THE ROYAL CONSECRATION IN MEDIEVAL SRI LANKA: THE PROBLEM OF VIKRAMABĀHU I AND GAJABĀHU II

Sirima Kiribamune
Sr. Lecturer in History
University of Sri Lanka

Vikramabāhu I (1111—1132) and Gajabāhu II (1132—1153)[1] are two of the problem kings of Sri Lanka. The two of them, father and son, ruled without the royal consecration and the problem that confronts us is why this had to be so.

It is rather unfortunate that we do not have a single literary work dealing with the political and legal institutions of ancient Sri Lanka. The rules and regulations which governed institutions such as kingship have to be gleaned from the actual practices noticed in historical sources and chance statements made in them. By the twelfth century A. D., the period to which Vikramabāhu I and Gajabāhu II belong, kingship was a well-established institution. From the less pretentious position of a chieftain in a limited territorial region, kingship had over the centuries acquired new dimensions in pomp and pageantry, in nature and functions. The not infrequent palace coups and wars of succession recorded in the chronicles of Sri Lanka suggest that there were differences of opinion regarding eligibility for kingship. It would seem that the rules were changed at times to suit certain situations and interested parties. However, there seems to have been, at least in the twelfth century, a rock base of accepted opinion as to the pre-requisite conditions for the acknowledgement of a legal monarch. The non-fulfilment of these conditions did not preclude a ruler's right to rule and wield authority, but it seems to have denied him a certain legality. Such monarchs appear to have been precluded from the royal consecration at which presumably a new consecratory title was conferred on them and a fresh regnal year proclaimed. There were only two consecratory titles in use, Siri Sangabo and Abhā Salamevan and they alternated with every fresh consecration. It would seem that an unconsecrated

ruler could use one of the above titles, provided he continued to use the same title as his predecessor, for the alternative title could only be conferred on consecration. Similarly the regnal year which he was entitled to use was that of the last consecrated ruler. In other words it would be the Siri Sangabo year or the Abhā Salamevan year that would be current, depending on which title was conferred at the last royal consecration. It is only on the basis of these assumptions that one can explain why Vikramabāhu I and Gajabāhu II who wielded full authority as kings of Polonnaruva, were denied consecration and were forced into the situation of using the regnal years of Jayabāhu I (1110—1111) to date their records.

At this point it might be useful to state briefly the circumstances relating to the accession of Vikramabāhu I and the political climate which prevailed during his reign and during that of his son and successor Gajabāhu II. Consequent to the expulsion of the Coḷas, Vijayabāhu I (1055—1110) effected the political unification of the island. His brother Jayabāhu was the recognized heir to the throne and Vikramabāhu, the son of Vijayabāhu I was given the title of Ādipāda and entrusted with the administration of the province of Rohaṇa. The basic assumption in this scheme was that Jayabāhu would succeed Vijayabāhu I and that Vikramabāhu would be next in the line of succession. However, this scheme was set aside by Jayabāhu's sister Mittā and her three sons, Mānābharaṇa, Kīttisirimegha and Srī Vallabha. On the death of Vijayabāhu I they placed Jayabāhu on the throne (no departure from the original scheme so far) and Mānābharaṇa and not Vikramabāhu was recognized as the next in the line of succession. Vikramabāhu who naturally took objection to this, fought against Jayabāhu and the sons of Mittā and conquered Polonnaruva. In the process he lost both Rohaṇa and the province of Dakkhiṇadesa to Mānābharaṇa and his brothers, who ruled them independently of Polonnaruva. It is to this depleted kingdom of Polonnaruva that Gajabāhu later succeeded.

For the problem at hand, the most pertinent question which arises from the events tabulated above is—what were the compelling factors or what would have been the arguments used in favour of Mānābharaṇa as against Vikramabāhu? The opinion expressed in the *Cūḷavaṁsa*, the main chronicle dealing with the history of this period, is that they were flouting former custom in recognising Mānābharaṇa as the heir to the throne after Jayabāhu.[2] Inheritance through one's mother's brother is an essential characteristic of a matriarchal society, and such tendencies are not completely absent in Sri Lanka during this period. However, it would not have been possible to push this line of argument without precedent, the customary law of succession being along the paternal line. Also, if mother-right was the argument in favour of Mānābharaṇa, his claims should have been advanced over

those of Jayabāhu as well. It would seem that the operative factors have gone unrecorded. These factors, whatever they were, were sufficiently cogent to deny Vikramabāhu and his son Gajabāhu the status of consecrated monarchs, despite their gaining the throne of Polonnaruva.

That Vikramabāhu I was not consecrated is specifically stated in the *Cūḷavaṁsa*.[3] Mānābharaṇa of Dakkhiṇadesa and his brothers ruling Rohaṇa are made to express the view that Vikramabāhu's position at Polonnaruva was illegal as he was not a consecrated monarch.[4] The Chronicle, however, is silent on the question of Gajabāhu II's consecration. He is said to have taken possession of the kingdom (*hathagathaṁ katvā*)[5] after the death of Vikramabāhu I. This does not convey the conviction that Gajabāhu's was an acceptable succession. It is perhaps worth noting that neither the *Pūjāvaliya*[6] nor the *Rājāvaliya*[7] mention Gajabāhu II in their king lists.

The epigraphical records of Vikramabāhu I and Gajabāhu II provide the best proof that they did not enjoy complete status as sovereign rulers. Inscriptions belonging to their reigns are invariably dated in the regnal years of Jayabāhu I, wherever it was considered necessary to do so. (There are some undated inscriptions too of Vikramabāhu I and Gajabāhu II). Jayabāhu did not rule for long at Polonnaruva, for Vikramabāhu took to the field soon after the former's accession. But there are inscriptions dated in the eighth,[8] twenty-third,[9] twenty-fourth,[10] twenty-seventh[11], thirty-fifth[12], thirty-eighth[13], fortieth[14] and forty-third[15] years of Jayabāhu's reign.

Among the regnal years of Jayabāhu I noticed above, the eighth year occurs in two inscriptions from Budumuttava, a place in Dakkhiṇadesa which was the principality of Mānābharaṇa. Mānābharaṇa had fought against Vikramabāhu and had set himself up as an independent ruler in this province, usually enjoyed by the heir to the throne or the Mahādipāda. One of the inscriptions at Budumuttava records a donation to the god Vikkirama Calāmega Īsvara of Vikkirama Calāmegapura. The practice of naming cities and temples after the rulers who founded or patronised them is quite common in both South India and Sri Lanka. The only contemporary king with the Vikrama name was Vikramabāhu I and if he is the ruler referred to as Vikrama Calāmega, it would appear that he enjoyed some measure of recognition in this region. Two other kings who had the name Vikrama are known to have had partial control of the country during the period of the Coḷa occupation, prior to Vikramabāhu I.[16] It could be argued that this shrine was perhaps named after one of them. This, however, is unlikely because Sinhalese rule was limited to Rohaṇa during this period and Budumuttava is a village in the Kurunegala district.

The other inscription from Budumuttava records an order issued by the five chiefs of Vīrabāhu devar who can be identified with Mānā-

bharaṇa. This confirms the view that the locality in question was in fact under Mānābharaṇa. That Vikramabāhu was ruling at Polonnaruva in what would have been the eighth regnal year of Jayabāhu is fairly clear from the evidence at our disposal. A Tamil inscription found at Polonnaruva indicates quite specifically that the 15th year of Gajabāhu corresponds to the 38th year of Jayabāhu.[17] According to the *Cūḷavaṁsa* Vikramabāhu I occupied the throne for 21 years.[18] thus leaving Jayabāhu only a two year regnal period. Therefore Vikramabāhu I would have been ruling at Polonnaruva in the so-called eighth year of Jayabāhu I.

Thus the Budumuttava inscriptions introduce us to a rather peculiar situation in Dakkhiṇadesa. The province governed by Mānābharaṇa is independent to all intents and purposes but concedes a certain amount of recognition to the ruler at Polonnaruva. But despite this the official scheme of dating is not in the regnal years of the current ruler at Polonnaruva, Vikramabāhu I, but in the regnal years of the ruler he had deposed, Jayabāhu I. It cannot be argued that the practice may have been continued because Jayabāhu was still alive, for although the death of Jayabāhu is announced in the reign of Vikramabāhu I,[19] the regnal years of Jayabāhu continue to appear even in inscriptions of Gajabāhu II.

Not many inscriptions of Vikramabāhu I have come to light. One which is a record of his queen Sundaramahādevi,[20] is fragmentary and no date occurs in the sections that can be read. Yet another inscription[21] which belongs to the reign of Vikramabāhu I and which is in fact an immunity grant made by him is dated in the regnal year twenty-three without any indication as to whose regnal year is meant. At the beginning of the inscription Vikramabāhu is introduced with a number of grandiose epithets. Next the purpose of the record is stated and lastly the date is given as the full moon day of Asela in the twenty-third year. In normal circumstances this year should be taken as the regnal year of the king who was responsible for the inscription. Paranavitana who has edited this inscription takes it as that and gets into serious difficulties. If a record has been dated in the twenty-third year of Vikramabāhu I, the dates in *Cūḷavaṁsa* (twenty one years for Vikramabāhu) have to be set aside as unreliable. But it would be more reasonable to assume that the date in the present record is a date in the regnal year in current use as in the Budumuttava inscriptions. As suggested earlier[22] Jayabāhu I would have been set aside in his second regnal year. Therefore the twenty-third year of Jayabāhu would correspond to the last year or twenty first year of Vikramabāhu. Thus there would be no conflict with the dates given in the *Cūḷavaṁsa*. If on the other hand one were to accept Paranavitana's interpretation that Vikramabāhu was on the throne in his twenty-third regnal year, we have to assume that Jayabāhu I was removed almost immediately after his accession.

As mentioned earlier,[23] an inscription at Polonnaruva states that the thirty-eighth year of Jayabāhu corresponds to the fifteenth year of Gajabāhu II. This would give twenty-three years to both Jayabāhu and Vikramabāhu. Therefore on Paranavitana's reckoning Vikramabāhu's accession would have taken place in the very first year of Jayabāhu I. This is not impossible but somewhat improbable. According to the information in the *Cūḷavaṁsa* Vikramabāhu was taken completely unawares by the coup-d'etat at Polonnaruva. Vijayabāhu I had died, the consecration of Jayabāhu had taken place and the armies of Polonnaruva were on their way to the South to forestall Vikramabāhu when the latter was alerted.[24] Vikramabāhu's was not a straight march to Polonnaruva. Six engagements were fought before reaching the capital city.[25] A certain length of time has to be allowed for these events making it very unlikely that the first year of Jayabāhu I corresponded to the first year of Vikramabāhu I. In the light of all this the irresistible conclusion is that the twenty-third regnal year in the immunity grant of Vikramabāhu I is a date in the regnal year of Jayabāhu I, this being the official scheme of dating in current use. Therefore one cannot agree with Paranavitana that we have here an instance where the regnal years of Vikramabāhu were used for purposes of dating.

The above position is further strengthened by an inscription belonging to the reign of Gajabāhu II, dated in the 40th year.[26] Unlike in the last inscription where the date occurs at the end of the record, in this instance the date is given at the very beginning. It starts off with "Srī, the 40th year" and there is no clue as to whose 40th year is meant. The inscription records a grant made by a palanquin-bearer of the Agampaḍi community of Gajabāhu. There is absolutely no doubt that the record belongs to the reign of Gajabāhu and by no stretch of one's imagination can it be assumed that Gajabāhu reigned for 40 years. The inevitable conclusion is that the date is in the regnal year of Jayabāhu I (this would correspond to the 17th year of Gajabāhu) for that was the official scheme of dating during this period.

That dates reckoned in the regnal years of these two rulers were not acceptable for official purposes is brought out clearly in the Tamil Pīllar Inscription at Polonnaruva cited earlier.[27] Here it is stated that the record was issued in the 15th year of Gajabāhu, but the date that is mentioned first is the 38th year of Jayabāhu. This would have been necessary if the regnal years of Gajabāhu sufficed for official purposes.

The Budumuttava inscriptions made it clear that in Dakkhiṇadesa the regnal years of Jayabāhu I were used for purposes of dating in spite of the fact that Vikramabāhu was ruling at Polonnaruva. That the same practice was current in Rohaṇa, the independent province of

the South, is proved by the Kaṭagamuva inscription.[28] This is dated in the 35th year of Jayabāhu (this would be the 12th regnal year of Gajabāhu) and records a grant by King Mānābharaṇa. Katagamuva (about 3 miles to the west of Situlpahuva), in the Southern Province is located in what would have been the Province of Rohaṇa. That Mānābharaṇa of Rohaṇa was a contemporary of Gajabāhu II can be established from the evidence in the *Cūḷavaṁsa*. Therefore we find that the common practice adopted both in Dakkhiṇadesa and Rohaṇa was to ignore the regnal years of both Vikramabāhu I and Gajabāhu II and to use the regnal years of Jayabāhu I, the last consecrated ruler of Polonnaruva.

That the regnal dates of Jayabāhu were the only valid dates for the periods of Vikramabāhu I and Gajabāhu II find further corroboration in an inscription belonging to Sundara Mahādevi, who calls herself the queen of Vikramabāhu and the mother of Gajabāhu. This record is dated in the 27th year of Jayabāhu.[29]

An inscription dated in the 43rd year of Jayabāhu mentions a grant made by Gajabāhu and subsequently confirmed by Mānābharaṇa.[30] This seems to be a spurious record[31] but the date and contents show that there is some historical basis to it. The 43rd regnal year of Jayabāhu would correspond to the 20th year of Gajabāhu, who according to the *Cūḷavaṁsa* had a 22 year regnal period.[32] Mānābharaṇa of Rohaṇa is known to have taken temporary control of Polonnaruva on two occasions, once during the tail end of Gajabāhu II's reign and again after his death. It would seem that the contents of this record refer to the first occasion when Mānābharaṇa took control of Polonnaruva.[33]

The dated records belonging to the reign of Vikramabāhu I and Gajabāhu II are spread throughout a period extending from about the 6th year of Vikramabāhu's reign to almost the end of the reign of Gajabāhu II. Among them there is only one instance when the regnal year of Gajabāhu is mentioned but that its validity was not recognised is clear from the fact that it is preceded by a date in Jayabāhu's regnal years. It would follow that both rulers lacked legal status. Vikramabāhu I was denied the royal consecration according to the *Cūḷavaṁsa* and there is no doubt that Gajabāhu II suffered the same privation.

Here it may be relevant to draw attention to an official designated "saṁvaccharika-nāyaka" in the *Cūḷavaṁsa*. At a time when the Sinhalese were experimenting with various leaders to rid the country of Coḷa domination, the Saṁvaccharika-nāyaka is said to have made known to the minister Buddharāja that prince Kitti (later Vijayabāhu I; 1055—1110) who was eligible for the throne was available and should be protected.[34] Paranavitana translates 'saṁvaccharika-nāyaka' as 'Chief

of Calendar'.[35] That this officer played a key role in the choice of a suitable prince to rule the island is very significant, for the announcement of a fresh regnal year was closely tied up with the legality of the succession.

Another noticeable feature is that the commonly used royal titles Siri Saṅgabodhi and Silāmeghavanna (Salamevan) are never directly associated with either Vikramabāhu I or Gajabāhu II. These titles are noticed in the historical sources of Sri Lanka from about the fifth century A. D. the evidence being clearer and more plentiful after the eighth century A. D.[36] It is very probable that they were conferred at the *abhiṣeka* or consecration. Jayabāhu I predictably is given the title in two Tamil inscriptions.[37] In all the other records where Jayabāhu's name is used for dating he is referred to as Jayabāhudeva,[38] Jayabāhu-devayanvahanse[39] or Jayabāhu-vathimiyanvahanse.[40] These instances make it quite clear that even though entitled to them, rulers did not necessarily use these titles in their records nor were they invariably referred to by them in contemporary inscriptions. Therefore the fact that neither Vikramabāhu nor Gajabāhu are specifically referred to by these titles does not necessarily prove that they were not entitled to them. The only evidence of a more positive nature is provided by the Māṅkanai inscription[41] where in the same record Jayabāhu is given the title Abhaya Salāmegha and Gajabāhu and Mānābharaṇa (the ruler of Rohaṇa) are referred to as Gajabāhu-tevar and Mānābaraṇa-tevar respectively. It could be argued that the author of the inscription who, according to the contents of the record, was a beneficiary at the hands of Gajabāhu, would not have even inadvertently omitted the Silāmegha or Sirisaṅgabo title, if Gajabāhu was entitled to either of them, especially in view of the fact that Jayabāhu whose regnal years are used to date the inscription is given the title Abhaya Salāmegha.

Earlier in this paper it was suggested that the deity, Vikkirama Calāmegha Iśvara and the city, Vikkirama Calāmeghapura were named after Vikramabāhu I.[42] The practice of using royal titles to name religious institutions is not uncommon. The *Cūḷavaṁsa* states that Kassapa V erected a building known as the Silameghapabbata in the Abhayagiri vihara.[43] Confirmation of this is to be had from an inscription at Anuradhapura.[44] The same inscription bears testimony to the adoption of the Salamevan title by Kassapa V. This therefore is an instance where the king's title is conferred on a religious building constructed by him. Closer to our period we have an inscription dated in the 24th year of Jayabāhu (this would in fact belong to the reign of Gajabāhu II) which records a grant made to the Brahmanas of the Jayaṅkoṇa Calāmeka Caturveti-maṅkalam. The inscription was found about four miles from Mihintale indicating an establishment close to Anuradhapura. This institution was no doubt named after Jayabāhu who is known

to have had the Salāmegha title. It has been suggested that this was the same as the Vijayaraja Caturvedi maṅgalam of the period of Vijayabāhu I, re-named during the reign of Jayabāhu I[45]. That the name continued to be used during the reign of Gajabāhu II is not strange, as Jayabāhu's name and regnal years were currently in use for official purposes. From this evidence it would be patently clear that Vikkirama Calāmega Isvara and Vikkirama Calāmegapura were named after a ruler who had the Vikrama name and Calāmega (Salamevan) title[46].

The identification of Vikkirama Calāmega with Vikramabāhu I necessarily means that he was entitled to use the Salamevan title. This would seem strange because the two titles Siri Saṅgabo and Salamevan alternated with every succession. Vijayabāhu I had the title Siri Saṅgabo[47] and Jayabāhu who followed him adopted the Salamevan title. Therefore Vikramabāhu I, if he was entitled to one of them, should have had the title, Siri Saṅgabo. Vikramabāhu was a rebel and had forced Jayabāhu to vacate the throne. It cannot be contended that Vikramabāhu adopted the title in defiance of Jayabāhu for both he and Gajabāhu seem to have acquiesced in the position that they were not entitled to certain privileges. They and members of their family did not defy the rule that official dates should be in the regnal years of the last consecrated monarch. That Vikramabāhu would have used the title Salamevan in defiance has to be ruled out.

In these circumstances the only possible explanation is that an unconsecrated ruler could use one or other of the official titles, provided it was the one that was last recognised. This would suggest that the title was in some way linked with the official chronological scheme. Current regnal periods were perhaps considered in terms of either the Siri Saṅgabo era or the Salamevan era[48] and rulers who were not entitled to the royal consecration although unable to announce a fresh era and a fresh title accompanying it, were expected to continue recognising the Salamevan or Siri Saṅgabo era, whichever was current at the time of their accession. With this perhaps was linked the possibility of using the current official title. It is only in these terms that one can explain the possible use of the Salamevan title by Vikramabāhu I. Such an assumption must, however, remain tentative until we have direct evidence to show that Vikramabāhu I in fact used an official title. The present evidence is of a somewhat indirect nature where a king's titles are conferred on a city and a deity and the evidence which suggests that the king in question was Vikramabāhu I is circumstantial.

That Vikramabāhu I and Gajabāhu II did not enjoy full official status and were not consecrated monarchs is further confirmed by the fact that there are no extant coins issues by either of them. Numerous

coins issued by the monarchs of Polonnaruva have come to light and it cannot be assumed that the coins of these two monarchs were singled out for destruction or have escaped detection.

As far as the *de facto* position of the two rulers was concerned, it must be pointed out that the above disabilities did not seriously undermine their authority to rule. Both rulers are referred to by the usual royal epithets that were in use during this period, the most common being devayan[49] or devayanvahanse[50]. This term, used for consecrated kings and even provincial rulers carries no distinction. Apart from this, Vikramabāhu I is referred to as 'Laṅkesvara' (Lord of Lanka)[51] and Gajabāhu II is given a more prestigious title—"anasakviti"[52] (one whose authority spreads over the entire universe). Vikramabāhu's right to the throne is never questioned by the *Cūḷavaṁsa* and Gajabāhu in one of his inscriptions claims the right to the throne by descent "parapuren himi raja pamaṇuvā siti".[53] Both rulers are known to make land grants[54] which were obviously legally valid, their commands in this connection being referred to by the legal term "vyavasthā". In the Kapuruvadu Oya inscription,[55] Gajabāhu is seen enjoying all the trappings of executive authority. He sits in the Citrakūṭamaṇḍapa or Assembly Hall, surrounded by his ministers, performing the functions of royal office and making royal proclamations for whatever was deemed necessary.

In the light of the above facts the *de jure* position of Vikramabāhu I and Gajabāhu II becomes even more bewildering. There was obviously a very strong reason why they were denied the consecration with the attendant privileges to take on a fresh throne name, inaugurate a new regnal year and issue coins. Whatever the customary law was that was operative in this connection, it was sufficiently well entrenched and had perhaps gained a certain sanctity that the kings of this period neither could flout it nor did they even try to, except perhaps in one instance.[56]

The qualifications for kingship are at times set out explicitly in our sources but more often they are implicit in certain situations. The cases of Vikramabāhu and Gajabāhu could be tested against these criteria and by a process of elimination it might be possible to find out the reasons behind the predicament of these two rulers.

Prince Parākramabāhu, when he announced his intention to unify the island, is reported to have stated that his three fathers (Mānābharaṇa, his father and his two paternal uncles, Kittisirimegha and Sri Vallabha) and his mother's brother, Vikramabāhu I, ruled the country like *gāmabhojakas* (village chiefs) unable to unite the country and abandoning the desire for royal consecration (*abhiṣekha*).[57] The implication here seems to be that these rulers were denied the 'abiṣekha'

because they did not wield authority over the entire island. This, however, is not a tenable position. There is reason to believe that at least Vikramabāhu I was recognised as the chief monarch of the island by his contemporaries in Dakkhiṇadesa and Rohaṇa. The possible extension of his authority over Dakkhiṇadesa has already been noticed.[58] That the king of Polonnaruva had a nominal status over the rulers of the other principalities is implicit in a statement by the latter that it was no disgrace to have Vikramabāhu, who was older than they, in the chief kingdom but that they should oppose Gajabāhu, who was a youngster.[59] Even if one concedes that Vikramabāhu did not have authority over the entire island, this would not have debarred him from the consecration. We have with us the classic example of Jayabāhu I whose legal position is in no doubt. When he ascended the throne, disregarding the claims of Vikramabāhu to the post of Mahādipāda, he did not have authority over Rohaṇa, the principality of Vikramabāhu. One might also mention that consecrated kings who ruled parts of Sri Lanka are particularly noticed in the post-Polonnaruva period. Therefore it cannot be said that authority over a united Sri Lanka was a *sine quo non* for the royal consecration.

That a monarch, to be acceptable, should be born of royal parents of equal birth is implied in many situations noticed in the chronicles of Sri Lanka. A case in point is that of Sotthisena, the son of Mahānāma who was set aside by his sister Saṁghā, the daughter of the Mahesi or chief queen—the reason being that the former was born of a Tamil lady.[60] The case of Kassapa I is yet another instance where having a mother of unequal birth was considered a disqualification.[61] Neither Vikramabāhu nor Gajabāhu fall into this category, the former being the son of Vijayabāhu I and his Kalinga queen, Tilokasundarī[62] and the latter the son of Vikramabāhu and his queen Sundaramahādevī.[63]

Harking back to certain early episodes in the *Mahāvaṁsa* relating to rulers such as Vijaya and Paṇḍuvāsudeva, a consort of equal status was considered necessary for the royal consecration.[64] This could not have been a difficult proposition for either of the two monarchs. In fact Vikramabāhu I's queen Sundara-mahādevī is described as one who was descended from the Ikṣvāku dynasty and the family of Suddhodana and as one who belonged to the Solar line of kings.[65]

"Āpā Mahayā siri vinda pilivela sey rajva"—'having enjoyed the good fortune of being äpā and mahayā, thus attaining kingship in due order'[66] is a claim often made by rulers who set out their right to the throne. Vikramabāhu is known to have enjoyed the title of äpa[67] but the title of Mahapā or Mahayā, usually given to the heir to the throne was denied him. However, we have many examples of rulers who were consecrated without this formality. To mention only two instances, there was Sāhasamalla,[68] who was invited over from

Kaliṅga after the death of his brother Nissaṁkamalla and Kalyānavatī,[69] his queen, who owed her position to a mīnister who acted as king-maker. Neither of them had the opportunity of enjoying the position of äpa or mahapā. The reasons behind the plight of Vikramabāhu and Gajabāhu still seem elusive.

Yet another problem which needs to be commented on is the fact that neither Vikramabāhu nor Gajabāhu had custody of the Tooth and the Alms Bowl Relics of the Buddha. An inscription which can definitely be dated to the period after Vijayabāhu I and more approximately to the period of political confusion on the eve of the accession of Vikramabāhu I states that the Tooth Relic was entrusted to a group of Velaikkaras for its protection. Those responsible for this act were the ministers of state and the monk Mugalan of Uttaramūla.[70] According to the *Cūḷavaṁsa*, the Tooth and Alms Bowl Relics of the Buddha were removed to Rohaṇa by the Buddhist monks because of the anti-Buddhist activities of Vikramabāhu. It would seem that the Relics were in Polonnaruva at the time Vikramabāhu captured the throne. Whether he attempted to take custody of them and failed is a problem which cannot be settled in the present state of our knowledge. The Relics remained in the custody of the Rohaṇa rulers until they were secured by Parākramabāhu I. During the intervening period Mānābharaṇa of Rohaṇa tried to establish himself at Polonnaruva and brought the Relics with him, perhaps with the idea of buttressing his claims.[71] Later on Parākramabāhu I waged a protracted war in Rohaṇa, a major consideration in it being the securing of the Relics. There is no doubt that during this period the custody of the Tooth and Bowl Relics of the Buddha gave added prestige and perhaps even legitimacy to a ruler but it cannot be maintained that without them, the consecration of a ruler was not possible. Parākramabāhu, according to the *Cūḷavaṁsa* was consecrated twice, the first time when he took over the kingdom of Polonnaruva consequent to the death of Gajabāhu[72] and the second time after he had defeated Mānābharaṇa who had challenged his position and taken temporary control of Polonnaruva.[73] It was only after both these events that he was able to secure the Relics.[74] This makes it amply clear that the absence of the Tooth and Bowl Relics of the Buddha would not have stood in the way of the consecration of either Vikramabāhu or Gajabāhu.

In two of his inscriptions, Nissaṁkamalla (1187—1196) addresses his mind to the problem of eligibility for kingship. He of course is dealing with a peculiar political situation where he and his dynasty faced opposition from various, factions both local and foreign. Therefore, the rules laid down by him were no doubt tailored to meet his own situation. Nevertheless they might shed some light on the accepted principles relating to kingship during this time. The inscribed records of Nissaṁka—

malla make it quite clear that he was looking out for popularity for himself and his dynasty and therefore he might not be expected to promulgate rules and regulations which were contrary to customary practice.

The Galpota inscription of Nissaṁkamalla[75] lays down that after the demise of a king, his children who held the titles of āpā and mahapā should be considered for the throne. The position is slightly different in his inscription at the north gate of Polonnaruva.[76] This opens the door to all royal princes, failing the *yuvaraja* or the heir to the throne. Vikramabāhu and Gajabāhu do not stand disqualified on this score. Both inscriptions agree that in the absence of royal princes, the choice should fall on the queens. The two other points on which these two epigraphs agree are: (1) members of the Govikula should not be considered for kingship and (2) non-Buddhist rulers such as Coḷas and Pāṇḍyas (Coḷas and Keraḷas in the inscription at the North Gate) should not be placed on the throne. The inscription at the North Gate adds that this should be so as the country belongs to Buddhism.

There is no question that Vikramabāhu and Gajabāhu belonged to the royal family which claimed to be of the Kṣatriya caste, and so the strictures placed on the Govikula should not apply to them. As for the second objection, these two rulers were neither Pāṇḍyas, Coḷas nor Keraḷas. Here one should not, however, miss the point that these people were disqualified not because they were foreign, for in that case Nissaṁkamalla himself was a foreign prince, but because they were not Buddhists, and Sri Lanka, asserts one record, belongs to Buddhism. Could this be of any relevance to the problem at hand? Was Nissaṁkamalla only appealing to popular emotion in order to deal with a situation peculiar to his time? Or were there time-honoured strictures against non-Buddhists who attempted to gain the throne of Sri Lanka?

That kingship was closely tied up with Buddhism is a point that cannot be easily missed even by one who takes a cursory look at the sources relating to the early history of Sri Lanka. This association seems to have been of significance even for the consecration ceremony. The Jetavanārama slab inscription of Mahinda IV[77] states that it was decreed by the Buddha that those who were not Bodhisatvas[78] will not be kings of Sri Lanka. It goes on to say that kingship was bestowed on a person by the community of bhikkhus for the purpose of defending the religion of the Buddha and that at the time of consecration the king ties a white scarf, signifying the attention he would pay to the community of monks.[79] There is also the instance of Vijayabāhu I whose consecration takes place in the hall which housed the Tooth Relic of the Buddha and the statement that he placed the throne

on his head at the request of the Sangha.[80] From this evidence it would seem that Buddhist monks played a prominent part in the inauguration of a ruler. We often find the Chronicles labouring the point that the king's main duty was to protect the people and Buddhism[81] and they do not tire of listing the services rendered to Buddhism, by individual rulers. Similar sentiments are often expressed in the inscriptions as well.[82] A statement in the Dāṭhāvamsa might also be relevant in this connection. Parakkama, the general who helped Līlāvatī to ascend the throne for the third time (1210—1211) is said to have trained (with a view to kingship) a Pāṇḍyan prince named Madhurinda in the arts and made him conversant with the doctrines of Buddhism.[83] It is very likely that this prince was not born a Buddhist and Parakkama who was aware of the strictures imposed on non-Buddhist aspirants to the throne of Sri Lanka tried to remedy the situation in his own way. The underlying assumption in all these statements is that the king was expected to be a Buddhist by religion. Thus Nissaṅkamalla was only emphasising the point—no doubt in the interest of his dynasty—when he raised the cry that Pāṇḍyas, Coḷas and Keraḷas should not be considered for the throne because they were non-Buddhists.

From this arises two questions (1) Were Vikramabāhu and Gajabāhu not Buddhists? (2) If so, could they have been denied consecration on this count?

Vikramabāhu was the son of Tilokasundarī, a foreign princess, chief queen of Vijayabahu I.[84] Although there is no direct reference to her religious learnings, there are certain indications that she was perhaps not a Buddhist. The *Cūḷavaṁsa* states that she broke the rule which made Buddhist monasteries places of refuge and for this offence she was deprived of all her revenues and was led out of the city by her neck. In this way the king is said to have appeased the community of monks.[85] For the chief queen to have been so disgraced in order that the monks be placated, it is very likely that she was not only a non-Buddhist but also that her actions were directed against Buddhism. Furthermore, the *Cūḷavaṁsa* while summing up the reign of Vijayabāhu I lists the Buddhist works of the ruler and adds to it certain Buddhist monuments put up by the *yuvaraja* and by one of his daughters, Yasodhara. There is no mention of anything uudertaken by his queens or his other children. In the circumstances there was every chance for Vikramabāhu to have come under the influence of his mother. If her disgrace had made any impression on his mind he could not have harboured very kindly thoughts towards the community of Buddhist monks.

Direct evidence which confirms the above deductions is not lacking. The *Cūḷavaṁsa* has a somewhat lengthy account of the privation

suffered by the Buddhist monks and their monasteries at the hands of Vikramabāhu. It is said that temple lands were given over to those who were in his service and monasteries in the capital city were made the dwelling places of foreign soldiers. The wealth that had been offered to the Tooth and Bowl Relics, the king is supposed to have used as he pleased and because of all this the monks are said to have removed the Relics to Rohaṇa.[86] Obviously they did not expect Vikramabāhu to grant due honour to the Relics. All this smacks of a non-Buddhist ruler, but for some unknown reason the *Cūḷavaṁsa* is reluctant to make this admission. The furthest it goes is to say that Vikramabāhu and his associates were behaving like heretics (titthiya tulyānaṁ) when they harmed the Buddhist religion.

The inscriptional evidence supports the position taken up in the preceding discussion that Vikramabāhu was not a Buddhist. To cite the negative evidence first, there is no contemporary record of any Buddhist monument or even a grant to a Buddhist institution which can be credited to Vikramabāhu. On the other hand, the second inscription at Budumuttāva shows that a Śaiva temple was named after him.[88] This alone is no proof that Vikramabāhu was a Hindu for even good Buddhists like Vijayabāhu I lent their names to Śaiva monuments.[89] Evidence of a more direct nature is found in the Kahambiliyāva slab inscription of Vikramabāhu.[90] The king's virtues and prowess are described in a number of epithets. Among them are two epithets of a religious significance — "Pārvati-pati-dattāsir-vīra-mahā-vṛṣa", 'the heroic great bull who has been given the blessings of the husband of Parvati (Siva) and "Rāja Nārāyana", 'a king like unto Vishnu'. Both have very clear Hindu associations. It is also significant that none of the epithets applied to Vikramabāhu in this record have the slightest connection with Buddhism. It is fairly clear from the evidence cited so far that Vikramabāhu I was not a Buddhist.

Gajabāhu II seems to have been somewhat of an eclectic person. Practising the traditional policy of toleration usually followed by the rulers of Sri Lanka, he gave his patronge to both Buddhism and Hinduism and the many records of his reign show that both these religions were freely patronised by private individuals as well. Foremost among the Buddhist devotees of his time was his mother Sundaramahādevī, the chief queen of Vikramabāhu I.[91] The king's own patronage of Buddhism is attested to by contemporary records. A grant made to a Buddhist temple at Polonnaruva is the subject of a Tamil inscription.[92] Although the position is not very clear, this was possibly a royal grant for, the inscription is wound up with the statement that whoever acted contrary to this would be disobeying the orders of the king. The Ruvanvalisaya at Anuradhapura also shares in the munificence of the king, being in receipt of a land grant.[93] Gajabāhu held the

Buddhist Sangha in high esteem, so much so that his political rivals enlisted its support when they wished to come to terms with him. Mānābharaṇa of Rohaṇa came to Gajabāhu in the company of Buddhist monks when he wished to enter into an alliance with him.[94] Gajabāhu himself sought the help of the Saṅgha when he was driven to dire straits by the armies of Parākramabāhu in order to reach a settlement with the latter.[95] The agreement itself was said to have been inscribed on a stone at Maṇḍalagiri Vihāra,[96] a copy of which has been found at the Saṅgamu Vihāra.[97]

Patronage of Buddhist temples and good relations with the Sangha do not necessarily mean that the king was a Buddhist. The only possible arguments in favour of such an assumption arise from the Saṅgamu vihāra inscription and the Nelubava Pillar inscription.[98] The former, which is a political agreement between Gajabāhu and Parākramabāhu I, ends with the statement, "anyone who acts contrary to this would be going against the authority of the Triple Gem."[99] It could be argued that the Triple Gem was invoked by the Buddhist monks, through whose active intervention this agreement was brought about. Also one of the parties to the agreement was Parākramabāhu I, an acknowledged Buddhist. The Nelubava Pillar inscription which records a grant to the Ruvanvalisaya ends with a request to future kings to protect this grant, acquiring the merit accruing from it, as if they themselves had made the donation. These might be interpreted as sentiments peculiar to a Buddhist but in view of the religious eclecticism of the time, a Hindu ruler could very well have been conscious of the merit accruing from a donation to a Buddhist temple.

Apart from private grants to Brāhmaṇas and places of Hindu worship which can be dated in the reign of Gajabāhu II, two inscriptions bear witness to the king's own patronage of Hinduism. One of them records the setting up of a pillar as a boundary mark for the Brahmadeya village of Kantalay[100] and the other is a grant made by Gajabāhu to a certain Dāpera Rangidāge Hināhi, who made an image of Skanda and other gods for a Laksapūjā.[101] The propitiation of Skanda and other attendant deities is a clear indication of the king's Śaivaite leanings.[102] The king is also credited with the patronage of Brāhmaṇas attached to the Koneśvaram temple at Trincomalee in the *Taksiṇa Kailāca Purāṇam*.[103]

Although the *Cūḷavaṁsa* does not refer directly to Gajabāhu's religious leanings, certain statements in it seem to imply that under him Buddhism could not expect the patronage usually accorded to it by a Buddhist ruler. The chronicle does not attribute any Buddhist monument to him. He is accused of bringing over nobles of heretical faith from abroad.[104] The rationale for Parākramabāhu I's war with Gajabāhu

is made out to be the welfare of the people and Buddhism.[105] Even when the Buddhist monks intercede with Parākramabāhu I on behalf of Gajabāhu, they argue that Gajabāhu was old and close to death and he had no sons or brothers, and Parākramabāhu would soon have the opportunity to work for the welfare of the people and Buddhism. As this particular section of the *Cūḷavaṁsa* is specially bent on eulogising Parākramabāhu I, one cannot ignore the subjective bias of the author. The position taken up by the *Cūḷavaṁsa*, however, seems to rest on something more tangible than the fertile imagination of the author. The most significant piece of evidence which supports this view is contained in the Devanagala inscription of Parākramabāhu I.[106] Here it is claimed that he waged war with Gajabāhu and Mānābharaṇa in order to restore Buddhism which had been ruined for a period of forty-two years since the death of Vijayabāhu. This is not a vague generalisation of a royal bard which can be brushed aside as pure eulogy. It is a specific statement which involves a precious period, and that includes the reign of Gajabāhu II, hence its significance. Moreover, the record is dated in the twelfth year of Parākramabāhu I, which is roughly about twelve years after the death of Gajabāhu, when memories were still fresh and it is very unlikely that Parākramabāhu would have made a public statement such as this without any basis.

One other clue which suggests Gajabāhu's leanings towards Hinduism is his retirement to Gangātaṭāka (Kantalay) after he had come to terms with Parākramabāhu I and settled the succession to the throne in the latter's favour.[107] After a period of long and bitter fighting, Gajabāhu had come to the end of the road as it were and whatever hopes and aspirations he entertained earlier had to be abandoned with the recognition of Parākramabāhu as his heir. The choice of Gangātaṭāka at this stage of his career might have been prompted by religious considerations. The Palamoṭṭai Tamil inscription which can be dated in the 42nd year of either Vijayabāhu I or Jayabāhu I shows that Kantalay was clearly a Hindu centre. According to this inscription Kantalay was called Vijayarāja Caturvedimaṅgalam and the Śiva temple found here was known as Ten Kailāsam (Southern Kailāsam)[108]. Caturvedimaṅgalam is the term usually applied to a Brahmin village. That Gajabāhu had associated himself with this Brahmin settlement is known from his Kantalay inscription referred to already[109] That this area continued with its Hindu associations for much longer is proved by the Kantalay stone seat inscription of Nissaṁkamalla which refers to the region as Caturvedi Brahmapura.[110] An alms hall built by this ruler was named after Pārvati, the consort of Śiva. Archaeological evidence also supports the assumption that this was a centre of Śaiva worship.[111] Thus it would seem that Gajabāhu II, bereft of all hope, chose to spend his last days in a Hindu atmosphere, where he could devote his time to religious activities.

If religion was the determining factor as regards the status of Vikramabāhu I and Gajabāhul I, it should be possible to test this against other non-Buddhist rulers of Sri Lanka. However, such testing need not cover the entire dynastic history of the country, for as pointed out at the beginning of this paper[112] rules and practices were liable to change from time to time. The period from Vijayabāhu I (1055—1110) to the end of the reign of Māgha (1236 A. D.) is the most relevant period for such an investigation, but unfortunately for us there is only one ruler who was definitely known to have been a non-Buddhist—this being Māgha. There is no ambiguity about the religion of Māgha in the *Cūḷavaṁsa*, which refers to him as one who held false beliefs[113]. On the basis of the arguments advanced so far, Māgha would not be entitled to the royal consecration. However, the information in the *Cūḷavaṁsa* is that he was consecrated.[114] In the face of this, the entire argument falls. However, a closer examination of the *Cūḷavaṁsa* shows, that this consecration of Māgha was not recognised. The consecration itself was said to have been performed by his chief warriors[114], men who had accompanied him from Kaliṅga.[115] Such a consecration would not have been very meaningful in the local context and that it was not acceptable is patently clear in the statements of the chronicle itself where the regnal period of Māgha is referred to as a "rājantara" or interegnum.[116] The *Pūjāvaliya* speaks of Māgha's reign as the "Demaḷa arājitaya",[117] conveying similar sentiments. Thus Māgha's reign does not seem to have been officially recognised and it would follow that the so-called "abhiṣeka" of this ruler was not legally valid. No coins of Māgha have been found and there are no inscriptions so far found which can be attributed to him. Therefore the case of Māgha seems to support the contention that kings of Sri Lanka had to be Buddhists in order to gain official recognition. These same sentiments are reiterated in the *Cūḷavaṁsa* when it comments on the religious activities of Parākramabāhu II, when it says that Lanka does not remain (for long) in the hands of heretical kings but it flourishes under kings of the true faith.[118] The author of the *Pūjāvaliya* comes out even more strongly in the same context when he says that it was not proper for heretical kings to rule Lanka which befits only those of the true faith. This he says is an established truth (ekāntha dharmayeka).

This then was perhaps the 'established' law and it was perhaps this law that operated against Vikramabāhu I and Gajabāhu II. Sri Lanka was the Island of Buddhism—"Dhammadīpa" and its rulers were expected to be Buddhists. Those who were not, were tolerated but grudgingly.

NOTES

1. The dates mentioned in this paper follow the chronological tables in the *University of Ceylon History of Ceylon* (UCHC), Vol. I, Pt. II, ed. S. Paranavitana, Colombo 1960.
2. *Cūlavaṁsa* (*Cv.*), ed. W. Geiger, Pali Text Society, London 1925. Ch. LXI, v. 4.
3. *Ibid.*, Ch. LXI, v. 47.
4. *Ibid.*, Ch. LXI, v. 30.
5. *Ibid.*, Ch. LXIII, v. 19.
6. Ed. A. V. Suraveera, Colombo 1961—a thirteenth century work which contains a short dynastic history of Śri Lanka.
7. A Sinhalese Chronicle datable in the 18th century.
8. S. Paranavitana, 'Two Tamil inscriptions from Budumuttava', *Epigraphia Zeylanica* (*EZ*), Vol. III, No. 33.
9. S. Paranavitana, 'Kahambiliyava (Kaudulu—vava) Slab-Inscription of Vikramabāhu I', *Ibid.*, Vol. V. No. 39.
10. K. Indrapala, 'A Pillar Inscription from Mahakirindegama', *Epigraphia Tamilica*, (*ET*), Vol. I, Pt. I, No. 2
11. S. Paranavitana, 'Devanagala Rock Inscription of Parakramabhāu I' *EZ*, III, No. 34.
12. W. S. Karunaratne, 'Katugamuva Slab-Inscription of Manabharana', *EZ*, V, No. 11.
13. H. C. P. Bell, *Archaeological Survey of Ceylon*, Annual Report (ASCAR), 1909, p. 27.
14. K. Indrapala, 'An Agampadi Inscription from Hingurakdamana', *ET*, I, Pt. 1, No. 4.
15. K. Kanapathi Pillai, 'Mankanai Inscription of Gajabāhu II', *University of Ceylon Review*, XX, No. 1, pp. 12 ff.
16. *Cv.*, Ch. LVI, v. 1 and v. 11.
17. *ASCAR*, 1909, p. 27.
18. *Cv.*, Ch. LXIII, v. 18.
19. *Ibid.*, Ch. LXIII, v. 1.
20. S. Paranavitana, 'Polonnaruva: Fragmentary Slab-Inscription of Sundara—Mahadevi', *EZ*, IV, No. 9.
21. S. Paranavitana, 'Kahambiliyava Slab-Inscription...', *op. cit.*
22. See above, p. 13
23. See above, p. 13—15.
24. *Cv.*, Ch. LXI, vv. 1—8.
25. *Ibid.*, vv. 12—17.
26. K. Indrapala, 'An Agampadi Inscription...', *op. cit.*
27. *ASCAR*, 1909, p. 27.
28. W. S. Karunaratne, *op. cit.*
29. D. M. de Z. Wickremasinghe, 'Dimbulagala: Mara-Vidiye Rock Inscription', *EZ*, II, No. 34.
30. S. Pathmanathan, 'The Tamil Inscription from Mankanai', *Pavalar Thuraiappapillai Nootandu Vilzha Malar*, Part II, 1972, pp. 81—88.

31. K. Kanapathi Pillai, *op. cit.*
32. *Cv.*, Ch. LXXXI, v. 5.
33. Paranavitana suggests that the text refers to the 2nd occasion when Mānābharaṇa was in control of Polonnaruva (*EZ.* VI, p. 9). That we have a definite correlation of dates in the Polonnaruva inscription of the 38th year of Jayabāhu, corresponding to the 15th year of Gajabāhu, bears repetition. Accordingly the 43rd year of Jayabāhu would correspond to the 20th year of Gajabāhu, who had a 22 year reign. The second occupation of Polonnaruva by Mānābharaṇa took place after the death of Gajabāhu and the contents of this inscription cannot refer to that period.
34. *Cv.*, Ch. LVII, v. 4.
35. S. Paranavitana, 'Panakaduva Copper—Plate Charter of Vijayabāhu I', *EZ*, v., p. 5.
36. *UCHC*, vol. I, pp. 364—365.
37. Paranavitana, 'Two Tamil Pillar Inscriptions...', *op. cit.*
38. K. Indrapala, 'A Pillar Inscription from Mahakirindegama', *op. cit.*
39. W. S. Karunaratne, *op. cit.*
40. D. M. de Z. Wickremasinghe, *op. cit.*
41. K. Kanapathi Pillai, *op. cit.*
42. See above, p. 14.
43. Cv., Ch. LII, v. 58.
44. D. M. de Z. Wickremasinghe, 'Anuradhapura: Slab Inscription of Kassapa V', *EZ*, I, No. 4.
45. K. Indrapala, 'An Agampadi Inscription...' *op. cit.*
46. The Palamottai Tamil Inscription (*EZ*, IV, no. 24) of Vikramra Calamega is not clear whether the regnal date in the record is Vijayabāhu's or Jayabāhu's. Until this is settled the evidence in the inscription cannot be used for the purpose of this discussion.
47. D. M. de Z. Wickremasinghe, 'Ambagamuva Rock Inscription of Vijayabāhu I', *EZ*, II, no. 35.
48. Paranavitana makes the same observation when he says: "In dating documents during this period in Ceylon, the year was not referred to by a recognised era like the Buddha varṣa or the Saka varṣa, but to the era of the inauguration of an Abhā Salamevan or Siri Saṅgabo, the throne names borne alternately by the medieval kings of Ceylon. *EZ*, V. p. 5, f. n. 2).
49. D. M. de Z. Wickremasinghe, 'Dimbulagala...', *op. cit.*
50. S. Paranavitana, 'Kahabiliyava Slab-Inscription...', *op. cit.*
51. *Ibid.*
52. C. E. Godakumbura, 'Kapuruvaduoya Pillar Inscription of Gajabāhu II', *EZ*, V. no. 38.
53. *Ibid.*
54. *Ibid.*
55. *Ibid.*
56. See below.

57. *Cv.*, Ch. LXIV, vv. 33—35.
58. See above, p. 14
59. *Cv.*, Ch. LXIII, 14 vv. 21—22.
60. *Ibid.*, Ch. XXXVIII, vv. 1—2.
61. *Ibid.*, v. 80 ff.
62. *Ibid.*. Ch. LIX, vv. 29—32.
63. D. M. de Z. Wickremasinghe, 'Dimbulagala...', *op. cit.*
64. *Mahavamsa*, ed. W. Geiger, P. T. S. London 1934, Ch. VII, v. 47; Ch. VIII, vv. 17—27.
65. D. M. de Z. Wickremasinghe, 'Dimbulagala ', *op. cit.*,
66. D. M. de Z. Wickremasinghe, 'The Two Tablets of Mahinda IV at Mihintale', *EZ*, I, no. 7.
67. *Cv.*, Ch. LX, v 88.
68. His legal status is in no doubt for he uses the Siri Sangabo title and his regnal years are used for the purpose of dating records. (*EZ*, Vol. II, no 36.)
69. She had the title Abha Salamevan and her regnal years are used for official dating. (*EZ*, Vol. IV, no. 10.)
70. D. M. de Z. Wickremasinghe, 'Polonnaruva: Slab Inscription of the Velaikkaras', *EZ*, II, no 40.
71. *Cv.*, Ch. LXX, v. 310.
72. *Ibid.*, Ch. LXXI, vv. 19—32.
73. *Ibid.*, Ch. LXXII, vv. 311—329.
74. *Ibid.*, Ch. LXXIV, v. 126.
75. D. M. de Z. Wickremasinghe, 'Polonnaruva: Galpota Slab Inscription', *EZ*, II, no. 17.
76. D. M. de Z. Wickremasinghe, 'Polonnaruva: Slab Inscription at the North-Gate of the Citadel', *EZ*, II, no. 28.
77. D. M. de Z. Wickremasinghe, 'Jetavanarama Slab Inscription of Mahinda IV', *EZ*, I, no. 20.
78. Persons destined to attain Buddhahood.
79. (*Siri Lakhi*) *no bosat hu ro raj vanhayi sähakula kot savaniya munirajhu* (*viyaran*) *lad tumā pay sivan rak* (*nuva*)*s mahasanghu pilivayu raj siri pämina sana bisev vindna* (*da*) *vas maha*/*sa*/*ng haṭ meheyaṭ uvasar vas* (*seve*) *bandna*
80. D. M. de Z. Wickremasinghe, 'Polonnaruva: Slab Inscription of the Velaikkaras'.
81. *Cv*, Ch. LXXX, vv. 9—14.
82. D. M. de Z. Wickremasinghe, 'Polonnaruva: Slab Inscription of Sahasa Malla', *EZ*, II, no. 36.
83. Canto I, vv. 4—8 (Colombo 1946)
84. *Cv.*, Ch. LIX, vv. 29—31.
85. *Ibid.*, Ch. LX, vv. 54—55.
86. *Ibid.*, Ch. LXI, vv. 54—61.
88. See, above p. 14.

89. S. Paranavitana, 'A Tamil Slab Inscription from Palamottai' *EZ*, IV, p. 194.
90. S. Paranavitana, 'Kahambiliyava Slab Inscription...'
91. An inscription which can be dated in the reign of Gajabāhu states that she had a road constructed between two temples, which were in turn provided with images, dagobas and Bodhi trees. It is also on record that she made a grant to the temple known as Demala paha. (*EZ*, Vol. II, no. 34.)
92. *ASCAR*, 1909, p. 27.
93. Vol. VI, Pt. I, no. 23.
94. *Cv.*, Ch. LXXX, vv. 179—182.
95. *Ibid.*, vv. 327—330.
96. *Ibid.*, Ch. LXXI, v. 3.
97. S. Paranavitana, 'Samgamu Vihara Rock Inscription', *EZ*, IV, no. 1.
98. *EZ*, VI. no. 23.
99. The Buddha, his doctrine and the Sangha.
100. K. D. Swaminathan, 'An Inscription of Gajabāhu II', *Ceylon Historical Journal*, Vol. X, nos. 1—4, 1960—61.
101. C. E. Godakumbura, *op. cit.*
102. Same as Laksa-arcanā. Performed on behalf of devotees. Offerings are made to the accompaniment of the recital of a lakh of names of the god. This figure is made up by the repetition of the sahasranāma a hundred times. "A study of Saivism of the epic and the Purānic Periods." Unpublished Ph. D. thesis. K. Kailasanatha Kurukkal, Poona, 1960, p. 635.
103. Ed. P P. Vaittiyalinka Tecikar, 1916. vv. 95—97.
104. *Cv.*, Ch. LXX, vv. 53—55.
105. *Ibid.*, vv. 210 and 248.
106. S. Paranavitana, 'Devanagala Rock Inscription...'
107. *Cv.*, Ch. LXXI, v. 1.
108. S. Paranavitana, 'A Tamil Slab Inscription from Palamottai...'
109. See above, page
110. D. M. de Z Wickremasinghe, 'Kantalai Gal-Asana Inscription of Kitti Nissamkamalla', *EZ*, II, no. 42.
111. S. Paranavitana, 'A Tamil Slab Inscription from Palamottai...'
112. See pp. 12—13.
113. *Cv.*, Ch. LXXX, v. 56,
114. *Ibid.*, v. 73.
115. *Ibid.*
116. *Ibid*, vv. 59—60.
117. Ch. 34.
118. *Cv.*, Ch. LXXXI, vv. 1 & 31; LXXXIV, v. 7; LXXXVII, v. 46