

RE-READING QUEIRÓS: SOME NEGLECTED ASPECTS OF THE *CONQUISTA*

Historians of Sri Lanka owe a great deal to a brief encounter between a young Portuguese Jesuit and an elderly lay-brother by the name of Pedro de Basto in Cochin in November 1635. Fernão de Queirós,¹ at the tender age of eighteen, had just made the arduous journey from Portugal to India for the first time. Pedro de Basto's official position may have been a humble one but his reputation shone far and wide and Queirós felt honoured and exhilarated by this conversation with him. Much later Queirós would remember warmly, "the way he welcomed me, the advice that he gave me, the news which he very frankly communicated to me, even though I was still very young and in the first years of the Company."² This news may well have been about what would happen to Queirós in years to come. For Pedro de *Basto* was famous on account of his remarkable gift for prophecy. He led a life replete with visions: of what was happening many hundreds of miles away, of what would happen after his death, of Heaven and Hell, angels and devils and Christ himself. He became a routine port-of-call for navigators enquiring as to how they would fare in their next planned expedition. Many years after his death in 1645, the Superiors of the company of Jesus finally got around to commissioning a record of his life and divine gifts.

That task fell to Fernão de Queirós, who was now enjoying high office in the Indian Church hierarchy.³ By the time he finally completed and revised the *History of the Life of the Venerable Brother Pedro de Basto* in 1684 Queirós had come to believe that he had been destined for this biographical duty ever since his encounter with the holy man. Queirós had been strongly impressed by Basto's prophecies about the ruin of the Portuguese State of India and in particular by his conviction that the island of Sri Lanka, one of the brightest jewels of the fading empire, would be conquered by the Dutch. Basto claimed that the Dutch would be acting as the instrument of God's punishment: the Portuguese had failed in their providential task of inaugurating a truly Christian world empire and now they would pay the price. Some eleven years after Basto's death the Dutch did indeed manage to wrest the island from Portuguese control. In the course of his research into these prophecies Queirós found it increasingly important to establish just what

had happened to the Portuguese in that bountiful Island. This is how he came to write the *Conquista Temporal e Espiritual de Ceylão* (The Temporal and Spiritual Conquest of Ceylon), an exhaustive history of Sri Lanka from the first visit of the Portuguese in 1505 to their expulsion 153 years later.⁴

This work lay unpublished till the twentieth century, but it is now widely available in Sri Lankan book-shops and often referred to as 'the single most important source for the Portuguese period.' Every serious scholar of this period has paid tribute to its comprehensiveness and historical value. Tikiri Abeyasinghe, for example, said that the *Conquista*, "is the history *par excellence* of the Portuguese in the Island. It has justly been hailed as second only to the *Mahavamsa* as a source for the history of Ceylon. For the loving care and great pains which he has gone through his sources and the wealth of information he has made available to us, Queyroz does not yield place even to the author of the *Mahavamsa*."⁵ However some years later Abeyasinghe wrote an article which was rather more sceptical and nuanced in its appraisal of the merits of the work, as its title indicates: 'History as Polemics and Propaganda: An Examination of Fernão de Queirós' *History of Ceylon*'. This excellent essay is where every student of Queirós should start.⁶ However, Abeyasinghe realised that it was only a beginning. He said there that he "would like to offer some comments on the subject in the hope that a debate on the value of Queirós' work will thereby be initiated."⁷ "At least as far as published work is concerned that hope has not really been fulfilled.

The present essay is intended to contribute to that debate by drawing attention to a few aspects of the *Conquista* (and Queirós' oeuvre as a whole) which scholars have by and large left unexplored. That is to say, it will suggest some alternative perspectives on the *Conquista* rather than offer any grand new analysis of it. For while the *Conquista* is undoubtedly rich, it is also difficult to digest; it is a large, complex, unwieldy work that tends to resist critical penetration. Its key virtues, that it uses sources now lost to us and describes events otherwise unknown, also make the reliability of the *Conquista* difficult to assess. It would take many years of work to unravel some of the knotty problems of its construction.⁸

There are three areas of research which would benefit from a reinvigorated study of the *Conquista* and Queirós' other writings: (1) The narrative history of early 16th century Sri Lanka; (2) The ethnography of early modern Sri Lanka and India; (3) Queirós and his milieu.

The Narrative History of Early 16th Century Sri Lanka

'Narrative history' is the area for which 'reinvigoration' is least required; indeed it is the subject for which Queirós is famous. Especially for the later periods, the *Conquista* has been used thoroughly and judiciously. Moreover Abeyasinghe's article gives a considered appraisal of his historical merits and shortcomings. Therefore, the following comments will be confined to two suggestions regarding his account of the earlier period, the first fifty years narrated by the *Conquista*.

The first suggestion is merely to read Queirós with a greater awareness of his tendency to manipulate his narrative in accordance with his own missionary preoccupations and long-standing topoi of Catholic apologetics or chronicles. This is necessary when Queirós offers commentary on the action or imputes motives to his characters. Clearly such statements should not be readily taken at face value, yet they have often led a rather privileged existence in subsequent historiography - perhaps because the attribution of motive lends a certain colour to the narrative.

For example, it has often been repeated that the principal reason why Bhuvanekabahu VII of Kotte (1521 - 1551) never converted to Catholicism was that he was afraid of alienating his subjects. While some Sri Lankan leaders (King Jayavira of Kandy, the Prince of the Seven Korales, Vidiye Bandara, the Chiefs of Trincomalee and Batecaloa) were politically cynical in their requests for baptism, Bhuvanekabahu is represented as being politically canny in his refusal of it.⁹ There is nothing *a priori* unreasonable about this. Sinhalese royal ideology placed a great emphasis on the King as the protector of Buddhism whose legitimacy was contingent on the fulfilment of his religious role. Moreover the fate of his successor Dharmapala who did convert might suggest that these ideological prescriptions could translate into communal action: the *sangha* deserted him, and great numbers of his subjects defected to Sitawaka.

On the other hand, such religious concerns were by no means the only or even the decisive factors in determining royal policy and subject response. In fact, the only direct evidence that Bhuvanekabahu calculated in this manner comes from Queirós. The most extreme statement occurs during an entirely unhistorical meeting with Francis Xavier.¹⁰ There we are given the text of a speech supposedly made by Bhuvanekabahu in which he admits that, "the religion of Buddum

contains errors as intolerable as they are incompatible with reason". Yet, although he accepts the truth of Christianity, "I am unable to receive Baptism at once, for the least suspicion that they should have of me in this regard would be enough to ruin the whole of my realm." That this speech - and even the sentiments of Bhuvanekabahu that it purports to convey - are entirely fictitious is not going to surprise anyone who is familiar with the methods of Queirós. However it is perhaps surprising that it is such a ludicrous and transparent fiction. The whole purpose of the speech seems to be to deny that there could ever be intellectual grounds for objecting to Christianity - and that the only reason why native princes refuse baptism is rank political calculation. Therefore, Queirós' frequent allusions to this sort of motivation represent a rhetorical ploy designed to further his arguments for a 'spiritual conquest' of Sri Lanka.¹¹

This was not a topos of his own invention. We can see its early deployment in a letter of Affonso de Albuquerque to the King of Portugal in 1514, describing his attempt to induce the Raja of Cochin to convert.¹² Albuquerque, in keeping with his typical self-fashioning, presents the narrative as a frank and straightforward narrative of what happened - and a number of historians have not seen much cause to question that.¹³ However the letter is arguably an intricately-constructed rhetorical attempt to negate the fact that Albuquerque failed in his mission to bring the Raja to baptism. It does this by insinuating that the failure was not due to any rebuttal of the intellectual force of Albuquerque's arguments; that instead it was due to the Raja's political cowardice and weakness of character; and by intimating that the Raja and the whole territory would fall to the Cross soon enough anyway.

We should treat Queirós' comments with equal caution. As C. R. de Silva has already pointed out, Bhuvanekabahu's own letters give a quite different picture of his state of mind. They are consistently frank about his refusal to convert and the importance he attached to the traditions of his forefathers.¹⁴

Queirós' representation of Bhuvanekabahu's adversary, Mayadunne of Sitawaka (1521 - 81) may well be subject to a similar stylisation. In Queirós' narrative Mayadunne is presented as the champion of Buddhism, implacably opposed to Christianity and its Portuguese propagators on grounds of principle. Mayadunne is described as "being anxious to extinguish in Ceylon the name of Christ..." and with Sankili, King of Jaffna (1519 - 61) he plans war, "on the plea of defending the Law of Buddum..."¹⁵ However given what we know of Queirós' mind-set - as someone who spent a great deal of time devising weapons with

which to defeat heathen argument and who saw the history of Sri Lanka (indeed history per se) as a narrative of 'spiritual conquest', a battle between God and the Devil - it is somewhat inevitable that he resorted to the traditional Portuguese motif of religious war. His kind of history demanded that there be a spiritual adversary and Mayadunne was the natural candidate. To Queirós' mind national resistance and spiritual resistance meant the same thing. And in setting up the conflict of Christ versus Buddha he momentarily forgot that Sankili - Xaga Raja as he is called - was a Hindu.

So, it may be true that, particularly after Bhuvanekabahu's death, and with the conversion of Dharmapala there was a groundswell of popular anti-Christianity to be tapped. *Bhikkhus* rose up in revolt and smuggled the tooth-relic into Sitawaka: an unmissable propaganda opportunity. The speech which Queirós puts in the mouth of the monk 'Budavance' at this point may be entirely fictional but it could conceivably represent the tone of Sitawakan propaganda.¹⁶ But we should think twice before assuming that Mayadunne was someone primarily motivated by religious principle. When he wanted to form an alliance with the Portuguese in 1547, he was not above coming to some sort of an agreement with Antonio Moniz Barreto "regarding the spread of the Christian religion and the service of the king of Portugal."¹⁷ There does remain the possibility that Queirós took this image of Mayadunne from a Sinhalese source. I have not yet been able to study all the relevant texts to ascertain whether this is so. At least one version of the *Rājāvaliya* never attributes this Buddhist mission to Mayadunne.¹⁸ It is conceivable that Rajasinha I's outright conversion to Hinduism was an expression of an older Sitawakan tradition of Saivite devotion - and the 'Bhairava' or 'Berendi' kovil, traditionally ascribed to Rajasinha, may have been built in his father's reign.¹⁹

The second suggestion concerns a *less* sceptical (or perhaps more creative) reading of Queirós. For all the acclamations of Queirós' historical value, parts of his narrative of Bhuvanekabahu's reign tend to be ignored by historians. There are some good reasons for this. For this early period Queirós was writing at a distance of some 140 years. His account is sometimes garbled and nonsensical. Most importantly one can write a decent history of the period from the surviving contemporary documents.²⁰ Often Queirós' narrative seems completely at odds with what we know from these documents.

Nevertheless, Queirós describes some intriguing events which seem to invite speculation. They tend to centre on the maverick behaviour of Vidiya Bandara (who Queirós refers to as 'Tribule'): he leads several freewheeling

campaigns which twice take him into Kandy to exact tribute and kill the King (!), there are various ruptures and reconciliations with Bhuvanekabahu and his Captains, he attacks Sitawaka, is imprisoned and escapes, and several times we are told that Sitawaka, Kandy and Jaffna form a monolithic alliance against this worryingly active Kotte.²¹ Apart from this narrative there are various other trivial incidents, but the most interesting is what might be called 'the second Catholic-Buddhist debate.' It occurs in Queirós' narrative of the mid-1540s (the first happened in 1543).

It is not so surprising that Queirós should have access to unusual information. Our other narratives for this period fall into two broad camps: the secular Portuguese chroniclers of the 16th century, men at some distance from Sri Lanka but with an overall awareness of patterns of events within the empire and with access to official archives; and the Jesuit hagiographic tradition concerned with Francis Xavier which ultimately derives from the letters sent by contemporary priests. Whereas in Afonso Dias de Lomba, Antonio Barboza Pinheyro and Bento da Silva, Queirós had access to an altogether different kind of source; these men were long-term residents of the *casado* community in Sri Lanka and therefore likely to be repository of family histories and a more local perspective.²² Then there is the lost work of Fr. Francisco Negrão which offered an earlier Franciscan viewpoint and an unusual interest in Sinhalese culture. Moreover, beyond these, Queirós also mentions various anonymous people with great personal experience of the Island whom he had managed to talk to. It is just conceivable that we even get something approaching a (much distorted) Sinhalese tradition.²³

This does not change the fact that the contemporary documents are infinitely preferable. And they would appear to render Queirós' narrative, as it stands *with its present chronology*, very implausible. All these calamitous political-military upheavals have left no impression on the correspondence of the time. The King of Kandy, for example, far from suffering constant invasions and executions, began the 1540s in frustrating isolation and spent the rest of the decade wooing Portuguese expeditions to his highland seclusion.²⁴ Even the alleged protagonist of the second debate, Father João de Villa de Conde, made no mention in any of his letters of such a dramatic chapter in the generally dismal story of his Ceylon mission. However, we should remember that Queirós did not tend to just invent *events* per se, (though he did invent much else) rather he got them muddled up, reinterpreted their significance, and massaged them so they did not completely disrupt the coherence of his narrative. In other words there is something behind Queirós' nonsense - something which may have its origins in

truth.

There are two possibilities (1) Such events did "happen" in some form, but they have been assigned to the wrong time and placed in the wrong order. This could be a result of the chronological imprecision of sources derived from oral tradition, or just the constant problems that Queirós faced in trying to create a coherent narrative out of such disparate materials. (2) Such events are taken from stories about the past that reflect the interests of particular communities - they are then exaggerations, distortions, transformations of historical fact. (Of course, in that case, they may also be myths). Now Schurhammer does not say any of this explicitly (he was not much given to elaborations of theoretical intent) but a number of suggestive footnotes in his introduction to the 1928 collection indicate that he had reached similar conclusions. As far as I know, he is the only person to attempt to digest this material in this manner.²⁵

Thus Schurhammer seems to have both possibilities in mind when he wonders whether Mayadunne's alliance with Kandy and Jaffna is a distant memory of Bhuvanekabahu's designs on these kingdoms for his sons in 1543, or if the story of the defection of Itacon's faction to Sitawaka recalls the defection of Prince Jugo's supporters; or if the account of Vīdiya Bandāra's imprisonment belongs properly to the 1550s, or if Vīdiya's siege of Kandy in January 1546 is a memory of Mayadunne's campaigns in the hill country at this time and so on.²⁶ One feature of many of Schurhammer's suggestions is their assumption that Vīdiya Bandara has somehow taken the credit for the actions of other people. Was there a group that had some interest in glorifying his name? Or is it that Vīdiya Bandara really was a more active and aggressive figure in Bhuvanekabahu's time than our Portuguese sources let on? And if, following Schurhammer's method, the story of the 'second debate' has its origins in some vague tradition, would that indicate that the Buddhist hierarchy were making a rather more vigorous and direct counter-offensive at this time than we are otherwise led to believe? Or should we resign ourselves to the fact that Queirós has disfigured his sources beyond repair?²⁷

The Ethnography of Early Modern Sri Lanka and India

A more valuable prize lies in wait for those prepared to tackle the hoards of ethnographic material buried away in Queirós' rambling narrative, the great majority of it in Book One.²⁸ Abeyasinghe's article gives us only one paragraph on this subject, but he makes some good points: "One can confidently assert that no

other seventeenth century work on Sri Lanka, except Robert Knox's *Historical Relation* contains as much anthropological material as Queirós' *History*." He also points out that so detailed is his information that it could only come from grass-roots level oral sources.²⁹

What kind of information do we get? Some of the topics are: the Vedda lifestyle and their functional incorporation into Kandyan society (the first European account of the Veddas?); the castes of Sri Lanka and some of their origin-myths; marriage ceremonies and polyandry; customs of warfare; and what could charitably be described as the 'ethos' of the Sinhalese: their moral prescriptions, their attitudes to law, war and death.³⁰ In the course of the lengthy geographical survey (chapters 4 to 9) we are sometimes given an impression of regional social variations and loyalties. There is a separate snapshot of Jaffna, with comments on its inheritance, caste, tenure systems.³¹ One of the most detailed chapters is reserved for an account of Sinhalese astronomical/astrological knowledge.³²

Queirós devotes most space to the religion of Sri Lanka - if the *Conquista* is a kind of reconnaissance report on the 'lie of the land' before invasion, then Sinhalese Religion is the most obvious obstacle to spiritual conquest. "Who are the religious of the sect of Buddha?" he asks at the head of Chapter 16 and he proceeds to tell us about the monastic system and the monkish manner of living, about their education and literary facility. He retells a brief life of the Buddha, and even has a stab at outlining Buddhist beliefs.³³ He reproduces a long account from China on the Buddha's life in order to contrast it with the Sinhalese version.³⁴ We get many descriptions of various temples and their associated myths.³⁵ All of this comes from Book One. Beyond this, in the far reaches of the narrative books, lie further scattered comments alluding to aspects of Sinhala culture.

Yet this material in the *Conquista* has generally been left in peace, while Robert Knox's account of Kandyan Society in the late 17th century has been comprehensively mined and is constantly referred to. Reliability is again at issue: R. Knox's *Historical Relation* is an eyewitness account by an Englishman who lived in the Kandyan region for nearly two decades. Queirós, on the other hand, never visited Sri Lanka and his account is a compendium of all sorts of sources which were produced at different times about different parts of the island: a much less attractive proposition.

At least that is how it seemed until very recently. Leaving aside what Queirós borrowed from known texts (such as Barros and Do Couto), it was

natural to assume that the remainder must be taken from the other sources which he explicitly names – and which are now lost to us: Bento da Silva and particularly Fr. Negrão's *Chronicle of the Province of San Thome*. Perera asserted that the latter work lay behind the bulk of the material in Book One.³⁶ This was reasonable enough: we know that Negrão produced a report on the ruins of Anuradhapura and managed to acquire translations of the Sinhalese chronicles.³⁷ Yet Jorge Flores has just made a startling discovery which should overturn this hypothesis. It appears that a great deal of Queiros' ethnographic material has been taken directly from an account of Ceylon written in the 1620's by Constantino de Sa de Miranda, which has been languishing in the University Libraries of Madrid and Zaragoza.³⁸ Queirós never mentions Miranda as a source, indeed he only refers to him once, as the Captain-Major of the Field involved in a battle against Mayadunne prince of Denavaka in circa 1619.³⁹

I was only made aware of this at a very late stage and have not seen the text for myself. We will have to wait Jorge Flores' publication of the text - with the title *Os Olhos do Rei. Desenhos e descrições Portugueses da ilha de Ceilão (1624, 1638)* - to see just how extensive Queirós' unacknowledged borrowing has been. One would expect, though, that by and large one can now bypass Queirós and go straight to his source. Nevertheless some interesting questions remain: how much editorial control did Queirós exert over Miranda's text? This is a crucial source, written by a man who had taken high office in the island: why did Queirós refrain from mentioning it even in his rough draft of the first part of the *Conquista* (which now lies in the Biblioteca da Ajuda in Lisbon)?⁴⁰

The main body of Negrão's work was completed before 1612, while Miranda's was not written much later: in other words, the bulk of Queiros' material relates to Sinhalese society in the late 16th/early 17th century, a period which is otherwise rather lacking in ethnographic evidence, and certainly more than half a century before that of Knox. In this way, it is possible that a re-reading of Queirós and Miranda will advance the cause of historicity in the study of Sinhalese culture. It is, no doubt, logical to assume that the civilization of the 16th century was not so different from that which left its impression on the more literate epochs of Parakramabahu VI's Kotte of the 15th century, or Kandyan society in the 17th and 18th century. Nevertheless from other sources one does get the occasional glimpse of idiosyncrasy.

Take for example, the letters of Morais and Dias in 1552, the first Jesuits to visit the Island and also (not coincidentally) the first Europeans to give an

inquiring account of Sri Lankan customs and religion.⁴¹ Both men complain with some passion of a major obstacle to their mission: that it is the custom for women to be kept entirely secluded from men other than their husband. This makes administering baptism rather tricky. The wife of the Prince of the Seven Korales, for example, committed suicide by taking poison because she was seen by another man. We do not hear any echoes of this from Kandyan times, while for the 15th century we can read verses describing men and women playing together in water-sports or mixing freely at poetry readings.⁴² In the face of this peculiar reportage one's first reaction might be to say that the newcomer Jesuits had mistaken Muslim practice for Sinhalese custom. But then we learn that, "In this country there are many elderly persons...and even some of those who are familiar with the King, whether Pagans or Portuguese, who have never seen the Queen and other noble ladies."⁴³ This norm existed among the Sinhalese elite. Indeed it may well have been peculiar to certain elite circles: it seems odd that no other missionaries have commented on it. Was this a local and transient custom of the mid-sixteenth century?

Despite the title of the *Conquista*, Queirós devotes a surprising amount of attention to describing the social and religious practices of India. This is partly because Queirós, not so unrealistically, saw Sri Lanka as part of the broader cultural unit of South Asia. The 'Chingalas' are a particular case in the general picture of "the Heathen of this Hindustan".⁴⁴ It is also because his own personal experience and the bulk of his expertise belonged to India. We learn about the Indian caste system and the way it determines modes of courtesy and attire; about the domestic rituals of eating and cleanliness; of kinship arrangements and the details of marriage ceremonies; about political ideology and the functioning of law.⁴⁵ Naturally it is Indian religion which excites Queirós' prose. We are treated to incredulous accounts of Hindu cosmology and the measurements of celestial topography.⁴⁶ But the most intriguing details come in the great miscellany of Chapters 20 to 23, as Queirós develops an obscure historico-theological thesis on the Western origins of Indian custom. One can even sense a kind of proto-anthropological appreciation of holism as Queirós explains why he thought it necessary to discuss fundamental Hindu beliefs: "But as nothing can be said about their customs without touching on the diversity of their castes, nor of these without speaking of Brûmã [Brahma], nor of him without touching the principle of their false Trinity..."⁴⁷

However, Queirós' comments on India are of less import than the information he relays on Sri Lanka. The religion and culture of seventeenth

century India attracted the attention of many other writers, who tended to produce works that were more thorough and insightful than the *Conquista*.⁴⁸ Having said that, we are sadly not in a position to judge Queirós' direct attempts to capture Hinduism. Both his works on this subject, a Theological and Philosophical Treatise and the *Perfeito Missionario*, were lost in the fire that destroyed the library of St. Paul's College, Goa, in 1664.⁴⁹

In any event, from the *Conquista* we are only going to get images of India or Sri Lanka as they were understood by the Portuguese. In the process of making use of this ethnographic data one inevitably gets dragged into the question of how much it has been 'distorted' or transformed by its mediation through a Portuguese-Indian Catholic sensibility. This can be a frustrating task but it has its own rewards.

Fernão de Queirós and his Milieu

This would represent a new field of research. Abeyasinghe touches upon Queirós' attitudes in so far that they have an effect on his history: on his belief in the divine will guiding the course of history, on his intense Portuguese millenarianism, on his antipathies against Muslims, the Dutch and Portuguese officialdom, his hardened stance against 'idolatry' and his somewhat complicated ideas about race.⁵⁰ But these do not need to be viewed as obstacles standing in the way of our clear vision of the past. We could shorten our focus and take as our object the mind of Queirós himself, as one route into the peculiar world that he inhabited. He is, after all, an interesting man or rather he was in an interesting position: probably one of the most learned men of his time in Portuguese India, struggling with ideas and debates on how to deal with non-Christian religions while maintaining a deeply orthodox world-view that held fast to Christian superiority and planted its roots in miracles, prophecies and allegorical readings of the Old Testament. He was also a man peering through the twilight of the Portuguese empire, whose life had been spent watching bits of the *Estado da Índia* fall away into heretical hands. This was the atmosphere that lent such power and pathos to the proclamations of Pedro de Basto and forced Queirós to cling to his rather desperate belief in the coming Fifth Empire. It is also a milieu that has not received its fair share of academic attention. We know a great deal less about the dynamics of ethnographic and theological thought in the late Portuguese Empire than we know about the intellectual scene in the Iberian Americas at this time.

Abeyasinghe's verdict on his laborious mental struggles was blunt: Queirós had, "little understanding of Oriental learning, eastern religion, or Asian culture..."⁵¹ Of course in one sense this is true enough. There were indeed European contemporaries who were making more profound enquiries into Hinduism. On the other hand, Queirós was highly educated and curious, particularly with regard to Sinhalese Buddhism. He was genuinely interested in such subjects and lamented the lack of information at his disposal. We should remember that the judgements and biases of the *Conquista* do not only represent the shortcomings of Fernão de Queirós, but also the shortcomings of the sources on which he relied.⁵² That Queirós could not lay his hands on a document which offered a more adequate explanation of Sinhalese Buddhism is an indictment of the incuriosity of the whole Portuguese community, not just of one man.⁵³ This is not to say that Queirós was driven by a purely academic need to know: knowledge was sought after in order to be refuted. This principle holds for most of the early European writings on eastern religion and it is to these works by Jesuits and other Christian scholars, slowly evolving a more sophisticated grasp of their opponents creeds (though Queirós was, it is true stuck in a rather vestigial and dead-ended branch of evolution), that we owe the beginnings of Orientalism.

Rather than merely condemn Queirós it would be more profitable to make the same effort to understand his mind-set that we wish he had made to understand the culture of his South Asian neighbours. To the modern scholar Queirós' mind is surely not less strange than those of the people he wrote about. When Abeyasinghe wrote that, "Queirós was not a product of his time, but of a period two centuries before" it was a witticism hardly intended to bear a literal interpretation.⁵⁴ Yet it relies on a certain blitheness with regard to geography in its implicit comparison of Portuguese Goa with the European centres of learning. As we shall see, Goa's location produced its own intellectual agendas. It is only if we insist on a teleology of academic advancement that Queirós registers as an insignificant relic.

One or two of Abeyasinghe's other judgements are a little uncharitable. He concedes that Queirós was strictly opposed to notions of European racial superiority. But it seems somewhat unnecessary to conclude that, "his favourable views on Asians flowed from political necessity."⁵⁵ Queirós does not strike one as being overly concerned with the delicate diplomatic concerns of the *Estado da India*. He is hardly shy of criticising that which fails to meet his standards of piety, that is to say all Eastern religions and Portuguese officialdom itself. In fact, one could equally imagine that his comments about race stemmed from his immersion

in the history of Sri Lanka - which clearly illustrated how the arrogance and insensitivity of the Portuguese in their dealings with the peoples and kings they encountered was one of their more counter-productive and reprehensible traits. After a reflective lament on the blunderings of the viceroy Affonso de Noronha in 1552, Queirós says that he touches upon this subject, "merely to show the petty things for which greater things are lost, and the unreasonableness of those who think that these [Eastern] Princes are not worthy of all honour and courtesy."⁵⁶ After all, on theological principle Queirós believed that all human beings were blessed with the faculties of reason such as to apprehend the divine and all were equal before the eyes of God: "it is an amazing thing that we seek to improve the works of God and fancy that only Northern people are to be esteemed, because they are white."⁵⁷ Queirós was perhaps capable of a humane indignation that extended beyond dogmatic pieties. We could equally explain his attitudes with the fact that by the late 17th century some of the more "enlightened" works of Jesuit oriental studies would have become part of the standard education or at least a matter for general discussion.

Yet Abeyasinghe describes Queirós as the product of an utterly reactionary and scholastic education. Only a study of the curricula of seminaries at this time and other letters and texts produced by his colleagues will tell us just how closed-off Queirós' little world was. No doubt they will not reveal a progressive schooling, but one suspects that it was somewhat broader than Abeyasinghe allows. The Jesuits were famous for providing a most demanding and comprehensive education. Between 1635 and 1641, Queirós took a degree in Humaniora and Philosophy at St. Paul's college Goa, a subject which he subsequently taught.⁵⁸ Many of the writers of the 'humanist' canon would have been covered by such a course. Which is not to deny that there is a curiously old-fashioned flavour to the *Conquista*. This makes its milieu all the more intriguing.

Abeyasinghe represents Queirós' approach to Eastern religion as being comprehensively and consistently negative.⁵⁹ Queirós does indeed show a visceral disgust at all forms of 'idolatry' and it is not difficult to picture him serving in the Inquisition of Goa.⁶⁰ He did think that other faiths were deeply mistaken and this mistake was the difference between Good and Evil. However, the dividing line between Christianity and other religions was not as hard or absolute as one might think and it had to be maintained in the face of various similarities and analogies and historical theories that pressed upon it. The harsh rhetoric of Queirós on the demonic ugliness of heathen Gods to which Abeyasinghe refers betrays a man concerned to keep that line in view at a time when it threatened to disappear. We

should not underestimate the extent to which more radical viewpoints contributed to the intellectual dynamics of the Jesuit world at the time.⁶¹ Another awkward factor was that at this mature stage in Portuguese Goan history, the Church must have included Indian converts who retained an awkward pride in their Brahmanic heritage. Indeed Queirós devotes two chapters to attacking a treatise by an anonymous author, clearly a Christian Brahmin, who sought to retrieve some of the nobility and even spiritual wisdom of his forefather's traditions. Of these chapters Abeyasinghe refers to them only as being, "classic examples of scholastic disquisitions."⁶² They may strike the modern reader as being over-long and tediously pedantic, being point-by-point rebuttals backed up by endless Biblical and classical authorities. But this also indicates that their target represented a threat of some force to Queirós' world.

It goes without saying that Queirós considered Christianity to be the only path to salvation. Therefore, he dismisses this resurrected Brahmanic pride by arguing that, "the only true Nobility is the one that is derived from [the worship of the] True God and that there is only false and imaginary nobility where false Gods are concerned."⁶³ However, this comes after two chapters which have exhaustively listed the analogies between the Judaeo-Christian tradition and Brahmanic custom. He concludes that "the foregoing comparison and observations clearly prove that the pagans of this Asia, and especially the Bramanes who are their Teachers and the Authors of all the fables they believe, *had received much intelligence concerning the teachings of the written Law which they had perverted...*" [emphasis added]⁶⁴ In other words this teeming world of Asian religion has its origins in divine revelation. The concept of diffusionism dominated explanations of cultural difference; the assumption was that of an original sameness overlain with more recent (if crucial) transformations. In this way the strangeness of other cultures was ultimately effaced. Behind every Hindu error one can find a Judaeo-Christian truth. To take just one example, the practice of *puja* and other kinds of offerings could be nothing but a distorted imitation of spiritual indulgences granted by the Popes of the 'True Church.'⁶⁵

Another reason for this belief in 'underlying sameness' is that Queirós was convinced that all human beings had no option but to know God; his presence was inscribed on the hearts of men, as Paul said in his *Epistle to the Romans*.⁶⁶ All religions of the world contained this dim appreciation of God. In tracing these familial connections between Christianity and Asian religion Queirós is not so far removed from the post-Vatican II theology of modern Sri Lanka. The difference is that Queirós regarded these relations with contempt as foolish and wrong-headed

cousins, whereas contemporary liberation theologians write to promote brotherly reciprocity.

From Queirós' prose, it would seem that these were assumptions that his audience would find uncontroversial. Controversy centred instead on the details: just how far one could press the analogies and in what circumstances. So Queirós says that while 'Hindustan' in general has Hebraic origins, it is not true that the Buddha preached the Ten Commandments.⁶⁷ This is not the result of dogmatic exclusivity on Queirós' part, because in the rough draft of the *Conquista* we find him saying exactly the opposite.⁶⁸ Between this draft and the final copy Queirós had changed his mind, presumably because he had been swayed by a recent academic case against his former viewpoint. Incidentally this rough draft of the first two books of the *Conquista* has rarely been used by scholars, perhaps because S.G. Perera somewhat over-emphasises its similarity to the final version in the introduction to his translation. He says that it is "almost identical with the first ten chapters of the First Book of the *Conquista*." In fact, the arrangement of the text is substantially different.⁶⁹ A more comprehensive analysis of this text may well reveal other developments in Queirós's thinking.

Even Queirós' polemical object to refute Buddhism and Hinduism could work towards promoting this sameness. It is a pleasing irony: in fashioning the Eastern religions into opponents of the True Faith he made them into its mirror image. To be suitable opponents they had to be recognisable as religions, and that meant they had to look like Christianity. This may help to explain the curious references to the 'Maturanse of Arracão' (as in the *Maha-terunnanse* of Arrakan). This figure is presented as orchestrating a Buddhist counter-offensive against the Franciscan mission: it is he who is supposed to have sent forth the *bhikkhu* to oppose Fr. João in the 'second debate' of the 1540s.⁷⁰ It is highly unlikely that any such figure existed. The Sri Lankan Sangha was never subject to an international hierarchy. However, the Theravada countries did tend to maintain close links with each other; in particular, they regularly called upon foreign monks to reinstate higher ordination when the tradition had lapsed at home. Twice in the seventeenth century, the Kandyan kings had sent a mission to Burma for this purpose and this could be the origin of Queirós' estimation of Arrakanese status.⁷¹

Yet surely the most important factor behind Queirós' representation is his need to make the 'Maturanse' into another Pope. Just as the Pope in Rome sends forth his legions of missionaries to the east to combat idolatry, so the 'Maturanse' of Arracão dictates the movements of the enemy from his South-East Asian base.

(Queirós saw South-East Asia as the most intractable Buddhist heartland.)⁷² Similarly, this false Pope dispenses jubilees to stiffen the spiritual resolve of his subjects and puts unorthodox thinkers on trial for heresy, just like his Roman counterpart.⁷³ Moreover, such similarities were not to be marvelled at, since it was customary for Satan to make Evil a simulacrum of Good. After telling us about the jubilees that the Maturanse gave to those who would help Mayadunne, Queirós says in parentheses, “for even here the Devil aped Christianity.”

This should alert us to the fact that it is not only in the editorialising of Book One that one will find evidence for the cast of Queirós' mind. All those passages in subsequent books which the historian's eye passes over as being palpably fictitious or deranged would now become the most interesting to view. The speeches which Queirós gives to his leading characters should attract attention, given that they allow him the most freedom from the constraints of his sources. The peculiarity of the speeches seems to derive from the tension created by three quite different aims: to achieve empathy with the actual situation of the character in question; to drive home arguments relating to his polemical aims; to flourish his literary style and classical erudition.⁷⁴ Apart from these deliberate aims, the speeches also unwittingly reveal the preconceptions which shape Queirós' thought.

Although this essay has separated out various perspectives to take on Queirós, in reality they all intertwine and impact on each other. Understanding Queirós and his milieu will change how we consider the problem of the reliability of his historical narrative. A single passage can reveal information on many different levels. As a case-study one could take Queirós' treatment of a very old Sinhala story, about King Kālani Tissa and the Kelaniya temple. Jonathan Walters has given us a detailed study of all the versions of this story as it has been retold over the centuries. In the Mahavamsa we are told that the king discovers evidence of an adulterous affair with his Queen and he throws into the sea an imposter-monk and an actual arhant on suspicion of aiding the adultery. The gods are angered with such impiety and raise the seas to destroy Kelaniya.⁷⁵ In the Dambadeniya period the story is elaborated so that it is an innocent Elder who is suspected of the adultery. He is not thrown into the sea but placed in a cauldron of boiling oil - but at that moment he becomes an arhant and so remains unharmed. He then perceives that he is paying for the sin in a previous life of casting a fly into boiling milk, he expounds a century of verses on the Dharma and he disappears into Nirvana.⁷⁶ The seventeenth century retellings differ principally through a greater exaggeration of the oceanic destruction caused by the Gods, so that the

Rājāvaliya tell us that, "altogether eleven-twelfths of Lanka were submerged by the great sea".⁷⁷ Walters suggests that this could be a Sinhala response to the Portuguese appropriations of the temple: a warning of the punishments accorded to those who defile its sanctity.⁷⁸

How is Queirós' account different? In the first place it would seem that it incorporates details that are not given in any other version. Walters says "I know of no other text which claims that 46 kings ruled Kelaniya, nor which claims that the guilty queen was from Sitawaka," and he goes on to suggest that this would represent a particularly Sitawakan bias.⁷⁹ In other words, Queirós has preserved a sixteenth century stage in the evolution of this myth. Otherwise Queirós' version seems closest to that in the *Rājāvaliya* as it reports that the greater part of the Island was destroyed.

The most striking difference is that the Buddhist arhant is turned into a proto-Christian martyr. He says in the boiling oil, "Since Lord, you show your power in my weakness by defending my innocence; even though I may be [innocent] of the crime they attribute to me, not long ago I committed another no less grave: grant that by this fire I may atone for it, the body suffering to save the soul."⁸⁰ Thus the traditional Sinhalese story of how kings are punished if they fail to meet Buddhist norms is transformed into the motif of the Christian faithful suffering under temporal tyranny. As Walters says, "In Portuguese eyes Kelaniya had become Portuguese." However Walters does not say whether this Christianisation represents a new version of the myth in circulation among the Catholic community, or whether it is a deliberate re-working by Queirós. Both possibilities are intriguing and are not mutually exclusive.

The former hypothesis would envisage a source that had retained the Portuguese community's feelings about Kelaniya in the seventeenth century. The Portuguese destroyed the temple and two Churches were built among the ruins. Perhaps the re-working of the myth lent a kind of legitimacy to this recreation: by making its Christian destiny prefigured in the person of the unlucky arhant. Indeed this could be one example of a Sri Lankan martyrology tradition which has found its way into Queirós. Another example might be the story of the monk who began to pronounce Christian ideas at a debate in Denavaka and ended up being stoned to death on the order of the Maturanse of Arração, receiving "the Crown of Martyrdom" in 1543.⁸¹ Such stories would give the Sri Lankan Christian community a sense of providential security.

On the other hand, this version of the story of Kālani Tissa could be a product of Queirós' mind and no one else's.⁸² As we have seen, the major irregularity of this account is in the content of the arhant's words; this interposing of an incongruous speech into the narrative is a classic trait of Queirós. For these stories about the Kelaniya and Denavaka martyrs also reflect one of Queirós' personal preoccupations, how sparks of divine grace can crop up in the very heart of idolatry: "And though even among these heathens God often works such wonders in justification of the truth..."⁸³

However, we need not charge Queirós with deliberate polemical distortion. We could equally attribute it to the problems of translation. We can assume that Queirós (or his source, Miranda or Negrão) was presented with a version of the story similar to that in the *Rājāvaliya*. There the arhant is made to comment on his predicament thus: "it is due to a sin committed in a former state of being".⁸⁴ How would a Portuguese of the sixteenth or seventeenth century translate that? And if Queirós is responsible for this version, how would he perceive its true meaning, being already predisposed, on intellectual principle, to see Judaeo-Christian structures underneath the messy complexities of Eastern religion? It is, in fact, not clear whether Queirós is making his monk refer to Original Sin, or just the sins which every mortal is guilty of in the course of life; no matter: the real sleight-of-hand which Queirós accomplishes is to make karmic retribution into Catholic atonement. Yet in a sense, this equivalence is not entirely bogus. There is perhaps one key difference between the two concepts: atonement takes before the eyes of God, whereas the working of karma is a natural law of the universe to which deities are irrelevant. Over and again this is revealed as the one major obstacle to Queirós' understanding of Buddhism and Hinduism; he cannot conceive of a system of thought in which all pattern and meaning in the universe does not ultimately derive from this watchful intelligence, from God. For Queirós it makes no sense for the arhant to merely perceive his sin, instead he must lament it and make that lament known to God and beg for forgiveness. If this represents a colonial appropriation of the story of Kālani Tissa, it is less through symbolic conquest than symbolic slippage.

There are then at least three kinds of information which are offered in this long paragraph on Kelaniya. It gives us evidence pertaining to Sinhalese culture itself, by preserving nuances of an otherwise unknown sixteenth century version of this story; it may also represent the viewpoint of the Portuguese community in seventeenth century Sri Lanka; and it tells us, inevitably, about the polemical intents and conceptual schemas of Fernão de Queirós.

Queirós the Writer

Queirós was not an historian in the modern sense. From many angles he can appear in this light: he did have a genuine interest in establishing what happened and he took great pains to gather information from as wide variety of sources as he could find. He exercised judgement in deciding between different accounts and so on. For large stretches Queirós can provide fairly reliable narrative information, as the works of C.R. de Silva and Abeyasinghe demonstrate.⁸⁵ On the other hand, his piety is not directed in the first instance towards the historical evidence, which can be manipulated, even fabricated at will.⁸⁶ Abeyasinghe shows clearly that the *Conquista* is shot through with propagandist objectives. And beyond this there were other imperatives, other kinds of truth which at times superseded the dictates of historical truth: the truth of prophecy and the truth of Portugal's providential destiny (as is well known) but also the truth of the Christian message as opposed to the falsity of competing creeds and indeed the truth of the real relationship between revelation and its parodic and degenerative offspring. Words slip their meanings over the course of centuries and none of our current academic caps fits him perfectly. But if we want to keep 'historian' we should also allow him his other titles: biographer, geographer, ethnographer, Catholic polemicist and comparative theologian.

A Mystery

Queirós also wrote a work which was presumed lost: The *Conquista temporal e espiritual do Oriente*. In a bibliographic essay, Schurhammer says that this can now be identified as an incomplete MS in the British Museum, Egerton 1646 (f. 26 - 246).⁸⁷ This was published as an anonymous work in *Documenta Ultramarina Portuguesa* I, 1960, 267 - 632 (no. 749) bearing the title from the manuscript: *Conquista da India per Humas e Outras Armas Reaes e Evangelicas (Em breves memorias de vará es illustres e feitos maravilhosos em huma e outra conquista)*. From Schurhammer's text it is unclear why he makes this attribution. From a brief perusal of the ^{MS} I can find no clues as to its authorship. It is quite different in style to the *Conquista*, being somewhat annalistic. Can Schurhammer's reasoning be elucidated?⁸⁸

NOTES

¹ This is the modernised spelling of his surname. It has been spelt variously as 'Queyroz', 'Queiroz' and 'Queirós'.

² *Historia da Vida do Veneravel Irmão Pedro de Basto, Coadjutor Temporal da Companhia de Jesus, e da variedade de successos que Deos lhe manifestou, ordenada pelo Padre Fernão de Queyroz da Companhia de Jesus.* Lisbon 1689.

³ See G. Schurhammer, 'Unpublished manuscripts of Fr. Fernão de Queiroz s.j.' in the *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies* Vol. 5, 1929, p. 213. We first hear of him working on the life in 1671, when Queirós was Praepositus of the Profess House, Goa, and was nominated patriarch of Ethiopia by the king of Portugal.

⁴ *Conquista temporal e espiritual de Ceylão*, ed. P.E. Pieris, Colombo 1916. This is taken from the Rio de Janeiro Manuscript. It is commonly available in English translation by S.G. Perera as *The Temporal and Spiritual Conquest of Ceylon* (3 Volumes, Colombo 1930; Reprint, New Delhi 1992) There is some ambiguity over the title of the work as there is another copy of the manuscript in the Biblioteca da Ajuda where the title is given as *Historia de Ceilão*. This is the title which Tikiri Abeyasinghe preferred. Here it will be henceforth abbreviated to the *Conquista* in the text, and Perera's translation will be given as 'Queirós' in the notes.

⁵ T. Abeyasinghe, *Portuguese Rule in Ceylon 1594 - 1612*. Colombo 1966, p. 7. However, Abeyasinghe also says that Queirós' "views of history are not ours nor are his interests our interests." page vii.

⁶ T. Abeyasinghe, "History as Polemics and Propaganda: An Examination of Fernão de Queirós, *History of Ceylon*" in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society Sri Lanka Branch*, n.s Vol. XXV, 1980/1, p. 28 - 69. The other crucial texts for the Queirós scholar are S.G. Perera's introduction to his translation of 1930, given above; S. G. Perera's *The 'Conquista' of Queyroz, the only history of the Portuguese in Ceylon*. Ceylon Historical Association, Colombo, Jan 1925, leaflet

no. 1; G. Schurhammer's article for the *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies* 1929 above; Schurhammer's introduction in German to G. Schurhammer and E.A. Voretzsch, *Ceylon zur zeit des Konigs Bhuvaneka Bahu und Franz Xavers 1539 - 1552*, Vol 1. (Leipzig 1928.).

⁷ Abeyasinghe, 1980/1, p. 29.

⁸ Schurhammer and Voretzsch 1928, p. 49 refers to the *Conquista* as an "uncritical compilation" in which "it is impossible to tell truth from fiction".

⁹ For their offers of baptism see V. Perniola, *The Catholic Church in Sri Lanka: the Portuguese period Volume 1 1505 - 1565*, Dehiwala 1989, pages 62 (Prince of the Seven Korales, Chiefs of Trincomalee); 160 (King of Kandy); 300 (Vidiye Bandara); 211 (King of Batecaloa).

¹⁰ Queirós, p. 266 - 267.

¹¹ See also Queirós p. 261, which is almost a variation on the same theme: *Bhuvanekabahu* is won over by argument (and spiritual power) but then, "in the end political reasons got the better of him and he continued in the worship of Pagodes."

¹² A. da Silva. *Rego Documentação para a Historia das Missoes do Padroado Portugues do Oriente*, 12 volumes, Lisbon 1947 - 1958, Volume One, Document 109.

¹³ One example is G. Schurhammer's *Francis Xavier, His Life His Times*, translated into English by M.J. Costelloe, Vols I - IV, Rome, 1973 - 1982, Volume II, where Albuquerque's account is quoted verbatim with very little comment. See Tom Earle's introductory essay in T.F. Earle and J. Villiers (ed.) *Albuquerque, Caesar of the East: Selected Letters of Affonso de Albuquerque and His Son*, Warminster 1990, for the rhetorical pose which Albuquerque maintains in his letters: a clever manipulation of his material is belied by a tone of manly simplicity.

¹⁴ *University of Peradeniya, History of Sri Lanka*, Vol II, ed. K.M. de Silva (Peradeniya 1995), p. 74. See also Perniola p. 98, 249.

¹⁵ Queirós, p. 262. See also p. 335.

¹⁶ Queirós, p. 336. However Queirós' manipulation is evident when he makes the monk say that Mayadunne was essentially motivated by the fear "that the religion of Buddum will be altogether displaced by that of Christ."

¹⁷ See the letter of João de Villa de Conde, 27/11/1547, in Perniola p. 236.

¹⁸ That is the *Rājāvaliya* as trans. B. Gunasekera 1900, new edition AES 1995. However, the *Rājāvaliya* described in the *Catalogue of the Hugh Neville Collection of Sinhalese Manuscripts* in the British Library, by K.D. Somadasa, 7 Vols, Pali Text Society/ British Library 1987, Vol I, Or.6606 (107), does appear to make Mayadunne an upholder of Buddhism. To resolve this point an examination of earlier texts, the *Sitawaka Hatana* and the *Alakaesvarayuddhaya*, for their representations of Mayadunne is called for. Would this pro-Sitawakan tradition eschew overt associations with Buddhism because of Rajasinghe's Saivism?

¹⁹ *H.C.P. Bell Report on the Kegalle District* (Colombo 1904) p. 62-5, refers to the local tradition which says that Rajasinghe built it when he converted to Saivism in order to redeem his crime of murdering Mayadunne. However, since the story of Rajasinha's parricide is itself likely to be an 18th century invention, this tradition seems to be baseless. See H.B.M. Ilangasinha, *Buddhism in Medieval Sri Lanka*, Delhi 1992, p. 120 - 122, and p. 213. Moreover, Donald Ferguson in his notes to *The History of Ceylon from the Earliest Times to 1600 AD as related by João de Barros and Diogo do Couto*, (trans. and ed. D. Ferguson, Reprint New Delhi 1993, p. 139, 152) says that this was the chief temple encountered by the Portuguese when they entered Sitawaka under Jorge de Castro in 1550 and which was plundered by Dom Affonso de Noronha in 1552. Couto describes this temple as dedicated to Paramisura (= Paramesvara = Siva) and as having strange architecture. This ties in with Bell's comments (above) on the strongly Dravidian features of the surviving architecture, so that it "must have had a refined beauty all of its own". P.E. Pieris, *Ceylon: The Portuguese Era* (First edition 1913, Second edition Dehiwala 1992, p. 123 and 221) also describes the Berendi Kovil as existing in Mayadunne's time and being repaired by his son. This is not to say that Mayadunne was a Hindu per se; it was quite normal for Sinhala Buddhist kings to patronise Hindu Gods.

²⁰ Collected in Schurhammer and Voretzsch 1928 and translated in Perniola 1989.

²¹ See, in particular, Queirós p. 252 - 265.

²² See Perera's introduction to the 1930 translation, p. 12, 13. For example, Lomba's father (or at least close relative) was chief magistrate at Colombo.

²³ Abeyasinghe 1980/1, p. 40, 41 argues that Queirós had sources very close to grass-roots Sinhalese life. Yet Abeyasinghe seems sure that Queirós used no sources which were Sinhalese in origin. While the *Conquista* displays an overwhelming Portuguese bias, the shadowiness of Queirós' oral sources count against such a categorical denial.

²⁴ However, in late 1545/1546 Kandy was menaced by a joint Kotte and Sitawaka invasion. See Perniola p. 68. It is conceivable that Vidiya Bandara played a role in this shadowy campaign, but Kandy was never actually taken.

²⁵ Pieris 1992, is the only other work to incorporate this information. However, Pieris' incorporation is rather uncritical, probably because Schurhammer and Voretzsch's collection of the contemporary letters - which would contradict or disrupt Queirós' narrative - had yet to appear.

²⁶ Introduction to Schurhammer and Voretzsch 1928, p. 42 - 47.

²⁷ A systematic pursuit of this issue may involve a great deal of labour for comparatively little reward. See Abeyasinghe p. 66 for a disheartened attitude to Queirós' amenability to source-criticism. Incidentally the 'second debate' story appears to have the stereotyped features of an oral tradition or myth - perhaps one engendered by a beleaguered Christian community in need of miraculous justification.

²⁸ Zoltan Biedermann has embarked on a PhD in Lisbon which should take a fresh look at Queirós in this regard. As I understand it, he is interested in comparing Portuguese and Dutch perspectives on Sinhalese culture.

²⁹ Abeyasinghe, p. 40, 41.

³⁰ Veddas p. 16 - 18; Castes p.19, 21, 98; Marriage 90, 91 Warfare 96, 97, 99. Sinhalese 'ethos' p. 22, 23.

³¹ Queirós, p. 53-5.

³² Queiros, p.105-110.

³³ It is not a very well-aimed stab. See Queirós p. 114 - 141.

³⁴ Queirós, p. 122 - 141. This is not presented as an account of Sinhalese belief, as the introduction to the Second edition of P.E. Pieris' *Ceylon: The Portuguese Era*, p. vi, states.

³⁵ Queirós, p. 35, 42, 57, 66.

³⁶ Perera 1930, p.15.

³⁷ See Queirós' reproduction of his king list, p. 13.

³⁸ Personal communication, Jorge Flores 16/5/2000, 20/6/2000. The manuscript, entitled *Formas de todas as fortalezas da ilha de Ceilão*, has the call-mark, Ms 13 in the Biblioteca Universitaria, Universidad de Zaragoza. My thanks to C.R. de Silva for alerting me to this discovery and for his comments on Sinhalese narrative poems of this period.

³⁹ Queirós p. 730. C. R. de Silva, *The Portuguese in Ceylon 1617 - 1638*, Colombo 1972, p. 52 places this in 1620. On pages 69, 147 and 152 we learn that Miranda commanded an expedition into Trincomalee in 1624, that he was re-appointed to the same post in 1635/6 and taken out of office in 1637.

⁴⁰ The rough draft masquerades under the title *Descrição Historica, geographica e topographica da Ilha de Ceilão* (Call-mark 51- VII - 27, number 27 in the volume, folios 266 - 281.) See footnote 69 below.

⁴¹ Perniola, p. 318 - 338. Their letters have not received the scrutiny they deserve.

⁴² I owe this comment on inter-sex propriety in Parakramabahu VI's Kotte to a conversation with K.N.O. Dharmadasa.

⁴³ Perniola, p. 332. It is possible that the Jesuits have formed a mistaken impression from unrepresentative circumstances. On the other hand there is no motive for any deliberate misinformation.

⁴⁴ See the title to Chapter 11, Queirós p. 79.

⁴⁵ See Queirós, p. 79 - 95.

⁴⁶ See Queirós, p. 79, 80, 110 - 114.

⁴⁷ Queirós, p. 80.

⁴⁸ Writers such as A. Valignano, G.P. Maffeus, R. de Nobili, A. de Azevedo, S.Goncalves, J. Fenicio, Linschoten, A. Roger and F. Pyrad de Laval had reflected on Hinduism in contrasting ways.

⁴⁹ See Schurhammer 1929, p. 210 and 213.

⁵⁰ Abeyasinghe 1980/1, p. 33 - 39, 50 - 53.

⁵¹ Abeyasinghe 1980/1, p.53. It is also true that he knew very little about Asian languages, but it is hardly surprising that he knew no Sinhala, given that he had never been to the Island. Nevertheless this does make his pompous proclamations about the inelegancies of Asian tongues rather hard to swallow. Queirós, p. 116.

⁵² Equally Queirós' erudition about Sri Lanka rested on the backs of other researchers, principally Miranda and Negrão. Incidentally another possible avenue of research would be to work out which of Queirós' attitudes he owes to (or were reinforced by) his sources. Negrão, for example, seemed to be particularly angry about disrespectful officials, see Queirós, p. 288.

⁵³ However see the discussion of the paragraph beginning, 'Some say he taught the worship of only one God...!' (Queirós p. 120), in A. Strathern, 'Representing Eastern religion: Queyroz and Gonzaga on the first Catholic-Buddhist disputation in Sri Lanka', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Sri Lanka 1998*, Vol XLIII (published 2000). This shows that Queirós probably did come across one source (again, is this in Miranda?) which gave a more accurate interpretation of Buddhism, but he refused to accept it because it would have undermined his own beliefs regarding the universal principles of religion. Incidentally, the sense of this passage has been further illuminated by comparison with the first draft of the *Conquista* in the Biblioteca da Ajuda. See forthcoming note in the JRASSL.

⁵⁴ Abeyasinghe 1980/1, p. 49.

⁵⁵ Abeyasinghe 1980/1, p. 53.

⁵⁶ Queirós, p. 299.

⁵⁷ Queirós, p.298.

⁵⁸ Schurhammer, p. 211.

⁵⁹ See Abeyasinghe 1980/1, p. 50 - 53.

⁶⁰ See. Schurhammer 1929, p. 214. In 1673, Queirós, "was for sixteen years Deputy at the Inquisition of Goa."

⁶¹ Some very general comments about the intellectual histories of these views are given in A. Strathern 2000. Most important was perhaps the tradition of Jesuit accommodationism which had began extending a bridgehead of understanding towards Asian religions with the labours of Alessandro Valignano and Roberto de Nobili.

⁶² Chapters 22 and 23. See Abeyasinghe 1980/1, p. 49, footnote 71.

⁶³ Queirós, p. 163.

⁶⁴ Queirós, p. 158.

⁶⁵ Queirós, p. 156.

⁶⁶ Epistle to the Romans, 2. 12 - 16.

⁶⁷ Queirós p. 142.

⁶⁸ See the *Descrição* in the Biblioteca da Ajuda (above), folio 273.

⁶⁹ Perera 1930, p. 15. The *Descrição* seems to contain roughly the same information as the final draft but presented in quite a different order. For example, on folio 271 we find sentences which will come in the final draft in the following pages: 65, 61, 62, 69, 70. Sometimes even the meaning of sentences is altered between drafts. Chunks are missing from the early draft indicating that he had yet to incorporate other sources. The latter part of the *Descrição* seems to argue for the urgency of the Portuguese conquest of the Island, which would belong to Book Six of the *Conquista*.

⁷⁰ Queirós p. 258. See also p. 237 where Sinhalese *bhikkhus* are described

as being the "Administrators of the Maturanse of Arração." *Terunnanse* is an honorific form of *thero*.

⁷¹ Vimaladharmasuirya I (1591 - 1604) invited monks from Arrakan to reinstate higher ordination. See H.B.M. Ilangasinha, *Buddhism in Medieval Sri Lanka*, Delhi 1992, p. 67. There is some evidence that Burmese monks were active in Sri Lanka in the fifteenth century also, though as the recipients of higher ordination rather than its dispensers. (Ilangasinha, p. 168).

⁷² See Queirós, p. 141.

⁷³ Queirós, p. 256 (heresy) and p. 325 (jubilees) Both these practices have no real equivalents in Buddhism.

⁷⁴ See also Abeyasinghe 1980/1 pages 55, 56 for further discussion on the invented speech and a list of examples.

⁷⁵ Jonathan S. Walters, *The History of Kelaniya*, Colombo 1996, p. 24.

⁷⁶ This is the version as given in the circa thirteenth century Rasavihini. See Walters 1996, p. 46, 47. In the fourteenth century a collection of 98 verses was identified as being the 'century of verses' which the arhant recited and thus given the name, *Tela-kataha-gata* (Oil cauldron verses). Walters p.46, footnote 24 argues convincingly that these 98 verses, dating stylistically to the tenth century, were not composed with the story of Kalani Tissa in mind. Nevertheless by the Kotte period this association was being made. G. P. Malalasekera, *The Pali Literature of Ceylon* (1928, reprinted Kandy 1994), p. 163 comments thus: "The verses embody in them the fundamental tenets of Buddhism and are an earnest exhortation to men to lead the good life." However, this association did not become an intrinsic or permanent feature of the story because the *Rājāvaliya* merely tells us that he spoke, "to the people declaring that this state of existence is a stain on Buddhahood." What does remain common to all versions of the story - except Queirós' - is the centrality of the ethic of *Rajadharma*, the law which binds kings. My thanks to K.N.O Dharmadasa and J. Walters for their comments on the *Tela-kataha-gatha* and other aspects of this story.

⁷⁷ *Rājāvaliya*, ed. B. Gunasekera 1995, p. 27.

⁷⁸ Walters 1996, p. 69.

⁷⁹ Walters 1996, p. 66, footnote 9. See Queirós, p. 29-31.

⁸⁰ My translation differs slightly from that given by Perera (p. 30). The Portuguese, from Peiris 1916, p. 23 is "Poys Senhor, mostrays vosso podder, em minha fraqueza, defendendo minha inocencia; ainda que o esteja na culpa, que me dão; outra cometi hã puoco tempo, nada menos grave; permiti que neste fogo a satisfaca; padecendo o corpo por salvar a alma."

⁸¹ Queirós, p. 236, 7. Denavaka ("Dinavaka" in Queirós) was a medieval district held by the kings of Sitawaka. See Ilangasinha p. 45.

⁸² Naturally, this could be ruled out if the story also appears in this form in the Miranda text. If so, and if Miranda is generally a less manipulative and intrusive narrator than, then this would indicate that he was simply recording a version of the story current among the Portuguese community. It may be relevant that the Kalani story is not given in the *Descrição* (Biblioteca da Ajuda).

⁸³ Queirós, p. 31.

⁸⁴ *Rājāvaliya*, p. 26.

⁸⁵ See T. Abeyasinghe, *Portuguese Rule in Ceylon 1594 - 1612*, Colombo and C.R. de Silva *The Portuguese in Ceylon 1617-1638*, Colombo 1972.

⁸⁶ Abeyasinghe 1980-81, gives a balanced appraisal of Queiró's merits as a historian. See in particular pages 52 - 68.

⁸⁷ G. Schurhammer, *Francis Xavier* (above). Vol. II, pp. 623, 624.

⁸⁸ This is not a rhetorical question. Schurhammer always had a reason for an assertion such as this. If anyone else can discern what that may be I would be grateful if they would let me know. The entry for Queirós is Daya de Silva, *The Portuguese in Asia 1498 - 1800: An Annotated Bibliography*, 1987, also makes this attribution, presumably on Schurhammer's authority.