

The Emperor of Ceylon at the time of the Arrival of the Portuguese in 1505

ACCORDING to the *Rājāvalī*, it was when Dharma Parākramabāhu (the Ninth) was Sovereign of Kōṭṭe that, in 1505, a Portuguese fleet commanded by Don Lourenço de Almeida arrived in the harbour of Colombo.¹ The date given for this event by the *Rājāvalī*, however, is 1522 A.C., being 17 years after the true date.² From the *Rājāvalī* we also learn that Dharma Parākramabāhu was the eldest of the four sons of Vira Parākramabāhu (the Eighth) who is called Javira Pracura Mabago by Diogo do Couto. The other sons of Vira Parākramabāhu were Vijayabāhu and Rājasimha, who as joint husbands of a princess resided at Māṇikkāḍavara, and an unnamed prince who resided at Rayigama. From a sister of the mother of these four princes, Vira Parākramabāhu had two other sons, namely, Sakalalakāvalla of Uḍugampola and Taniyavalla of Mādampe.³

The earliest Portuguese writings referring to Ceylon do not give the name of the Kōṭṭe Sovereign at the time of de Almeida's arrival at Colombo.⁴ Diogo do Couto says that it was in the time of a king named Boenegabo Pandar (Bhuvanekabāhu) that the Portuguese first arrived in this Island. According to this historian, Javira Pracura Mabago Pandar (Jayavira Parākramabāhu, i.e. Vira Parākramabāhu VIII) was succeeded by the eldest of his sons, called Drama Pracura Mabago (Dharma Parākramabāhu). 'At this time, there died one of the king's brothers, who left four sons and two daughters and their mother married another brother of her husband's called Boenegabo Pandar, who was ruler of Reigao (i.e. Rayigama). This king, after being crowned eight times, died, leaving three young sons, whom

1. *Rājāvalī*, translated by B. Gunasekara, Reprint, Colombo, 1954 (*Rt.*), p. 63.

2. In a learned paper entitled 'The Discovery of Ceylon by the Portuguese in 1506,' Donald Ferguson maintains that the true date of this event was 1506, but this view has not been adopted by later writers. See *Journal of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society (JCBRAS)*, Vol. XIX (No. 59), pp. 284—400. For the purpose of this paper, it is immaterial whether the event took place in 1505 or 1506.

3. *Rt.*, p. 61; *JCBRAS*, Vol. XX (No. 60), p. 70.

4. *The History of Ceylon from the earliest times to 1600 A.D. as related by João de Barros and Diogo do Couto*, translated and edited by Donald Ferguson, in *JCBRAS*, Vol. XX (No. 60). For Barros's account, see pp. 22 ff. *The Portuguese in Ceylon in the First Half of the 16th Century*, Gaspar Correa's Account by Donald Ferguson in *Ceylon Literary Register, Third Series (CLR)*, Vol. IV, pp. 141—161, 161—211.

their uncle seized and secretly slew, the right to the throne thus being left to him alone, whereupon he forthwith had himself crowned as emperor, bringing up in his house the three stepsons whom we have mentioned, who were also his nephews, the sons of his brother, who were called Boenegabo Pandar, who was the eldest, and the second Reigao Bandar, and the third Madunc Pandar.⁵ Bhuvanekabāhu who, according to do Couto, succeeded Dharma Parākramabāhu and was occupying the throne of Kōṭṭe in 1505, was previously the ruler of Rayigama. He can therefore be identified with the unnamed brother of Dharma Parākramabāhu who, according to the *Rājāvalī*, dwelt at Rayigama. According to do Couto, Dharma Parākramabāhu reigned for eight years only, but the *Rājāvalī* ascribes to him a reign of twenty-two years, and states that he was succeeded by his brother Vijayabāhu (the Sixth). The names of the three sons of Bhuvanekabāhu (the successor, according to do Couto, of Dharma Parākramabāhu) are the same as those which the *Rājāvalī* gives to the sons of Vijayabāhu VII; the relations of these princes with their father, as given by do Couto, are identical with those of the sons of Vijayabāhu with their father.⁶ It is therefore clear that the Bhuvanekabāhu of do Couto is the same as the Vijayabāhu of the *Rājāvalī*. The tradition that the Portuguese first landed in Ceylon when a Bhuvanekabāhu was reigning at Kōṭṭe is also given by the *Saṅgarājavata* of the eighteenth century.⁷

Fernaõ de Queyroz closes his garbled account of the Emperors who ruled at Kōṭṭe before the arrival of the Portuguese with the statement that it was in the days of a Sovereign of Kōṭṭe named Paracarmes-Bau (Parākramabāhu) who was the son of Vira Paracrama-Bau (Vira Parākramabāhu) that de Almeida came to the port of Colombo. This historian, thus, is in agreement with the *Rājāvalī*, though he does not give the epithet of Dharma to the Parākramabāhu with whom the first Portuguese to arrive in Ceylon had dealings. According to de Queyroz it was Javira-Paracrama-Bau (Jayavira Parākramabāhu) the successor of Ruqueli-Paracrama-Bau (Rukule Parākramabāhu, i.e. Parākramabāhu VI) to whom the name of Darma (Dharma) was given by the people.⁸ Though do Couto and de Queyroz

5. *JCBRAS*, XX (No. 60), pp. 70—71.

6. *JCBRAS*, XX (No. 60), pp. 72—70 and *Rt.*, pp. 64—66.

7. Edited by Sri Charles de Silva, vv. 41—42. According to Ribeiro, too, the Emperor at the time of the first arrival of the Portuguese in Ceylon was styled Boenegabo Pandar. Ribeiro, however, takes this monarch to be the same as Bhuvanekabāhu VII. See Ribeiro, *History of Ceylon*, translated by P. E. Pieris, Colombo, 1909, p. 8.

8. *The Temporal and Spiritual Conquest of Ceylon*, by Father Fernaõ de Queyroz, translated by Father S. G. Perera, Colombo, 1930, (Queyroz), pp. 25—26.

are at variance with regard to the name of the Emperor at Kōṭṭe when de Almeida arrived at Colombo, they both agree in stating that he was a son of Vīra Parākramabāhu (the Eighth).

In his account of the 'discovery' of Ceylon by Lourenço de Almeida in 1505, de Queyroz refers to the Emperor of Kōṭṭe at that time by the name of Paracrama Bau (Parākramabāhu) with no distinguishing epithet.⁹ In recounting the relations of the Portuguese with the residents of Colombo in 1507, the king is referred to as being then in his dotage.¹⁰ De Queyroz has also recorded that, about this time, King Parākramabāhu had to face disaffection in his own court and a rebellion on the frontier of Candea, which are explained as 'the common fate of old age.'¹¹ We are told by de Queyroz that, towards the end of 1517, when the Portuguese Governor Lopo Soares de Albergaria arrived in Colombo with the intention of building a fort there, the Emperor Parākramabāhu himself came to the seaport from Kōṭṭe to meet the Governor. In the account of this interview between the Sinhalese Emperor and the Portuguese Governor, the former is represented as a man in extreme old age 'with a long grey beard and authority of person'. In an anecdote which de Queyroz has made the old Emperor relate, the latter refers to his father as the Emperor Paracume-Bau (Pārakumbā or Parākrama-bāhu).¹²

A document which de Queyroz makes this Parākramabāhu sign on this occasion, acknowledging vassalage and the payment of tribute to Portugal, is dated in the 40th year of his reign. Not long afterwards, as a result of popular resentment against the Emperor for his weak-kneed attitude towards the Portuguese, he is said to have completely lost his reason. The people thereupon entrusted the government to his son Vigia-Bau (Vijayabāhu), who is said to have hastened the end of the old Emperor by giving him poison. This Vijayabāhu is said to have been the younger son of Parākramabāhu; the elder, named Chacrauda-Bau (Cakrāyadha-bāhu), being passed over in the succession as not so capable. According to de Queyroz this Emperor Parākramabāhu reigned for 46 years.¹³

The Vijayabāhu referred to here is said, in the course of de Queyroz's subsequent narrative, to have lost his life in the episode well-known in the

9. *Queyroz*, p. 177.

10. *Queyroz*, p. 183.

11. *Queyroz*, p. 185.

12. *Queyroz*, p. 191.

13. *Queyroz*, p. 197.

history of the period as Vijayabā-kolle.¹⁴ He was therefore the king usually called Vijayabāhu VII, though he was actually the sixth ruler of that name. According to the *Rājāvali*, Vijayabāhu VI (VII)¹⁵ was a son of Vīra Parākramabāhu. Therefore, the Emperor who, according to de Queyroz, was occupying the throne of Kōṭṭe at that time was Vīra Parākramabāhu VIII, and he was succeeded after his demise by Vijayabāhu VI (VII). The *Rājāvali*, however, interposes the twenty-two years' reign of Dharma Parākramabāhu, the eldest son of Vīra Parākramabāhu, between that monarch's reign and the advent of Vijayabāhu VI (VII). Modern writers on Ceylon history from G. Turnour up to Sir Paul Pieris¹⁶ have all taken it as an established fact that the Portuguese arrived for the first time in Ceylon in the reign of Dharma Parākramabāhu IX, but two distinguished historians who have written after de Queyroz's important work had been made available to students of Ceylon history,¹⁷ namely H. W. Codrington and Father S. G. Perera, are definitely of the view that that event took place when Vīra Parākramabāhu was the Emperor of Kōṭṭe. Father Perera, however, is of opinion that though Vīra Parākramabāhu was the nominal Emperor, he had entrusted the government of his realm to his sons, Dharma Parākramabāhu ruling at Kōṭṭe and Vijayabāhu at Devundara. Also according to Father Perera, the King Paracrama-Bau of de Queyroz at the time of de Almeida's arrival at Colombo in 1505, was Dharma Parākramabāhu IX, to whom he has assigned a reign of ten years from 1509 to 1519. Codrington, on the other hand, is of the opinion that Vīra Parākramabāhu reigned up to 1513 at least, and possibly up to 1518, while Dharma Parākramabāhu is treated as a shadowy figure, reigning from 1509 to 1528 at least, and spending his last days at Kālaṇi. We now proceed to examine the positions taken up by these two historians.

De Queyroz states that the Emperor Parākramabāhu who ceased to reign a short time after he entered into a treaty with Lopo Soares reigned for 46 years. This is at variance with the alleged treaty of vassalage of 1517

14. *Queyroz*, p. 203.

15. Mudaliyar Simon de Silva, in a paper contributed to the *JCBRAS*, XXII (No. 65), pp. 316 ff., has conclusively proved that there was no king named Vijayabāhu VI preceding the reign of Parākramabāhu VI. The next king after Vijayabāhu V to bear the name was he who succeeded Dharma Parākramabāhu. He should, therefore, be styled Vijayabāhu VI, and not VII as is usually done.

16. G. Turnour, *The Mahāvamsa, with the translation subjoined*, Cotta Mission Press, 1837, p. lxxvii; Pridham, *Ceylon*, Vol. 1, pp. 84—85; W. Knighton, *The History of Ceylon*, pp. 222—3; Paul Pieris, *Ceylon: The Portuguese Era*, Vol. 1, p. 40 and pp. 438 ff.

17. H. W. Codrington, *A Short History of Ceylon*, London, 1947 (SHC), pp. xviii, 94 and 100; Father S. G. Perera, *A History of Ceylon: The Portuguese and Dutch Periods*, Revised by Father V. Perniola, Colombo, 1955, pp. 12 and 15.

which contains the words 'in the heart of my Empire, 40 years called Segara',¹⁸ which probably are meant to convey that the document was dated in the 40th year of the Emperor's reign, for the Emperor, according to the subsequent narrative, died in 1518. The figure 46 is probably due to a clerical error, or the reign has been calculated from the time that Parākramabāhu became *yuvārāja*, and the alleged treaty is dated from the years of his reign as Supreme ruler. If we take that this Parākramabāhu of de Queyroz was in the 40th year of his reign in 1517, he should have begun his reign in 1478. This would be about the time when, according to Sinhalese sources, Vīra Parākramabāhu ascended the throne of Kōṭṭe. For we know from the *Budugūṇa-alanikāra* that the third year of Bhuvanekabāhu VI was 2015 of the Buddhist era, i.e. 1472 A.C., and that he died after having reigned for seven years. According to the *Rājāvalī*, the son of Bhuvanekabāhu VI, named Paṇḍita Parākramabāhu VII, was proclaimed Emperor at Kōṭṭe; but the younger brother of the deceased Emperor, then *yuvārāja* at Ambulugala, asserted his rights to the succession and, having slain Paṇḍita Parākramabāhu, ascended the throne of Kōṭṭe as Vīra Parākramabāhu. Though do Couto credits Paṇḍita Parākramabāhu with a reign of three years, the *Rājāvalī* is silent on the duration of his authority. The trend of the narrative in that chronicle gives one the impression that Paṇḍita Parākramabāhu did not wield the sceptre for even a year. At any rate, Vīra Parākramabāhu would have considered himself the legitimate successor of Bhuvanekabāhu VI, and counted his regnal years from the demise of the latter.¹⁹ Thus, if Vīra Parākramabāhu was the Emperor at Kōṭṭe in 1517, he would have been at that time in the 40th year of his reign.

Bhuvanekabāhu VI and Vīra Parākramabāhu VIII were both actual or adopted sons of Parākramabāhu VI.²⁰ The Kuḍumirissa rock-inscription, which must be of Vīra Parākramabāhu,²¹ refers to the great king, the father of the ruler who issued the grant; and, later in the document, the original grantor so referred to is named Śrī Parākramabāhu. In the Kalyāṇī inscription, Bhuvanekabāhu VI, the elder brother of Vīra Parākramabāhu, is quoted as referring to his father as Parākramabāhu.²² Thus the reference to his father as a Parākramabāhu by the Emperor of Kōṭṭe in 1517 would not militate against the identification of the latter with Vīra Parākramabāhu. Bhuvanekabāhu VI, then known as Prince Sapumal, was old enough in

1450 to lead an expedition to Jaffna. Assuming that his younger brother, the later Vīra Parākramabāhu, was fifteen years old at that time, he would have been 82 years of age in 1517. This is in accord with the statement of de Queyroz that, already in 1507, the king called Parākramabāhu by him was in his dotage.

The Parākramabāhu who was the Emperor at Kōṭṭe at the time de Almeida arrived at Colombo, de Queyroz informs us, had to deal with a rebellion 'on the frontier of Candea', i.e. the Kanda-uḍa-raṭa, not long after that event.²³ There is no evidence from any other source that there was a rebellion against Vīra Parākramabāhu in that quarter during his reign. On the other hand, the *Rājāvalī* informs us that, in the reign of Dharma Parākramabāhu, the prince of the Uḍaraṭa became refractory, and was brought to submission by the Emperor's brother, Śrī Rājasinha of Māṇik-kaḍavara.²⁴ According to the *Rājāvalī*, Vīra Parākramabāhu reigned for twenty years, and Dharma Parākramabāhu for twenty-two years; de Queyroz assigns to the Parākramabāhu, the Emperor of Kōṭṭe at the time of the first arrival of the Portuguese, a reign of 46 (possibly an error for 42) years. If we give credence to the *Rājāvalī*, the position is that this Parākramabāhu of de Queyroz is the result of making one personage of Vīra and Dharma Parākramabāhus. On the other hand, if de Queyroz is right, the *Rājāvalī* has made two separate Emperors out of two different titles of one and the same Sovereign. De Queyroz is not alone in omitting Dharma Parākramabāhu and making Vijayabāhu VI (VII) succeed Vīra Parākramabāhu. The *Rājaratnākara*,²⁵ written in the latter half of the sixteenth century, and following it the continuation of the *Cūlavaiṣṇava*, written in the reign of Kīrtiśrī Rājasinha of Kandy, omit Dharma Parākramabāhu from the list of Ceylon kings.²⁶ Consequently, in Wijesinha's Chronological List of Ceylon kings, there is no Dharma Parākramabāhu.²⁷

The questions thus arise whether de Queyroz's evidence on this matter is reliable, and what was the source of his information about the Emperor of Kōṭṭe at the time of the first arrival of the Portuguese in Ceylon. The

23. *Queyroz*, p. 177.

24. *Rt.* p. 62.

25. *Rt.*, pp. 61 and 63.

26. *Rājaratnākara*, edited by P. N. Tisera, Colombo, 1929, p. 43; *Cūlavaiṣṇava*, edited by W. Geiger, P.T.S., Vol. II, chapter 92, vv. 1—4. The statement in the *Sūlu-pūjāvaliya* that the Portuguese first arrived in Ceylon in the reign of Paṇḍita Parākramabāhu, the predecessor of Vīra Parākramabāhu, indicates the unsatisfactoriness of the historical traditions relating to Kōṭṭe kings that prevailed among the scholars of Kandy in the eighteenth century.

27. *Mahāvaiṣṇava*, translated into English, Government Printer, Colombo, 1917, p. xxvi

18. *Queyroz*, pp. 195 and 197.

19. See University of Ceylon, *A History of Ceylon, (UHC)*, Vol. I, pp. 677—683.

20. *UHC*, Vol. I, p. 673.

21. *JCBRAS*, Vol. X (No. 34), p. 98.

22. *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XXII, p. 45.

earliest Portuguese writings referring to Ceylon do not mention this ruler by name. The letter of King Emmanuel (Manuel) of Portugal to Pope Julius, dated 25 September, 1507,²⁸ which gives a graphic account of the reception of the first Portuguese ambassador at Kōṭṭe, refers to the Sinhalese Emperor as King, without giving his personal name. The letter of Affonso de Albuquerque to King Manuel, dated 30 November, 1513,²⁹ says that 'the King of Ceilam is dead,' but does not give his name. Neither Gaspar Correa, nor Lopes de Castanheda, nor Joaõ de Barros—the earliest historians of the Portuguese in India—gives the name of the Kōṭṭe Sovereign with whom the Portuguese had dealings between 1505 and 1518.³⁰ The first Portuguese writer to refer to this Sinhalese Sovereign by name is Diogo do Couto; that, too, in his somewhat garbled account of the Sovereigns of Kōṭṭe before the arrival of the Portuguese. The position thus appears to be that the earlier Portuguese writers on Ceylon were not curious about the name of the Sinhalese Sovereign with whom their pioneer adventurers had dealings. The later writers, after they had gained some acquaintance with the people of Ceylon, their customs, traditions and institutions, made an attempt to ascertain this fact, but the conclusions they arrived at would have depended on the veracity of their informants. We have seen that the information gathered by do Couto with regard to this matter was that the Portuguese first arrived in Ceylon when a king named Bhuvanekabāhu was reigning at Kōṭṭe,³¹ and that this is in accord with a tradition current among the learned circles in Kandy in the eighteenth century. Similarly, the information gathered by de Queyroz, or the writer whom he copied, to the effect that the Sovereign at Kōṭṭe at the time of the first arrival of the Portuguese was succeeded by a Vijayabāhu is based on another tradition, current among the Sinhalese, which has found its way to the *Rājaratnākara*, also a work written in Kandy. Neither do Couto nor de Queyroz had the means, even if they desired to do so, of ascertaining the truth or otherwise of the information with regard to these matters which they recorded.

The interest shown by de Queyroz in ascertaining the name of the Sinhalese Emperor who had dealings with Lourenço de Almeida and Lopo Soares de Albergaria is part of the effort, noticeable throughout his work, to enliven his narrative with factual minutiae and conform to accepted norms of historical writing. For this same purpose, he invents appropriate speeches to be put into the mouths of important personages, and even

28. *JCBRAS*, Vol. XIX (No. 59), pp. 340—41.

29. *JCBRAS*, Vol. XIX (No. 59), p. 373.

30. *JCBRAS*, Vol. XX (No. 60), pp. 22 ff; *CLR*, Vol. IV, pp. 146 ff.

31. See above, note 3.

includes episodes of doubtful historical authenticity. An example of the last category appears to be the detailed account of the visit paid by Parākramabāhu to Lopo Soares when the latter arrived at Colombo for the purpose of building a fortress there.³² None of the earlier Portuguese historians of India alludes to such a visit and, if a Portuguese Governor received such consideration from the Sinhalese Sovereign, there was no reason why they were silent on it. In fact, Gaspar Correa categorically states that, when the Emperor received the messengers sent by Lopo Soares, he sent his grand chamberlain to negotiate with the Portuguese Governor;³³ Joaõ de Barros states that the Sinhalese Sovereign 'conceded him (Lopo Soares) the fortress, sending to interview him with words that showed his satisfaction'.³⁴ Therefore, until one is satisfied about the authenticity of the source on which de Queyroz based his account of this alleged visit of the Sinhalese Sovereign to meet Lopo Soares, all the interesting details given in that account of the appearance and character of Parākramabāhu have to be treated with suspicion. On the face of it, it is most unlikely that the Emperor would have been so unmindful of his dignity, and so imprudent as to risk his person, by a visit to the captain of a foreign armada.

Similar should be the verdict with regard to the agreement which Parākramabāhu is said to have signed and given to Lopo Soares. Many of the titles given to Parākramabāhu in this document, such as 'Fortunate descendant of the Kings of Anu-Raja-Pure,' 'Rightful heir of the Kings of Dambadeni and of the great Peak of Adam' are of a type quite unlike the epithets given to Sovereigns in genuine documents emanating from the Court of Jayavardhana-pura³⁵, and seem to have been invented, not without the idea of ridiculing the Emperor, by a Portuguese writer not acquainted with the formulae in use among the scribes of Kōṭṭe, but with some knowledge of the history of the Island.

The letter of de Albuquerque, to which reference has already been made, seems to contradict what we gather from de Queyroz's narrative, that the Emperor of Kōṭṭe in 1505 and 1518 was one and the same. Paul Picris, however, is of opinion that the expression 'King of Ceilam' in a Portuguese document of this period need not necessarily mean the Emperor of

32. *Queyroz*, pp. 89—192.

33. *CLR*, Vol. IV, p. 195.

34. *JCBRAS* XX, (No. 60), p.40.

35. *Queyroz*, p. 195. For royal titles in the Kōṭṭe period, see Bell, *Report on the Kegalla District (RKD)*, pp. 93—94, *Epigraphia Zeylanica (EZ)*, Vol. III, pp. 66—67, *JCBRAS*, Vol. XXII (No. 65), pp. 271—273.

Kōṭṭe, and that it may refer to some other ruler of the Island. He says that the ruler of Jaffna is so styled in some Portuguese documents.³⁶ We shall revert to this point later.

Having thus examined the literary sources that have a bearing on the subject, we now take up for consideration the contemporary epigraphical records likely to throw light on it. There are two dated stone inscriptions and a datable copper-plate charter, the evidence supplied by which should, in my opinion, decide the question in a conclusive manner. These are the stone inscription of a paramount king named Vijayabāhu at Devinuvara (Dondra),³⁷ a copper-plate of a Sovereign of the same name found at Kadirāna in the Negombo District, now preserved in the Colombo Museum, and the stone inscription of an Emperor named Parākramabāhu at the Rajamahavihāra at Kālaṇi. Of these, the last-named record, the most significant for our purpose, has not, in my opinion, been correctly interpreted as yet, so far as its chronological significance is concerned.

To take the two documents of Vijayabāhu first. The Devinuvara inscription is dated the first of the waning moon in the month of Poson in the year after the fourth (i.e. the fifth) of the Emperor Sirisaṅgabo Śrī Vijayabāhu who attained the sovereignty in the year 1432 of the Śaka era. Normally, expired years are quoted of the Śaka era, to convert which into those of the Christian era, 78 has to be added. But, as Codrington has pointed out, the Śaka year quoted in this document has to be treated as current. The Kadirāna Sannasa,³⁸ which is written in characters resembling those of the Devinuvara inscription, records a grant made to a Brahmin on the new-moon day of Poson in the year after the eighth (i.e. the ninth) of the Emperor Sirisaṅgabo Śrī Vijayabāhu, on the occasion of a Solar eclipse. There were Solar eclipses in the lunar month of Poson (May-June) on 18 June, 1517 and 8 June, 1518, but the second was not visible in Ceylon. The date of the Kadirāna Sannasa has therefore to be taken as 18 June, 1517, which was in the ninth year of Vijayabāhu.³⁹ The Śaka year 1432, in

36. Paul Pieris, *Ceylon: The Portuguese Era*, Vol. I, pp. 442—443.

37. The text of this record was first published by T. W. Rhys Davids in *JCBRAS*, 1870—71, p. 26. Rhys Davids' reading has been reproduced by E. Müller as No. 163 of his *Ancient Inscriptions in Ceylon*. For the revised text, see S. Paranavitana, *The Shrine of Upulvan at Devinuvara (Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of Ceylon, Volume VI)*, pp. 75—78.

38. The text published by Louis de Zoysa, Maha Mudaliyar, in *JCBRAS* for 1873, Vol. V, No. 18, pp. 75—79. The Maha Mudaliyar's text has been included by Dr. E. Müller as No. 162 in his *Ancient Inscriptions in Ceylon*.

39. *EZ*, Vol. III, p. 58. H. C. P. Bell (*RKD*), p. 86, takes the Śaka year quoted in the Devinuvara inscription to be the same as the fifth year of Vijayabāhu and concludes that this Emperor ascended the throne in 1505. The wording of the inscription does not support Bell's interpretation. Moreover,

which he ascended the throne, was therefore equivalent to 1509 A.C., and his accession must have taken place before the new-moon of Poson of that year if his ninth year was current on 18 June, 1517. In the thirteenth year of the same Sovereign is dated the Kappāgoḍa inscription.⁴⁰ This record is one attested by Vijayasimha Ekanāyaka Perumālu, identical with the Ekanāyaka Mudali of the *Rājāvali*, who, according to that chronicle, together with Kaṇḍure Baṇḍāra, conspired to keep the three sons of Vijayabāhu and Rājasimha out of the succession. This conspiracy led to the famous Vijayabā-kolle, in which Vijayabāhu lost his life, and the throne passed to Bhuvanekabāhu VII. It is now known for certain that the last named king began his reign in 1521.⁴¹ If Vijayabāhu ascended the throne in 1509, his thirteenth regnal year, the date of the Kappāgoḍa inscription, could have been current in 1521. It is thus clear that the Emperor referred to in the Devinuvara and Kappāgoḍa stone inscriptions and the Kadirāna copper-plate is the monarch named Vīgia Bau by de Queyroz, the first Sinhalese ruler to make a determined stand against the designs of the Portuguese to gain control over Ceylon.

Now, according to de Queyroz, it was shortly after Lopo Soares succeeded in establishing the first Portuguese settlement in Colombo that Vijayabāhu became Emperor of Kōṭṭe. Father S. G. Perera, therefore, gives Vijayabāhu VI (VII) a reign of only two years from 1519 to 1521, but thinks that he was ruling in the south of the Island while Dharma Parākramabāhu was reigning at Kōṭṭe.⁴² The Vēragama Sannasa of Vijayabāhu militates against this view of Father Perera, based on de Queyroz; for this document, dated in the seventh regnal year of the monarch, embodies an order delivered by him, while he was seated on the throne, attended by his ministers, in the palace of Jayavardhanapura (Kōṭṭe). Codrington, on the other hand, takes Vijayabāhu to have reigned from 1509 to 1521 at Kōṭṭe, while, at the same time and much later, Dharma Parākramabāhu was reigning, perhaps at Kālaṇi, and Vīra Parākramabāhu at some unspecified place.⁴³ According to Codrington, therefore, there were three

Contd. from page 18.

if Vijayabāhu VI came to the throne in 1505, his ninth year, during which there was a Solar eclipse in Poson (June), should have been 1513 or 1514, in neither of which years there was such a Solar eclipse. I am indebted to Mr. D. J. Jayasinha, Director, Department of Meteorology, for obtaining from the Royal Greenwich Observatory, information about these eclipses.

40. Bell, *Report on the Kegalle District*, (*RKD*), pp. 86—87. For Ekanāyaka-mudali, see *Rt.*, pp. 64—65.

41. For the date of Bhuvanekabāhu, see *JCBRAS*, Vol. XXII (No. 65), pp. 267—302, and *CLR*, IV, p. 380, foot-note 2.

42. S. G. Perera, *op.cit.*, p. 15.

43. Codrington, *SHC*, pp. xviii, 96 and 100.

contemporary Emperors in the realm of Kōṭṭe from 1509 to 1513 or 1518. This conclusion, quite at variance with the historical tradition of the Sinhalese, has been arrived at partly on the evidence of the Kālaṇi Rajamahavihāra inscription, to which we now direct our attention.

This inscription, which was first edited and published by Maha-Mudali Louis de Zoysa,⁴⁴ refers to the year 2051 of the Buddhist era and the nineteenth regnal year of the Emperor Sirisaṅgabo Śrī Parākramabāhu. The learned Maha-Mudali interpreted the document as stating that the Emperor named therein ascended the throne in the year of the Buddhist era given in it, thus making the actual date of the record to be in 1527 A.C. The Maha-Mudali identifies the Emperor of the Kālaṇi inscription with Dharma Parākramabāhu IX, refers to the fact that the *Mahāvamsa* (the later continuation of the venerable chronicle) and the *Rājaratnākara* ignore this monarch, and rightly concludes that this is more to their disadvantage than to the sovereign cold-shouldered. He then refers to the date of the accession of Vijayabāhu VI (VII) given in the Devundara inscription and, exhibiting remarkable judgment (given the validity of the premises on which it is based) and modesty becoming a great scholar, comments in these words, on the problem thus posed: 'I shall not, at present, attempt a solution of this strange historical problem, beyond expressing my belief that the assumption of the sovereignty by Dharma Parākrama Bāhu was disputed by his brother Vijaya Bāhu, and that, at least for a time, one part of the nation (probably those in the South) acknowledged the latter as sovereign, while the rest adhered to his brother'.⁴⁵

This suggestion of Louis de Zoysa has been adopted as reasonable by H. C. P. Bell. And it is the Maha-Mudali's view that has been adopted, with certain modifications, by H. W. Codrington and Father S. G. Perera. The historical problem which has arisen from his interpretation of the Kālaṇi inscription has been characterised as strange by Louis de Zoysa, even at a time when the reign of Vijayabāhu VI (VII) was taken to have extended up to 1534 and Bhuvanekabāhu VII was given a reign of eight years beginning in that year.⁴⁶ The historical problem has become much stranger now that it has been definitely established that Bhuvanekabāhu VII came to the throne in 1521.⁴⁷ For, according to the accepted interpretation of the Kālaṇi inscription, Dharma Parākramabāhu was still Emperor in 1527,

44. *JCBRAS*, Vol. V, 1871—1872, pp. 36—44.

45. *RKD*, p. 86.

46. G. Turnour, *The Mahāvamsa*, Cotta Mission Press, 1837, p. lxxviii.

47. See note 41 above.

though Bhuvanekabāhu VII was elevated to that position as a result of the Vijayabā-kolle in 1521. Codrington tries to get out of this difficulty by taking Dharma Parākramabāhu to have been only a nominal figure-head of no consequence, who led a shadowy and inglorious existence at Kālaṇi. But the inscription at the place, accepted by him to have been dated in an year of the Buddhist era equivalent to 1527, refers to Dharma Parākramabāhu as delivering the command embodied in the document while seated on the throne in the royal palace of Jayavardhana Kōṭṭe, attended by the ministers of state (*mudali-varu*).⁴⁸ Neither in the Sinhalese historical tradition nor in the Portuguese writings is there any suggestion that Bhuvanekabāhu VII, after being elevated to the imperial throne of Kōṭṭe, shared that as well as his palace with another Emperor who was his uncle. This absurd position, to which historians have been led by the Kālaṇi inscription, makes it necessary to question whether the interpretation of that record hitherto accepted is correct, or whether a different interpretation, which does not give rise to such a 'strange historical problem,' is not possible. In order to facilitate a consideration of this question, I give below the text of the relevant part of the record, following H. C. P. Bell's improved reading thereof,⁴⁹ but supplying the lacunae in two places and correcting an error in one place, by checking with the stone and the photograph published by Bell.

- 1 Svasti Śrī [| *] Saddharmmādhirāja tribhuvanānandakara Śākya-kula-
- 2 tilaka sakala-loka-divākara aṇṇa-mahā-nirvāṇa-dāyaka
- 3 Gautama-sarvajña-rājottamayāṇan-vahanseṭṭha de-dās-ek-panas-
- vanu⁵⁰ Laṅkā-rāja-śriyaṭa
- 4 pāmiṇi Tri-Siṃhālādhiśvara para-rāja-rājesvara sāmanta-rāja-kirīṭa-
- ratna-(bhṛṅgāva)ḷi-⁵¹
- 5 sevita pādāmbuja-śīśirakara-kiraṇāyamāna kīrti-bandha-bandhura-
- śūra-vīra⁵²-guṇa-

48. *Jayavardhana-Kōṭṭeyehi śrī-māligāve siṃhāsāneyehi vāḷa-hiṇḍa mudali-varu māda va vadāḷa mehevarin*. *Ceylon Antiquary and Literary Register (CALR)*, Vol. I, p. 157.

49. *CALR*, Vol. I, pp. 155—158 and Plate IX.

50. Louis de Zoysa and H. C. P. Bell both read this word incorrectly as *vanu*; there is no doubt of the word as it is on the stone and that is *vanu*. There is no *va* after *nu*, which is followed by the *la* of the word *Laṅkā*.

51. Bell leaves a lacuna of four *akṣaras* at the end of line 4. The Maha-mudali has the reading *māpāḷi*. The last letter of the line is clearly visible, and is *ḷi*. The letters preceding are not well preserved; but, as the figure of speech requires a word meaning 'bees,' these have been read conjecturally as *bhṛṅga*.

52. The Maha-Mudali's reading is *supravīra*. Bell leaves these four letters undeciphered; but the reading given above is quite distinct on the stone.

- 6 ratnālaṅkṛta viśuddha-Buddhāṅkura śrīmat Sirisaṅgabo Śrī Parākramabāhu cakravartī-
7 svāmīn-vahanseṭa daśa-nava-vanu Navamā pura ekolos-vaka

Bell's translation of this passage,⁵³ which agrees in essentials with that of the Maha-Mudali, is as follows :—

' Hail ! On the eleventh day of the bright half of the month of Navam, in the 19th year of the reign of His Imperial Majesty Śrīmat Siri Saṅgabo Śrī Parākrama Bāhu, Supreme Ruler of Tri Sinhala (Ruhūṇa, Māyā, Pihiṭi) Sovereign Lord of other Rājas, on whose lotus-feet have settled (like bees) jewels in the crowns of Kings of the neighbouring (countries), whose store of fame is bright as the beams of the moon ; who is adorned with delightful qualities like unto gems ; who is an immaculate embryo Buddha ; and who ascended the throne of Laṅkā in the year 2051 of the Era of the omniscient and supreme Gautama Buddha, sovereign lord of the glorious and true doctrine (*dharmma*), who gladdens the three worlds (of gods, men, and Nāgas), who is a tilaka ornament to the Royal race of Śākya, and who is the sun of the universe and the giver of *Nirvāṇa*, great, undying'.

The Maha-Mudali and Bell both wrongly read *vanu* in l. 3 as *vanuva* and construed the phrase ending with it as referring to *Laṅkā-rājaśriyaṭa pāmīṇi*, thus interpreting this part of the record as stating that the year in the Buddhist era given therein is the date on which the king described in the following phrases came to the throne. But the word on the stone is *vanu*, which is in the nominative singular or the stem form, and not *vanuva*, which may be taken as the locative singular of *vanu*, or *vanu* and the verbal form *va*. If it was the intention of the writer of the document to express the fact of the king attaining to the sovereignty on a particular date, the word expressing the ordinal number of the year should have been in the locative case. Compare, for example, the opening lines of the Devundara slab-inscription of Vijayabāhu VI (VII), where we read,⁵⁴ ' Śrī śuddha-Śakavaruṣa ek-dahas-sāra-siya-de-tis-vanuchi raja pāmīṇi Śrīmat Sirisaṅgabo-Śrī Vijayabāhu.'

The Pāpiliyāna inscription uses the following phraseology, differing from that in the record under discussion, in order to state that it is dated in the month of Māṅḍindina in the 39th year of Parākramabāhu, who came

53. In this extract from Bell's translation, the diacritical marks have been supplied where necessary and the spelling of proper names, in one or two places, have been brought to the standard now accepted,

54. S. Paranavitana, *Shrine of Upulvan*, *op.cit.*, p. 76.

to the throne in 1958 B.E. :— *Śrī Buddha-varṣayen ek-dahas nava-siya aṭa-panas avuruddak piṇṇu saṅda Siri-Laka raja pāmīṇi Śrī-Parākramabāhu cakravartī-svāmīn vahanseṭa-ckui sālis vanu Māṅḍin-dina* Here, as in the Devundara inscription, *pāmīṇi* is construed with a word in the locative case and *vanu*, as in the Kālaṇi inscription, qualifies the name of the month. The phraseology of the Sabaragamū Saman Dēvāle inscription resembles that of the Pāpiliyāna document. Thus, when the construction of the sentence is properly analysed, it cannot be taken as giving the date on which the Emperor named came to the throne.

On the other hand, the correct analysis of the sentence is to take that portion of the record from the beginning up to *vanu* in l. 3 and the subsequent portion up to *vanu* in l. 7 as two separate clauses, each ending with *vanu* in the stem-form, standing in apposition with, and qualifying Navamā, the name of the lunar month in the locative case. Thus analysed, the month of Navam, in which the document is dated, was both the year 2051 of the Buddhist Era, and the nineteenth of the Emperor named therein. The correct translation of the portion of the inscription we have quoted would thus be :

' On the eleventh day of the bright half of the month of Navam (of) the year Two Thousand and Fifty One unto Gautama, the Omniscient Supreme Lord, who is the Sovereign Lord of the Ultime Truth, who causes the three worlds to rejoice, who is the forehead ornament of the Śākya race, the Sun of the Whole Universe and the giver of the immortal and great Nirvāṇa ; and the year nineteenth unto His Majesty, the Imperial Lord, the illustrious Sirisaṅgabo Śrī Parākramabāhu who has attained to the regal splendour of Laṅkā, who is the Supreme Overlord of the three Sinhala, the sovereign Overlord of other kings, the lotuses of whose feet are frequented by rows of bees which are the jewels on the crowns of feudatory kings, who is resplendant with a store of fame (bright as) the beams of the Moon, who is adorned with the jewels of valiant and heroic qualities, and who is an immaculate Bodhisattva.'

According to this correct interpretation of the record, 2051 of the Buddhist era was not the year in which the Emperor Parākramabāhu came to the throne, but the equivalent of his nineteenth regnal year. It will thus be clear that ' the strange historical problem,' with which more than one distinguished writer on the Ceylon history of the period had to grapple,

is not one which has been left to us by the writers of the early sixteenth century, but one which has arisen in the second half of the nineteenth century.

When 2051 B.E. is taken as the nineteenth year of Dharma Parākramabāhu, many of the recorded historical facts of the period admirably fit with each other. The date of the Kālaṇi inscription, *pura* 11 of Navam in 2051 B.E., is equivalent to 31 January, 1509. This day could have been the first or the last of the nineteenth year of Dharma Parākramabāhu, which was then current. The upper limit of the nineteenth year of the Emperor is thus *pura* 12 of Navam, 2050 B.E., i.e. 15 January, 1508; the lower limit is *pura* 10 of Navam, 2052 B.E., i.e. 19 January, 1510. According to the *Rājāvali*, Dharma Parākramabāhu reigned for twenty-two years.⁵⁵ The upper and lower limits of the twenty-second year would have been *pura* 12 of Navam, 2053 B.E., i.e. 11 January, 1511 and *pura* 10 of Navam, 2055 B.E., i.e. 16 January, 1513. Had the twenty-second year of Dharma Parākramabāhu been completed when his reign came to an end, i.e. when he died, his death could have occurred some time after 16 January, 1513 and before the expiry of the 23rd year, i.e. *pura* 10 of Navam, 2056 B.E. (4 February, 1514⁵⁶).

This is in accord with the letter of Affonso de Albuquerque to King Manuel, dated 30 November, 1513, in which it is stated that 'the King of Ceilam is dead.'⁵⁷ It may be, as Paul Pieris states, that in Portuguese documents the expression 'King of Ceilam' may mean a ruler in the Island other than the Emperor of Kōṭṭe, but it has definitely been used in many contexts to mean the latter. As there is evidence in the Kālaṇi inscription, correctly interpreted and taken together with the *Rājāvali*, that an Emperor of Kōṭṭe ceased to reign in or about 1513, the statement in de Albuquerque's letter must be taken as referring to Dharma Parākramabāhu.

De Albuquerque's letter also states that the dead king of Ceilam 'had two sons, and there is a division between them over the succession to the throne; they told me that one of them sent to Cochin to ask them to give him help, and saying that if they wanted a fortress he would give them a site for it.' If, on the authority of the Kālaṇi inscription as it has now been interpreted, we take that Dharma Parākramabāhu died in or about 1513,

55. The equivalents in the Christian era of these dates in the Buddhist era have been ascertained with the aid of L. D. Swamikannu Pillai's *Indian Ephemeris*, Vol. V.

56. *Rt.*, p. 63.

57. See above, notes 29 and 36.

this statement in de Albuquerque's letter partly agrees with the account given in the *Rājāvali* of what took place after the demise of that monarch. For we learn from this chronicle⁵⁸ that, on the demise of Dharma Parākramabāhu, the ministers of state and the people offered the throne to Sakalalākāvalla of Uḍugampola, the half-brother of the deceased monarch, but that prince, saying that 'there were several objections to it', himself took the lead in securing the throne to Vijayabāhu who resided at Māṇikkaḍavara. Perhaps, the rôle played by Sakalalākāvalla on this occasion was not such a self-abnegating one as is stated in the *Rājāvali*. However this may be, the *Rājāvali* vouches for the fact that, on the demise of Dharma Parākramabāhu, there was a move to keep his younger brother, Vijayabāhu, out of the succession, in favour of Sakalalākāvalla. Vijayabāhu, faced with such a situation, might well have asked for Portuguese assistance to his cause, and Sakalalākāvalla, fearing the consequences of an intervention by the Portuguese, gracefully withdrew from the contest. De Albuquerque refers to the two rival contestants as sons of the dead king, whereas, in actual fact, one of them (Vijayabāhu) was a brother, and the other a half-brother of his. This inaccuracy in the relationship of the two princes to the dead monarch could have arisen through the intermediaries from whom de Albuquerque learnt of the happenings in Ceylon. Or, he may have been careless about this detail when he wrote the letter to his king, assuming, on the analogy of the rules of succession in Europe, that the claimants to the throne on the demise of a monarch would have been his sons.

De Queyroz has also recorded that Vijayabāhu was elevated to the throne 'because he was better fitted to govern than the elder Chacraude Bau' (Cakrāyudha-bāhu).⁵⁹ This Cakrāyudha appears to correspond to Sakalalākāvalla of the *Rājāvali*; but de Queyroz, in another place, states that the three princes, namely Bhuvanekabāhu, Maha Rayigam Baṇḍāra and Māyādunne, whom Vijayabāhu wished to keep out of the succession, were sons of Cakrāyudha.⁶⁰ According to the *Rājāvali*, these princes were born to Vijayabāhu and his brother Rājasimha whilst they were living together as the co-husbands of a princess at Māṇikkaḍavara.⁶¹ It therefore appears that Cakrāyudha is another name of Rājasimha. It was Cakrāyudha who went to Colombo, on the news of the first arrival of the Portuguese, to observe these strange people and to recommend whether to adopt a friendly attitude towards them or resist them.⁶²

58. *Rt.*, pp. 63—64.

59. *Queyroz*, p. 197.

60. *Queyroz*, p. 203.

61. *Rt.* p., 64.

62. *Rt.* p., 63.

Whatever be the identity of the prince who contested the succession with Vijayabāhu, it may now be taken as established that this monarch assumed the reins of government at Kōṭṭe in 1513. He was therefore the Emperor at Kōṭṭe when Lopo Soarez de Albergaria arrived at Colombo to build a fortress there. Joaõ de Barros, in his account of this event, states that the king (i.e. the Emperor of Kōṭṭe) 'had some time ago been occupied in treating of this matter with Afonso Dalbuquerque'.⁶³ This statement most probably refers to the offer made to the Portuguese of a site to build a fortress by one of the two princes who contested for the throne of Kōṭṭe after the death of the Emperor in 1513, as reported by de Albuquerque in his letter to King Manuel quoted before. And the present interpretation of the Kālaṇi inscription, by which the death of Dharma Parākramabāhu can be inferred to have occurred in or about 1513, satisfactorily explains the statement of de Barros.

Gaspar Correa, in his account of the building of the first Portuguese fortress in Colombo,⁶⁴ says that the Emperor of Kōṭṭe at that time, who was at first friendly towards the Portuguese, was persuaded by a brother of his, who ruled in another part of the Island, to resist the Portuguese. This brother of the Emperor, it is said, sent a large body of men to take part in the fighting, but it appeared to the Portuguese as if this prince was prepared to come to an understanding with the Portuguese Governor if, in the course of the fighting, he destroyed the Emperor.

If we follow de Queyroz and conclude that the Emperor at the time was Vīra Parākramabāhu, we cannot account for this statement of Correa, for a brother of Vīra Parākramabāhu living at that time is not known from any source. If, on the other hand, on the authority of the Kālaṇi inscription as now interpreted, we take that Vijayabāhu VI (VII) was the sovereign of Kōṭṭe at the time, he had more than one brother or half-brother who could have been the prince referred to by Correa. One of his brothers was the prince of Rayigama,⁶⁵ who probably was yet alive in 1518. Sakalalakāvalla of Uḍugampola, a half-brother of Vijayabāhu, was probably dead in 1518, for the Kadirāna Sannasa, issued in 1517, states that the grant referred to therein was made by Vijayabāhu from the new palace at Uḍugampola. If Sakalalakāvalla was then living, it is very unlikely that the Emperor would have been in residence at Uḍugampola. But Vijayabāhu had another half-

63. *JCBRAS*, Vol. XX (No. 60), p. 40.

64. *CLR*, Vol. IV, pp. 196—197.

65. *Rt.*, p. 61.

brother, Prince Taniyavalla of Mādampe, who, in the reign of Dharma Parākramabāhu, helped in repelling a raid on the pearl-banks at Chilaw by a Muslim pirate.⁶⁶ The exploits of this prince have become legendary, and he has been deified after his death.⁶⁷ It is most likely that he advised his brother to adopt a firm attitude towards the Portuguese.

Though it has been concluded from the combined evidence of the Kālaṇi inscription and the *Rājāvali* that Dharma Parākramabāhu's reign ended with his death in or about 1513, his successor Vijayabāhu VI (VII) is stated in the Devinuvara inscription to have begun his reign in Śaka 1432, corresponding to 1509 A.C. Such overlapping of the closing years of the reign of one monarch with the opening years of his successor is known during the Gaṃpaḷa period.⁶⁸ This is also known to have occurred in the reckonings of the regnal years of the Coḷa emperors of South India.⁶⁹ Such overlapping of reigns was due to the reason that monarchs reckoned their regnal years, not from the date on which they were elevated to the supreme power, but from that of their election as heirs-apparent (*yuvārāja*). The words in the Devinuvara inscription, *raja pāmīni* 'attained to the regnal status,' do not necessarily connote the supreme overlordship. Though the reign itself was reckoned from the date of being installed as heir-apparent, the regnal years are quoted in public documents only after the assumption of supreme power. The Devinuvara inscription, being in the fifth year of the reign reckoned from 1509, was in fact dated 1514, after the death of Dharma Parākramabāhu. It is also possible that, during the last five years of the reign of Dharma Parākramabāhu, that Emperor was not in a position to actively direct the affairs of state, and that Vijayabāhu acted on behalf of the Emperor. For it has been reported by Barros that in September, 1508, the Emperor of Kōṭṭe was very ill.⁷⁰

The upper and lower limits of the nineteenth year of Dharma Parākramabāhu, as we have seen above, being *pura* 12 of Navam, 2050 B.E. and *pura* 10 of 2052 B.E., respectively, the first year of his reign must have commenced on a day between *pura* 12 of Navam, 2031 B.E., i.e. 14 January, 1489 and *pura* 10 of Navam, 2033, B.E., i.e. 20 January, 1491. If the regnal years of Dharma Parākramabāhu were reckoned from the end of the reign of his

66. *Rt.*, pp. 61—62.

67. For traditions about Taniya-valla and documents purporting to be his, see *JCBRAS*, Vol. XXVII (No. 73), pp. 167—171.

68. *UHC*, Vol. I, p. 647.

69. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, *The Cōlas*, 2nd edition, Madras, 1955, pp. 194, 246, 343, 348 and 375.

70. *JCBRAS*, Vol. XIX (No. 59), p. 366.

predecessor, Vira Parākramabāhu,⁷¹ the last possible day of the reign of the latter was 20 January, 1491. Vira Parākramabāhu, as we have remarked above, might have reckoned his regnal years from the end of the reign of Bhuvanekabāhu VI, which, on the authority of the *Budugumālānikāra*, the *Rājāvalī* and the Dādigama inscription, would have been 2020 B.E., i.e. 1477/78 A.C.⁷² Accordingly, Vira Parākramabāhu's reign could not have lasted for more than fourteen years. But the *Rājāvalī* credits him with a reign of twenty years, while do Couto has recorded a tradition that he reigned for only three years.⁷³ As this monarch's Kuḍumirissa inscription, already referred to, is dated in the eighth regnal year, do Couto is wrong in stating that he reigned for only three years. The twenty years given to him by the *Rājāvalī* might not have been as Supreme Emperor. Before Vira Parākramabāhu made himself Emperor of Kōṭṭe, he was known as Ambulugala-raja, being the *yuvārāja* with his seat at Ambulugala. And what the *Rājāvalī* states is that the King of Ambulugala reigned for 20 years.⁷⁴ Therefore it is possible that Vira Parākramabāhu reckoned his regnal years from the date that he became *yuvārāja* at Ambulugala. It is, however, more likely that Dharma Parākramabāhu's first regnal year and the fifteenth of his predecessor ran concurrently. One cannot, of course, be quite certain of the twenty years assigned to Vira Parākramabāhu by the *Rājāvalī*, for that source is certainly in error when it gives Vijayabāhu VI (VII) a reign of fifteen years;⁷⁵ this monarch, who counts his regnal years from Śaka 1432 (1509 A.C.), lost his life in 1521. For the present, however, we take it that the first six years of the reign of Dharma Parākramabāhu ran concurrently with the last six years of Vira Parākramabāhu, and that the latter's rule as Emperor in Kōṭṭe was between 1477 and 1496 A.C.

At any rate, there is no document assignable to the reign of Vira Parākramabāhu which quotes a regnal year higher than the eighth, and no valid evidence to support the view that he reigned for over twenty years. The inference drawn from the omission of his name by the *Rājaratnākara*, and following it by the continuation of the *Mahāvamsa*, that he reigned until

71. D. M. De Z. Wickremasinghe (*IEZ*, Vol. III, p. 41), relying on the Mummēssarama Sannasa, which gives 2060 B.E. as the twelfth regnal year of Dharma Parākramabāhu, concludes that this Emperor began his reign in 1506. But this Sannasa, which also wrongly gives the Śaka year 1435 as the equivalent of the same regnal year, has been rightly condemned as a forgery. On such dubious evidence, Wickremasinghe proposes to alter the reading *ek-panas* in the Kālaṇi inscription to *ekumpanas*, but the writing on the stone slab is against him in this arbitrary proposal.

72. *UHC*, Vol. I, pp. 682 and 849.

73. *Rt.*, p. 61 and *JCBRAS*, Vol. XX (60), p. 70.

74. *Ambulugala-raja*. . . . *viṣi avuruddak rājyaya kara svarga padaviya lada*; *Rājāvalī*, text edited by B. Gunasekara, Reprinted Colombo, 1953, p. 50.

75. *Rt.*, p. 67.

the assumption of the sovereignty by Vijayabāhu VI (VII), has been shown to be fallacious by the present interpretation of the Kālaṇi inscription. The omission of his name by the *Rājaratnākara* could have been due to the remissness of its author. The name could even have been dropped out by a subsequent copyist. The inference that Vira Parākramabāhu reigned up to 1519, drawn from the statement of de Queyroz that the Parākramabāhu who had dealings with de Almeida and Lopo Soares, was succeeded by a Vijayabāhu in that year, is contradicted by de Queyroz himself when he states that the Parākramabāhu in whose reign the Portuguese first arrived in Ceylon was a son of Vira Parākramabāhu. And de Queyroz's statement that the king who ceased to reign in 1519 had enjoyed a reign of forty-six years is contrary to the contemporary evidence of de Albuquerque that a king of Ceilam died in 1513. Moreover, we have shown above that a good many of the statements of de Queyroz with regard to these early years of the Portuguese connection with Ceylon are either not supported, or even directly contradicted, by earlier Portuguese historians. Above all, there is the Kālaṇi inscription, correctly interpreted, which goes counter to such an inference drawn from the statement of de Queyroz.

On these grounds we conclude that, as recorded in the *Rājāvalī*, the first arrival of the Portuguese took place in the reign of Dharma Parākramabāhu.

On the basis of the above discussion, we may assign the following dates to the Emperors of Kōṭṭe who reigned in times immediately preceding or following the arrival of the Portuguese in the Island :—

Vira Parākramabāhu (Parākramabāhu VIII)	1477—1496
Dharma Parākramabāhu (Parākramabāhu IX)	1491—1513
Vijayabāhu VI (VII)	1509—1521.

S. PARANAVITANA