famous model, none at all to copy an obscure one. 1

Thus a pious devotee would naturally select a highly and widely venerated image as a model to be copied. From the stories which had grown up around various statues it appears that Buddha images from India and Ceylon were regarded as holy relics and they therefore would have served as models for the artists of Sukhodaya. Well-known Buddha images and miniature models must have reached there from holy places, in particular through returning pilgrims. In order to demonstrate their holiness and importance the owners of these statues probably attributed to them some of the local legends.

Amongst the literary evidence for such importations of images from Ceylon is the story given in the Jinakālamālī and in the Sihīṅga-Buddharūpanidāna about a Buddha image made in Ceylon and imported to Sukhodaya during the reign of Indrāditya, where it was highly venerated by the rulers as well as by their subjects. 2 In fact if we are to believe the account, the image through its miraculous powers succeeded in arriving by itself on the shores of Thailand after a

1 Griswold, Dated Buddha Images of Northern Siam, p. 17.
2 See supra, pp. 281 ff.
shipwreck. After the fall of the Sukhodaya kingdom the image was moved to various places and several copies of it were made. The story tells us that the rulers of various kingdoms in Thailand even went to war in order to possess it, and naturally every king who came into possession of the statue would have had copies made to prevent the original from falling into enemy hands. Therefore the next ruler to obtain possession of such an image, unaware that he had been cheated by his enemy, would imagine that he had acquired the original Sinhalese Buddha, a process which was repeated several times during the course of events.¹

Unfortunately it is not now possible to identify the original Sinhalese Buddha image, and perhaps it was even lost for ever while being moved from one place to another, although at present three statues are claimed to be the original. One is at Chiangmai (Plate 75), one at Nakhon Srit'ammarat (Plate 76), and the other in the National Museum in Bangkok (Plate 77). The first two images cannot be accepted as copies of a Sinhalese model, however, because the iconography is quite different from that of the Sinhalese Buddhas. Both are in the bhūmisparśa-mudrā pose which is not well-known in the Sinhalese sculpture.

Griswold thought that both were copies of a Nālandā model which was introduced during the reign of King Tiloka of Chiangmai and which was claimed as the Sinhalese Buddha at a time when a substitute was sought for the lost image.¹ The iconography of the statue in the National Museum, on the other hand, suggests that it could be a copy of a Sinhalese image. At one stage Buribhand thought that this was the original image brought from Ceylon and the drastic alterations made to it about a century ago accounted for disparities between it and the Sinhalese art style.² However the differences are conspicuous enough to warrant the assumption that it is a copy rather than an importation from Ceylon.

The image is in the dhyāna-mudrā position commonly found among Sinhalese Buddha images, and the vīrāsana and even the flame-like uṣṇīṣa suggest its affinity to them (Plate 78). The differences which appear in the style of the image could have occurred as the copy was modified through the incorporation of local ideas in the process of copying. Chand and Yimsiri explain this as follows:

¹ See infra, p.435, note 2.
It should be understood that any "copy" of the Sihing made by the ancients would not be like an "exact" copy of today when we could make a negative, but that it would be a new "modelling" as like as the artists of that time could make it - either of the same size as the "original" ... or an enlargement .... Under such circumstances the local "handiwork" would be incorporated not only in the modelling, but in the casting as well.

Before the Thais established themselves in Northern Thailand, the Mon kingdom of Lamphun was in the Dvaravati cultural sphere. It doubtless also favoured Theravāda Buddhism, and in addition probably came under the Theravāda Buddhist influence of its neighbour, Pagan. Archaeological evidence confirms that Lamphun had an art tradition associated with Buddhism and this was inherited together with Theravāda by the Thais when they migrated and subjugated Lamphun. The rulers of Lamphun recorded their services to the religion in stone inscriptions written in Mon interspersed with Pāli. Besides these, they had stūpas built and stone and terracotta Buddha images modelled.

The unification under Mengrai in A.D.1292, and the foundation of the new capital Chiangmai four years later, were

1 Chand and Yimsiri, Thai Monumental Bronzes, p.74.
important steps in the history of Northern Thailand.\textsuperscript{1} The Thais of the north came into close contact with the Theravāda Buddhist art tradition, and Buddhist culture received a new impetus during this reign.

The Lamphun art tradition inherited by the Thais was a provincial version of Dvāravatī art. The architects and the sculptors who now worked for new Thai masters would have been Mons or Thais trained in the Mon art tradition. Therefore the sculpture made during the early stages of the Thai kingdom of Chiangmai was a continuation of Lamphun style.\textsuperscript{2}

However up until the present not many examples of the Lamphun style have been recovered. Apart from a few bronzes, most of them are terracotta and there is no way of differentiating between the products of the Lamphun period and the early Chiangmai period because the sculpture of both periods is of the same style. In any case, as far as we can tell, these sculptures are in the Dvāravatī style,\textsuperscript{3} although the archaeological evidence is too meagre to enable us to say whether the Sinhalese influence on the Dvāravatī style reached as far as Lamphun. The influence of Lamphun or Mon architecture

\textsuperscript{1} Griswold, JSS, Vol. XLI, p.102.
\textsuperscript{2} Ibid., p.103.
\textsuperscript{3} Ibid.
prāsāda would suggest that there were some contacts with Lamphun, but there is no way of determining whether these led to Sinhalese influence on the sculpture.

The second stage in the development of Chiangmai sculpture was brought about by the introduction of the Sukhodaya style. When the Forest-dwelling sect of the Buddhist monks led by Sumana was introduced into Northern Thailand by King Gû Na or Kilana in A.D. 1269,¹ Sumana found that he needed some device for spreading the religion. He therefore suggested that the king should have four large standing images cast in bronze. The monarch agreed to the project which was begun under the supervision of Sumana and took two years to complete.² The original form of these statues is no longer discernible as they were subject to alteration in later times. However, the epigraphical evidence shows that Sumana had them made on the pattern of images already seen elsewhere, probably in Sukhodaya.³

² Ibid., pp.198-200.
Thus Sumana's visit led to the introduction of art traditions of Sukhodaya into the kingdom of Chiangmai. A statue Sumana brought with him was used as a model at the request of the king himself. This style of Buddhist art introduced by Sumana has been called the 'Sumana style' (Plates 79-80) by Griswold, and from the available evidence it appears that this Sukhodaya-inspired style prevailed in Chiangmai until the Lion type\(^1\) of image was introduced during the reign of King Tiloka in the middle of the fifteenth century.\(^2\)

The anatomy, costume, posture of the Chiangmai images of 'Sumana style' are all derived from the Sukhodaya tradition, but they are cruder, heavier and less refined than their Sukhodaya prototype. This may have arisen from the inexperience of the northern artists in the face of this new tradition and perhaps also from the fusion of their own traditions with what they had learnt from Sukhodaya. However the relations between the north and Sukhodaya were close enough for them to have had the opportunity to study the

---


2 Griswold, JSS, Vol. XLI, p. 110. According to Griswold this style of sculpture introduced by Sumana continued from about A.D. 1370-1470.
Sukhodaya art tradition closely and it is possible that artists from Sukhodaya itself were invited to the north. ¹

Although Sumana belonged to the Sinhalese sect of the Forest-dwellers, he never visited Ceylon. During the period when sculpture was produced in the Sumana style we do not get much evidence of direct contacts between Ceylon and Chiangmai; therefore any Sinhalese influence on the sculpture of this period must have reached Chiangmai indirectly through the Sukhodaya style. The flame finial on the top of the Buddha images and the virāsana of the seated images may be Sinhalese features that came to Chiangmai in this indirect way.

Furthermore, in the story of the Sinhalese Buddha image it is said that it was brought to Chiangmai, where some copies of it were made. The account says that a Buddhist monk from Kamphaeng Phet arrived at Chiangrai when Mengrai's brother was ruling there, showed the prince a wax replica of the miraculous image brought from Ceylon, and narrated its whole story up to the time it came into the hands of the ruler of Kamphaeng Phet. Accompanied by his army, the prince of Chiangrai then took the statue to his brother's kingdom, Chiangmai, where he left the original in his brother's

¹ Griswold, JSS, Vol. XLI, pp. 107 ff.
possession, after having a copy of it made which he took back with him to his own kingdom. ¹

From this account it appears that even if the original Buddha image brought from Ceylon was not taken to Chiangmai, at least a copy of it reached there. Furthermore it makes it clear that further copies were made in Chiangmai. However, there is nothing Sinhalese in the iconography of the image to be seen in Chiangmai today, which is claimed to be the Sinhalese Buddha but which cannot even be a copy of it. Griswold has rightly pointed out that it could, on the other hand, be a copy of a Pāla image and his explanation of the misnaming of the statue is quite convincing. ² However from the account of the Sinhalese Buddha image it appears that Buddha images certainly were brought from Ceylon and that they were highly venerated in various kingdoms in Thailand and therefore would have had some influence on the iconography of the local images.

¹ Jinakālamalī, 89-90; Coedes, BEFEO, Vol.XXV, 1-2, pp.97 ff. The date of the arrival of the image is not clear. The Jinakālamalī inserts the story between the events that occurred in A.D. 1369 and 1371.

² Griswold, Dated Buddha Images of Northern Siam, pp.43-46. According to Griswold when the Sinhalese Buddha somehow disappeared from Chiangmai the Buddhist monks found a substitute of 'Lion Type' and this substitution was aided by ambiguity of name Sing, which could be taken as either lion or Sinhalese. The 'Lion Type' is the Buddha in bhūmisparśa-mudrā and was copied from a famous image brought from Nālandā in India at the end of the fifteenth century A.D. during the reign of King Tiloka of Chiangmai.
Some of the archaeological evidence from Chaiya confirms that Sinhalese art traditions followed the spread of Theravada Buddhism from Ceylon. After studying some images from Chaiya, Dupont came to the conclusion that there was a separate school of sculpture there from about the twelfth century A.D. onwards and that Sinhalese influence had been one of the major factors contributing to its formation.¹

Of the five objects that Dupont attributed to this school, three are small bronze statuettes of the standing Buddha which are in the National Museum in Bangkok and are said to have come from Chaiya.² These three images are all making a two-fold gesture; the vitarka-mudrā, forbidding relatives to dispute, with the right hand, and the vara-mudrā, bestowing favours, with the left. The upper robe has only a few scanty folds incised in a slanting manner. The right shoulders of the images are bare, the left being covered down to the forearm. There is a scarf falling over the left shoulder. Due to the transparency of the upper robe, which

appears to be coiled round the body, the inner garment is visible. The style of the robe, the fact that the right shoulder is bare, and the combination of two gestures are special distinguishing features of these images, whose usnīṣas are almost hemispherical, with floral decoration on the front side.

The famous Buddha of Grahi (Plate 81), according to Dupont, belongs to the same school. The image was found in a paddy-field near Wat Hua-wiang in Chaiya and is now in the National Museum in Bangkok. This is a large bronze figure of Buddha seated on a nāga. The Buddha and nāga are cast separately and the difference in the style of the two pieces has caused the scholars to conclude that they belong to two different periods, and even to two different art traditions.¹

The right hand of the Buddha image is placed in the bhumisparśa-mudrā position and the legs are in the virāsana pose, in which one leg is laid upon the other. The upper garment leaves the right shoulder bare, then clings to the body until it passes over the left shoulder and falls free. The scarf falling over the left shoulder reaches nearly to the waist and is shown as a piece of cloth folded into several

¹ Dupont, BEFEO, vol.XLII, p.109; Le May, A Concise History of Buddhist Art in Siam, pp.48-49.
pleats. These are typical features of Thai statues in the Menam valley in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries and are common to both the Sukhodaya and the U Thong schools of sculpture.¹ The heavy and bulging hair arrangement gives the appearance of a wig. The usnīsa is almost hemispherical, and is decorated with a floral ornament in front.²

The nāga or coiled serpent is in Khmer style; moreover it bears an inscription in the Khmer language, according to which the image was ordered by the governor of Grahi (Chaiya).³ The date given in the inscription is A.D. 1183; therefore the nāga also can be attributed to the same date. Le May thought that both the nāga and the image were made in the twelfth century A.D. by two artists belonging to two different traditions.⁴ Since the Buddha image has some characteristics in common with the statues of the Menam valley of the fourteenth century it is thought that the Buddha of Grahi also belonged to the same period.⁵ Buribhand and Griswold agree with Le May's

² Ibid.
⁴ Le May, A Concise History of Buddhist Art in Siam, pp.48-9.
⁵ Dupont, BEFEO, Vol.XLII, p.112.
opinion that this image belongs to the late Dvāravatī art tradition, and they attribute the statue to a period broadly between the eleventh and the fifteenth century A.D., which was also, according to them, the period of late Dvāravatī art.¹

Another work of art which has been grouped in the 'school of Chaiya' is a Buddha head in gilded sandstone (Plate 82). Originally it was in the Wat Phra Maha Tat of Chaiya and thence it was taken to the National Museum in Bangkok.² The features of the face of this statue are very regular and reminiscent of Indian or Indo-Javanese models. The usṇīṣa, like that of the Buddha on the nāga, is hemispherical with a floral design in front. On the whole this statue is similar to that of the Buddha of Grahi rather than to the three bronzes first discussed.³

In Dupont's opinion the various relationships between the five pieces, and the fact that all of them were found in Chaiya, justify the assumption of a separate school of art,

¹ Buribhand and Griswold, op.cit., p.20, note 11.
² Ibid., pp.20-21.
named by him the 'school of Chaiya'. Other writers such as Buribhand, Griswold, Chand and Yimsiri agree with Dupont on this.

When investigating the origin of the 'Chaiya school', Dupont compared these images with fourteenth century images from Sukhodaya and U Thong and found very striking similarities in the upper robe, the virasana and even in the facial features, which led him to believe that the influences contributing to the formation of the latter two schools were also operative in the development of the roughly contemporary 'Chaiya school'.

Thus since the Sinhalese influence is conspicuous in the art of Sukhodaya and U Thong it is thought that the similarity between these schools and that of Chaiya is more likely to have been due to the common source of inspiration than one school influencing another. Thus Dupont wrote:

The Chaiya school has been constituted in the central part of the Malay Peninsula under the same influences as the first schools of the Thai in Lower Menam (the schools of Sukhodaya and U Tông) and probably following the same religious propagation. It appears

2 Buribhand and Griswold, op.cit., p.22; Chand and Yimsiri, op.cit., p.77.
4 Ibid., p.112.
to have been subject in particular to the influences from Ceylon.... The creation of this school in a milieu which is almost unknown to us, but to which the Siamese language without doubt had not penetrated, seems to be due to the strong influence which the Buddhist centres of Ceylon commenced to exercise about that epoch. The entire archaeology of Western Indo-China, Burma included, moreover demonstrates from the beginning of the thirteenth century an increasing contribution of Sinhalese elements, associated with the expansion of Theravāda Buddhism. 1

Although the Sinhalese influence was one of the components of the 'Chaiya school', it appears that there was a tradition of sculpture in the peninsula even before the rise of this school. In fact, according to Buribhand and Griswold, during the period of Śrīvijaya supremacy over the Malay Peninsula the works of art produced in this area were 'sufficiently homogeneous in character to constitute a school', and this local art tradition was also an influence in the formation of the 'Chaiya school'. 2

Then again some of the examples of the 'Chaiya school' are similar to Dvāravatī sculpture and it is quite natural to see Dvāravatī influence in most of the creations of the 'Chaiya school', and Le May, for example, compared the Buddha image of Grahi with a late Dvāravatī seated image as follows:

---
1 Ibid., pp.111-12 Eng.tr. by Paranavitana in Ceylon and Malaysia, p.200.
It is to my mind, closely akin to fig 35 which is a later product of Mon or Dvaravati art. I need only to point to the set of the legs which are drawn inwards, to the way in which arm and hands are placed, the heavy folds of the robe and the type of features with the oval face, the "shallow" form of eyebrow and the sensitive nose, to show at once the affinity between these two figures. 1

There are a number of pieces of this category of late Dvaravati art in the National Museum in Bangkok. Their main characteristics consist of one leg usually superimposed upon the other and drawn inwards, the right hand performing the gesture of maravijaya and sometimes samadhi, facial features in the Mon or Khmer tradition, and the headdress surmounted by a cone-shaped ornament. 2

The Chaiya school of Buddhist sculpture resulted from the expansion of Theravada Buddhism into the Malay Peninsula which came after the Mahayana influence from the kingdom of Srivijaya had waned, and being a Theravada school of sculpture, would have been influenced by the Dvaravati art which also belonged to the same sect. Thus when there was a revival of Theravada Buddhist art in the Malay Peninsula, the Mon influence would have been felt, since the kingdom of Dvaravati

1  Le May, A Concise History of Buddhist Art in Siam, pp.48-49.
2  Buribhand and Griswold, op.cit., p.20. According to these two authors this late Dvaravati art could be dated between eleventh and fifteenth century A.D.
was associated with Theravāda Buddhism and since the Dvaravatī art tradition was known in that region. We have already seen that there was Sinhalese influence on Dvaravatī art, and therefore this would have been passed on as an indirect influence when the 'school of Chaiya' inherited the Dvaravatī characteristics.

Furthermore, the development of the 'Chaiya school' probably resulted from the spread of Sinhalese Buddhism from Burma and Ceylon to the Malay Peninsula after the decline of Srivijaya. Thus the closeness of religious contacts between Ceylon and the Malay Peninsula from about the twelfth century A.D. was probably one of the factors leading to the rise of the 'Chaiya school' of sculpture by spreading Theravāda Buddhism from Ceylon and thus ousting Mahāyāna influence,

Another provincial school of sculpture in Thailand which was indirectly influenced by Ceylon developed at U Thong. In this case Sinhalese influence filtered in via the art of Dvaravatī and Sukhodaya which both contributed considerably to the formation of the U Thong school. From an examination of bronzes belonging to this art tradition, it appears that they are made up of Mon, Khmer and Thai ingredients in varying

---

1 See supra, pp. 276-79.
proportions (Plates 83-85). The sculpture of this school can be dated roughly between the beginning of the thirteenth century and the end of the fifteenth century A.D. At the end of the fifteenth century this art tradition was absorbed into the Ayodhya or National style.

The robes of the Buddha images of the U Thong school are worn in a fashion similar to those of the Sukhodaya Buddhas, that is in the open mode with the right arm, shoulder and breast bare, the scarf being represented by a simple fold of cloth falling nearly to the waist in front. The arrangement of the hair also resembles that of the Sukhodaya Buddhas, apart from the band retaining the hair on the forehead which is imitative of the Khmer school of sculpture in Lopburi. Sinhalese influence on these statues can also be seen in the flame-like rasmi springing from the usnīsa, which had become a prominent feature during the Sukhodaya period, and in the

---

2 Ibid.
3 Ibid., p.142; Buribhand and Griswold, op.cit., p.3.
4 Buribhand and Griswold, op.cit., pp.11-12.
5 Coedès, *Ars Asiatica*, p.34.
virāśana pose, although both these features would have been
derived from an indirect source such as the Sukhodaya or
Dvāravatī Buddhas. It is not easy to discern any direct
influence from Ceylon on the style of this school of sculpture
even though there were sometimes direct religious contacts
between the two countries, for by that time adequate local art
traditions had developed, while the Sinhalese art was
deteriorating and no longer as attractive as it had formerly
been. Moreover, such Sinhalese influence as is to be seen
can only be faintly and vaguely discerned, while the Khmer,
Dvāravatī and Sukhodaya characteristics are quite conspicuous.

Apart from some bronzes which have been dated after the
thirteenth century A.D., very little Sinhalese influence is
seen in the Burmese sculpture belonging to our period. A
seated bronze Buddha image from Shway-doung monastery in
Mronhoung in Akyab district, is in the virāśana pose with one
leg superimposed upon the other. The hands are in dhyāna-mudrā,
the meditation pose. The robe is worn in open mode with the
right shoulder bare and the shoulder-flap is noticeable in
front. Another, from Kyauktaga village in Pegu township, is
also a seated Buddha in the virāśana pose but with the hands
in the bhūmisparśa-mudrā. The robe is worn in a similar
fashion to the first one. On both these images the flame-like
usnīsa is prominent. Such stylistic characteristics as the virāsana, the dhyāna-mudrā, the robe in open mode and the flame-like usnīsa are all Sinhalese features, and they may have resulted from the Sinhalese Buddhist influence in Burma. 1

Except for one example, there is no evidence that Sinhalese sculpture received any influence from South-east Asia. This single example is a bronze Buddha standing on a lotus pedestal and comes from Gaḍalādeṇiya temple in Kandy (Plate 86). The robe of the image is worn in a fashion which is different from that of the Buddha image of the Gampola period (A.D.1341-1415). It covers both shoulders and while clinging to the body in front, it hangs in a panel-like fashion behind, falling from the shoulders to the ankles. 2 According to Paranavitana, the style of the garment and the lotus pedestal show that this image belongs to the Pāla school of Indian sculpture. 3 However from an artistic point of view it is inferior to the original Pāla sculpture from India and therefore Paranavitana's suggestion is that this image could be the product of a South-east Asian

sculptor who was influenced by Pāla art traditions. Although the tradition says that it was brought from Goa by Dhammakitti, the founder of the temple, Goa did not appear on the Ceylonese horizon until the sixteenth century when the Portuguese arrived in Ceylon. However, it suggests that the statue was not a local product but an import. Dhammakitti came to Ceylon from Dhanyakataka in South India and it is possible that the image was brought to Ceylon from there. On the other hand it is also possible that it came from South-east Asia where the local sculpture is known to have been subjected to Pāla influence.

The foregoing discussion shows that from the Dvāravatī period to the Ayodhya period there was Sinhalese influence on the sculpture of Thailand through the religious contacts between the two countries. The degree of influence varied from time to time, depending upon the local environment and the nature of the influence which reached Thailand from Ceylon. Thus it was strongest during the Sukhodaya period, when religious contacts were closer and the Sinhalese art

1 Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, p.201.
3 Ibid; Paranavitana, Ceylon and Malaysia, p.201.
and culture were at their zenith. However, only a little Sinhalese influence on sculpture could be seen in Burma. In Ceylon too, South-east Asian influence is absent except in one example.
CONCLUSION

A study of political, religious and cultural contacts between Ceylon and South-east Asia from the eleventh to the end of the fifteenth century A.D., shows that Ceylon's relations with that part of the world were equally as important as those with the Indian Sub-continent. Ceylon's influence during this period upon such countries as Burma, Thailand and Cambodia now appear much greater than hitherto believed.

During the five centuries of our survey, there are only a few recorded instances of political relations. For example during the reign of Vijayabahu I, the Burmese King Anawrahta helped the Sinhalese ruler in his struggle against the Coḷas, motivated partly by his own wish to reduce the latter's influence. The only known Ceylonese expedition to South-east Asia occurred when Parākramabahu I invaded Burma, while the only invasions of Ceylon itself by peoples of South-east Asia were those of Candrabhanu of Tambralīṅga during the reign of Parākramabahu II.

From an examination of what we know of the Kaliṅga rulers of Ceylon, it appears that there are difficulties in accepting Paranavitana's theory that they came from South-east Asia. We have found that this is based on insufficient evidence, while his interpretation of source material is fanciful in
the extreme. A detailed study can only lead to a reaffirmation of the traditional view that the Kaliṅga rulers came to Ceylon from Kaliṅga in the Indian Sub-continent.

The most important aspect of relations with South-east Asia was notably the religious one; religion was the medium through which the dissemination of culture took place. From the time of Vijayabāhu I's invitation to the monks from Burma, Ceylon played a leading rôle in spreading Theravāda Buddhism in Burma, Thailand and Cambodia, all of which came to regard Ceylon as having the purest form of Buddhism in the contemporary Buddhist world. Thus those countries entered the orbit of Sinhalese influence and a number of Burmese, Mon, Thai and Cambodian monks visited Ceylon in quest of learning and to receive higher ordination, while many Sinhalese monks engaged in missionary activities abroad.

Religion was accompanied by cultural influence. From our study of relationships between art and architecture of South-east Asia and those of Ceylon, we see that Ceylon did much to spread 'Indian culture' in South-east Asia, a fact which has not so far been adequately recognised. Sinhalese influence was most strongly felt in Thailand, but was also noticeable in Burma. There is however no evidence of Sinhalese influence on what remains of the Cambodian architecture and sculpture in this period.
Through these contacts Ceylonese architecture in its own turn was slightly influenced by South-east Asia, although these contacts seem to have had little effect on the evolution of Ceylonese sculpture.

A more detailed comparative study of the art and architecture of Ceylon and South-east Asia may yield evidence of further contacts and helps to clarify the hypothesis which we have put forward. Further fieldwork might also reveal Ceylonese influence in South-east Asia in such areas as painting, political organization, literature, etc. Thus there is ample scope for further research which might enlarge our conceptions of the importance of cultural interchange between Ceylon and South-east Asian Kingdoms.
Three years after he re-interpreted the existing source material and advanced his new theory about the Kalinga rulers of Ceylon, Paranavitana claims to have discovered some inscriptions which support and corroborate almost all these hypotheses of his. He writes about the discovery of these inscriptions as follows:

Recently, I had the good fortune of discovering a series of documents which throw a flood of light on the relations which the Maharajas of Sri Vijaya had with the ancient Sinhalese kingdom on the one hand, and with the rulers of the South Indian states on the other. The manner in which I became aware of the existence of these documents, and of their preservation through the centuries, is so unique that one may entertain suspicion about their genuineness. The documents have been written very superficially, in tiny characters, in between and over the lines of the original writing, on a large number of Sinhalese inscriptions in slabs, pillars and natural rocks, ranging in date from the eighth to the fifteenth centuries. There are several layers, one over the other, of these palimpsests, as they may be called. They are of such an unobtrusive character that they may be altogether obscured in the process of inking when estampages are prepared of the original inscriptions.\(^1\)

Among these interlinear inscriptions Paranavitana claims to have read extracts from early chronicles such as the *Rajavamsa-pustaka*,

---

Yavana-ṛājya-vṛttānta, Paramaparā-pustaka, Suvarnapura-vamsa, Sundarī-vṛttānta and the Magharāja-vṛttānta which are no longer extant.

From these newly-discovered records Paranavitana has drawn an enormous amount of material about the relations between Ceylon and South-east Asia, particularly the kingdom of Śrīvijaya. According to him, they contain evidence that the Maharāja of Śrīvijaya was restored to his throne by a Sinhalese ruler in the ninth century A.D. and include many references to matrimonial alliances between the Sinhalese royal family and that of the kingdom of Śrīvijaya. Furthermore, Paranavitana says that these records contain evidence of Sinhalese rulers from the ninth century onwards who were Malayan in origin. When Ceylon was under the Colas, the Maharāja of Śrīvijaya is said to have visited Ceylon personally to help the Sinhalese ruler against these South Indian emperors. The Kaliṅga rulers were Malayan in origin according to these inscriptions, and the Māgha who invaded Ceylon in the thirteenth century was a prince from Śrīvijaya who had gone to Malabar and married the daughter of the ruler of that kingdom. Thus when Māgha invaded Ceylon he did so with the help of his father-in-law from South India. Candrabhānu of Tambraliṅga was a son of Māgha and was installed in the Malay Peninsula by his father after Māgha became the
ruler of Polonnaruva. Later, Māgha made him the ruler of the Śrīvijaya kingdom in Sumatra and thus Candrabhaṇu invaded Ceylon as the monarch of that kingdom. Furthermore, these inscriptions appear to contain evidence of close relations between Ceylon and South-east Asia up to the fifteenth century A.D.¹

Unfortunately, however, these inscriptions have so far only been read by Paranavitana and other scholars who have examined the especially made estampages which were used by Paranavitana himself cannot see any interlinear inscriptions other than some criss-cross lines.² Therefore there is much doubt about the authenticity of these records. Leslie Gunawardene, who examined some of these inscriptions, writes as follows about the Abhayagiri inscription from which Paranavitana deciphered an interlinear one.

The main lines of the inscription are separated by horizontal lines drawn 1.6 in. from each other. The area in which Paranavitana traced seven more lines is a portion 6.5 in. in height and is one of the most


weathered sections of the slab. One would expect 'superficially incised minute letters' to be easily defaced by being exposed to the elements. But Paranavitana gives a continuous reading of this portion. What the present writer, without the trained eye of the epigraphist, could see in this portion, was a jumble of criss-cross lines and blotches, evidently the marks of erosion. Here and there, while looking for the writing that Paranavitana speaks of, one may sometimes notice what appears like the form of a letter. But it could easily be one's imagination. However, an examination of the slab and the two estampages makes it quite clear that it is impossible, even for a trained epigraphist, to get a continuous reading as Paranavitana has done. This portion of the slab is completely weathered away in a large number of places and leaves only white blotches on the estampages. A further attempt was made to ascertain the presence of interlinear writings by taking pencil rubbings of the better preserved portions of the two relevant slabs at Abhayagiri; but this, too, did not yield affirmative results.

Paranavitana's method of deciphering these inscriptions also creates doubts about the existence of these interlinear writings. Most of them are badly weathered and even the original inscriptions are hard to decipher. Paranavitana admits that they are not very well preserved and he says that only by a comparison of several copies of the same record could he make out a readable text. In some instances he

1

Gunawardene, 'Ceylon and Malaysia: A Study of Professor S. Paranavitana's research on relations between the two regions', Mimeographed paper dated 28th March, 1969, p.5.
himself has restored certain parts conjecturally in the light of the rest of the contents. However, Paranavitana has not indicated his method in the text itself. Gunawardene comments on this:

Here one has to constantly keep in mind that one is dealing with what is perhaps the least scientific branch of the discipline of archaeology. The reading of a word as well as the interpretation thereof could be most open to the subjective bias of the scholar. Hence strict care has to be taken by the epigraphist to separately indicate the clear letters, the doubtful readings and the conjectural restorations. It is most unfortunate that in giving the readings of the relevant inscriptions, Paranavitana fails to follow the system he had constantly adhered to in his previous publications in the *Epigraphia Zeylanica* and other journals of indicating doubtful readings with simple brackets and conjectural restorations with square brackets. His efforts are directed merely at giving a continuous reading. The usefulness of his reading for historical purposes is severely affected by this regrettable omission.1

Finally it is not clear why these inscriptions were written on older ones instead of fresh stones being used. Paranavitana's explanation is that this was done in order to preserve them from being destroyed by the opponents of the rulers of Śrīvijaya origin. However, it would be surprising if these opponents had had such a high regard for historical sources that they were not prepared to destroy the interlinear inscriptions at the expense of obliterating the older records.2

---

1 Ibid., p.4.
2 Ibid., p.6.
Under these circumstances there are serious doubts about
the authenticity of these so-called interlinear records and
indeed their very existence. Hence they have been excluded
from the main body of the thesis.
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