The Titles of the Sinhalese Kings as recorded in the Inscriptions of 3rd Century B.C. to 3rd Century A.C.

Introduction

The titles of the Sinhalese Kings as recorded in the inscriptions of 3rd B.C. to 3rd A.C. were Maharaja, Raja, Gamanī, Devanāpiya, Ma Parumaka and Apaya. (Princes were called Aya and Princesses Abi). In his paper on "Two Royal titles of the early Sinhalese and the origin of Kingship in Ancient Ceylon," Paranavitana discussed the titles Gamanī and Ma Parumaka: some supplementary observations thereto are offered here. The Chronicles omit altogether the epigraphical titles Ma Parumaka and Apaya, and they accord the title Devanāpiya only to Devanāpiya Tissa although the epigraphs prove its continuation by this King's successors for nearly 3 centuries; but, with regard to Gamanī, they establish an usage from the time of Paṇḍuvasudeva to Gajabāhuka Gamanī which is in general agreement with the inscriptions. The names and titles of Kings appear in the inscriptions (i) when the King himself is the donor, in which case it is usual for him to give also his father's and grandfather's names if they were Kings, or (ii) to show the kinship to the Royal family where the inscription is by a Queen, prince, princess or relative, or (iii) to describe an office held directly under the King where the inscription is by a high official, or (iv) to date the epigraph regally. Of 83 pre-Christian cave inscriptions in which Royal personages are named, only 7 represent grants by the King himself, while 33 are by Queens and Princesses, 28 by Princes and 15 by other persons. For every epigraphical grant of a cave by a Royal personage there are at least 12 grants by chiefs, headmen, householders and others. The paucity of cave inscriptions of the Kings themselves, at a time when the cave monastery was the vogue, is certainly surprising, especially as the Chronicles would have us believe that the Kings of the early Buddhist period built and endowed

2. (a) the Dambulla inscription of Saddhā Tissa, A.I.C. (Ancient Inscriptions of Ceylon by E. Müller) 3, (b) the Ritiqala inscription of Lajatissa, E.Z. (Epigraphy Ceylanica), I, 144, (c) the 4 inscriptions at Periyapuliyanukalum, A.S.C.A.R. (Archaeological Survey of Ceylon, Annual Report), 1905, 47, Nos. 19 to 22, in which the joint donors are Raja Uti and his wife, Abi Anuradi, and (d) perhaps, the partly mutilated Mihintāle inscription of Utiyā which reads:—DEVANĀPIYA MAHARAJAHA GAMAṆI UTI . . . PANІ LEṆE.
Vihāras in many parts of the Island with great liberality. In the 1st, 2nd and 3rd centuries B.C., when the rock inscription replaces the cave inscription, the position changes and the Kings themselves are the grantors in about half the number of inscriptions in which they are mentioned. It might be contended that there is a probability of the Kings not having been accorded their full or proper titles in the large proportion of inscriptions in which they themselves were not the grantors and that this accounts for the variations in the Kings’ titles exhibited in the inscriptions. In the writer’s view such laxity or carelessness in naming the King is not likely to have occurred or to have been countenanced.

Maharaja and Raja

The relative frequency and value of the Royal titles Maharaja and Raja are illustrated in the tabular statement. A further analysis of 234 inscriptions of Royal personages, both identified and unidentified, in the period under review, discloses the following frequencies in the use of the various titles, singly and in combination:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Inscriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Devanampaiya Maharaja Gamaṇi</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devanampaiya Maharaja</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devanampaiya Raja</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devanampaiya</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maharaja Gamaṇi</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raja Gamaṇi</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maharaja</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raja</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamaṇi</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma Parumaka Maharaja</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma Parumaka Maharaja Apaya</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maharaja Apaya</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Saḍḍhā Tissa, Kaniṭṭha Tissa and Mahāsena are described as Maharaja in every inscription in which they are mentioned. But they are exceptions. In general, the Kings were styled Maharaja in a majority of inscriptions, but there was no apparent distinction between Maharaja and Raja. In India, the Kings did not assume the title Maharaja till about the 1st century B.C., but in Ceylon it was in use nearly 2 centuries earlier. The Mahāvamsa employs it rarely but in those instances it signifies no higher degree of rulership.

3. Devānampiya Tissa, for instance, is credited with the construction of 68 rock-caves around the Kantaka Cetiya at Mihintale (M. Mahāvamsa 16, 12), but, although most of the caves in this locality bear inscriptions, not one is by Devānampiya Tissa. Duṭṭhagāmaṇi Abhaya is stated to have built 68 or 99 Vihāras (M. 24, 47; 32, 26). Saḍḍhātissa built Vihāras from Dīghavāpi to Anurādhapura, one for every yojana of the way (M. 33, 9).
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THE TITLES OF THE KINGS AS RECORDED IN THE
INSCRIPTIONS OF 3rd B.C. TO 3rd A.C.

MAHARAJA AND RAJA—TABULAR STATEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KING</th>
<th>Inscriptions of the King's Reign</th>
<th>Inscriptions Containing Posthumous References to the King</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. in which the King is styled Mahāraja</td>
<td>No. in which the King is styled Raja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVĀNĀMPIYA TISSA...</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTTIYA...</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KĀKAVĀṆṆA TISSA...</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUṬṬHAGĀṆĀṆI ABHAYA...</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SADDHĀ TISSA...</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANJATISSA...</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAṬṬTĀṆĀṆI ABHAYA...</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAHĀCŪṆI MAHĀTISSA...</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TISSA...</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUṬTAKAṆṆA TISSA...</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHATIKĀBHAYA...</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAHĀDĀṬHΙKA MAHĀ-NĀGA...</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĀMANDAGĀṆĀṆI ABHAYA...</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBHA...</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VASĀBHA...</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAṆKANĀṆIKA TISSA...</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAṆJABĀHUṆA GĀṆĀṆI...</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAHALOKA NĀGA...</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHĀṬIKĀ TISSA...</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANĪṬṬHA TISSA...</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIRINĀGA I...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOHĀRΙKA TISSA...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIRINĀGA II...</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOṬṬHĀBHAYA...</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAHĀSEN...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

126 81 36 9 70 46 19 5

237
Some Kings (Duṭṭhadāmanī Abaya, Vaṭṭagāmanī Abhaya, Mahācūḷa Mahātissa, Kuṭakanāṇa Tissa and Āmanḍagāmanī Abhaya) were mentioned at times by their personal names without any title other than Gamaṇī. Duṭṭhadāmanī and Tissa were styled Devanāpiya Raja and not Maharaja. A pre-Christian cave inscription at Mihintalā reads:—DIPA RAJA JITAYA MAHABIYA LENE ṢAṢAṢA: Dipa Raja signified the King over the whole Island and it did not derogate from his dignity to be called Raja. The conclusion to be drawn from the evidence is that, in regard to the Anurādhapura kings, Maharaja and Raja were understood and used as synonymous terms, no greater emphasis being laid on the former: these Kings, certainly from Duṭṭhadāmanī Abhaya onwards, ruled over the whole of Ceylon.

An unusual use of the title Maharaja has to be mentioned. A 1st century inscription at Karandahela, incised over 200 years after the death of Kākavanṇa Tissa, reads:—HABUTAGALA VHARAHĪ KAKAVANA TISA MAHARAJAHA UVASIKA MATA TU (MA) HA VAVI ṢAṢA DINA MĀHA VA . . . The Rugam inscription, which is relevant though just outside the period covered by this paper, begins:—SIDDHAM YĀṬALAKA TISA MAHARAJA . . . SARIMEKAVANA ABA MAHARAJA TUMANA PACAVANAKA VASAHĪ PIYAKALUTAṬA VAHIRA ICI CEYA ICI KARAVAYA: its date is about 5 centuries after the time of Yaṭṭhālaya Tissa. Both Kākavanṇa Tissa and Yaṭṭhālaya Tissa are posthumously styled Maharaja in these 2 inscriptions although neither of them ascended the throne of Anurādhapura or ruled over the whole Island.  

4. The Śīlavakanda inscription (A.S.C.A.R. 1935, para 41) reads:—UPAṢAKA VELAṢA LEṈE UPAṢIKA TIṢAYA LEṈE GAMANI ABAYAṢA RAJASI ṢAṢAṢA DINE.
5. An inscription at Dambulla Vihaṟa and the Tittavela inscription (A.S.C.A.R. 1933, paras 56 and 76) read respectively:—(i) DAMARAKITA TERAHĀ LENE AGATA ANAGATA CATUDĪṢA ṢAṢAṢA DINE GAMANI ABAYAṢA RAJIYAHĪ KARITE, and (ii) BATA MAHATIṢAHA LENE GAMANI ABAYAṢA RAJAYASI . . . ṢAṢAṢA.
6. E.Z. III, 156, note 5.
7. The Dunumadālakanda inscription (A.I.C. 15) begins:—KUṬAKAṆA GAMAṆI ABAYAHĀ PUTI BĀṬIYA MAHARAJA; see also the Rāṭravela inscription (note 51) and E.Z. III, 156, note 5.
8. The Ridhivihāra inscription (C.J.S. II, 179) begins:—DEVAṆIPIYA TISA RAJAHARA MARUMANAKE TISA MAHARAJAHA MARUMANAKE NAKA MAHARAJAHA PUT(A GA)MANI ABAYA DINE.
9. See notes 8 and 38.
10. 1½ miles north of the 13th milepost on the Pottuvil-Monērāgala road. Dr. Paranavitana informs me that this inscription is in verse.
11. A.I.C. 24, revised: the word which would have explained the context in which Yaṭṭalaka-Tisa is here mentioned is, unfortunately, obliterated.
12. Kākavanṇa Tissa was ruler of Rohaṇa when Elāra reigned at Anurādhapura. There is disagreement as to where Yaṭṭhālaya Tissa ruled, whether at Mahāgama or Kal-yāṇī—see M. 22, 10; M. 85, 64 to 65; Puj 15; Raj 24.
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The pre-Christian cave inscriptions contain the names of several Royal personages (Raja, Gamaṇi, Aya, Abi) whose identities are uncertain. Parana-vitana suggests that the princes named in the Bovattagala inscriptions appear to be identical with the Kṣatriyas of Kājarāgāma mentioned in the Mahāvaṃsa. The 14 inscriptions at Koṭṭadāmuhela, only 10 miles to the west, all read, with slight variations, as follows:—DAMARAJA PUTA MAHATIṢA AYAH A JITA ABI ŠAVERA AYA ABAYA PUTA TIṢA AYAH A JAYA ABI ŠAVERAYA DINE. Damaraja and his son, Mahatiṣa Aya, of the Koṭṭadāmuhela inscriptions are identical with the persons bearing the same names in the Bovattagala inscriptions: and both sets of inscriptions bear the same distinctive symbol of the fish. The genealogy derived from them is as follows:—

GAMIṆI

THE ELDEST OF TEN BROTHERS

RAJA UTI

8 OTHER BROTHERS

DAMARAJA

AYA ABAYA

AYA MAHATIṢA

AYATIṢA

ABI ANURADI

ABI ŠAVERA

The fish symbol occurs also in the Henannēgala inscription which mentions Gamaṇi Tiṣa, Majima Raja and Gamiṇi.

15. If this Damaraja was a local ruler in South and South-East Ceylon, there was another king bearing the same name at Anurādhapura: see the inscription of Aya Asāli, son of Gamaṇi Dhamaraja, at Mihintalē (A.S.C.A.R., 1911-12, 95, No. 10, revised) and a reference to Damaraja in an inscription at Nāṭṭunkanda not far from Mihintalē (A.S.C., 7th Report, 48, No. 3).
16. Parker, 446.
About 20 miles from Henannegala is the Kusalānakuṇḍa inscription which reads:—UPARAJA NAGA PUTE RAJA ABAYE NAMA TAŚA PUTE GAMIṆI TĪŠE NAMA LENE KARITE ŚUḌAŚANE ŚAΓAŚA. This inscription does not bear the fish (or any other) symbol, but its proximity to Henannegala suggests that the Rājas and princes mentioned in the 2 inscriptions belonged to the same Royal family. Very close to Kusalānakuṇḍa is the Kaludupotana-malai inscription reading:—AYABAYA PUTAŚA RAJĪYAŚI KAṬE PARUMAKA ŚA... Aya Abaya may be identical with Raja Abaya of Kusalānakuṇḍa. Paranavitana considers that Naga Aya of the Kolladehiya (Kinīvalgoda) inscription may be Mahānāga, the first ruler of Rohana.—PARUMAKA PUŚADEVAŚA JAYA PARUMAKA LAŠOṆAYA LENE NAGAYAHA RAJAYAHI KAṬE ŚAΓAŚA. Two inscriptions at Mihintale bear the text:—KAṆAGAMA RAJASA TĪŠAHA JITA ŚAVERA ŚAMAṆIYA LENE ŚAΓAŚA. Two inscriptions at Mihintale bear the text:—KAṆAGAMA RAJASA TĪŠAHA JITA ŚAVERA ŚAMAṆIYA LENE ŚAΓAŚA. An inscription at Koratota near Colombo, records the grant of a cave by the daughter of a Mahāraja whose name is not stated. The Periyapuliyankulam inscriptions mention a princess named Abi Anuradi, the daughter of Raja Naga and the wife of Raja Uti. The Āmulambē inscriptions give the genealogy:—

PACINA RAJA

| RAJA ABAYA | TĪŠA AYA |

TĪŠA AYA

The Bambaragala inscription mentions Pocani Raja Nāgaya and his wife, the daughter of a Brāhmaṇa. Princes named Aya Śuratiśa, Aya Śīva, Daraka Aya son of a Raja, Aya Duhita (probably a contemporary of Vaṭṭagāmāṇi Abhaya) and Uti Aya are mentioned in inscriptions at Dimbulāgala, Mutu-

17. Ibid. 421 and 445. revised.
19. A.S.C.A.R., 1934, para 71(i). If the Kusalānakuṇḍa inscription is not associated with the one at Henannegala, the equation Nagaya (Kolladehiya) = Uparaja Naga (Kusalānakuṇḍa) = Uparāja Mahānāga (Mahāvasa), seems feasible.
23. A.I.C. 34. revised.
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The identification of the Royal personages named in the foregoing series of pre-Christian inscriptions is outside the scope of this paper, but the inscriptions are relevant to show that Buddhist rulers styled Raja ruled in the south and east contemporaneously with the early Devanapiya Maharajas and Rajas of Anurādhapura. It is not possible to be precise as to whether they were dependent, independent or semi-independent of the Anurādhapura king, but it is significant that none of them is styled Devanapiya or Maharaja. Ayas also exercised ruling powers and two of their inscriptions are dated regally, Nagayaha rajayahi and Ayabaya putasa rajiyaśi.

Devanapiya

The significance of Devanāmpriya in Asoka’s inscriptions has been explained elsewhere. Its etymological meaning is “dear to the gods” and it was used in India as a honorific title and sometimes as a substitute for Rājā by the Emperor Asoka principally and to a lesser extent by his predecessors and successors. The Ceylon chronicles are unanimous that Muṭasiva’s son and successor, Tissa, was the first (and only) King of Lanka to be called Devānāmpriya. The epigraphical evidence in support of the Chronicles that Devānāmpriya Tissa was the first King to be so named lacks certainty. The Rajagiri-lenanakanda inscription of Devanapiya Tissa and the following inscription from Mihintalā refer most probably, though not with certainty, to Devānāmpriya Tissa:—Dé(VA)NAPIYA MAHARAJAHA BARIYAYA BAKA . . . UPAŠIKA VARUNA(DA)TAYA LENE. Paranavitana attaches credibility to the Mihirāṃsi account of Devānāmpriya Tissa’s second consecration and suggests that “when Asoka conferred the dignity of a King upon Tissa (Devānāmpriya Tissa) he also permitted the latter to use the title (Devānāmpriya) by which he always refers to himself in his own inscriptions”.

26. Ibid, III, 211.
32. A.S.C.A.R., 1933, 1011-12, 91, No. 2, revised. The 2 Piccandiyāva inscriptions (A.I.C. 84) reading (i) MAHARAJAŚA DEVANAPIYĀŚA GAMINI TISĀSA VEJĀ BAMAṆĀ GOBUTIYA LENE ŚAGAŚA, and (ii) MAHARAJAŚA DEVANAPIYĀHĀ ACIRIYA BAMAṆĀ GOBUTIYA LENE, also refer, in all probability, from the nature of the script, to Devānāmpiyā Tissa. In the later Yaṭahalena and Minvila inscriptions (C.J.S. II, 203, No. 618, and E.Z., III, 156, note 5), Devanapiya stands for Devānāmpiyā Tissa.
This proposition may not be wholly acceptable: but Devanāpīya Tissa and Asoka were contemporaries and there was intercourse between the Mauryan empire and Ceylon, and there can be no doubt that Devanāpīya Tissa assumed the title in imitation of Asoka.

The earliest, certain, epigraphical use of Devanāpīya is in the Mihintale inscriptions of Uttiya, the younger brother and successor of Devanāpīya Tissa. In the period of about 110 years (corresponding, approximately, to the 2nd century B.C.) between Uttiya and Vaṭṭagāmāni Abhaya, there is some slight degree of doubt as to the identities of the kings mentioned in the inscriptions. Devanāpīya Maharaja Gamaṇī Abaya of the Tōnigala, Kossagamakanda and Mihintale inscriptions has been identified on palaeographical grounds with Duṭṭhagāmāni Abhaya. The Koravakgala inscription of the reign of the same King reads —DEVANĀPIYA RAJA ABAYASA SENAPATI PARUMAKA MI_HTASA LEŅE AGATA ANAGATA CATUDIŠA ŠAGASA. There is no evidence, historical or epigraphical, that any ruler other than the King at Anurādhapura bore the title Devanāpīya. The preceding epigraph, incised in the King’s lifetime, after he had ascended the throne of Anurādhapura and restored Sinhalese sovereignty over the whole of Ceylon, has the unusual combination Devanāpīya Raja in place of Devanāpīya Maharaja.

Wickremesinghe has identified Devanāpīya Maharaja Gamaṇī Tisa of the Ritigala inscription with Saddhā Tissa. The same identification has been made in respect of the Dambulla and Nuvaragala inscriptions and the 5 inscriptions at Rājaγala.

In the Ritigala inscriptions, Lanjatissa is styled Devanāpīya Tisa and Devanāpīya Laja (ka Tisa...): the second of these inscriptions is partly obliterated and probably contained the title Maharaja or Raja at the end, but in the first inscription Devanāpīya was used along with the King’s personal name, in an inscription of the King himself, unaccompanied by either Maharaja or Raja.

Devanāpīya Maharaja Gamaṇī Abaya of the 9 Gallena inscriptions and the Sasserauvā inscription is identified as Vaṭṭagāmāni Abhaya. Henceforward occurs a change in the position of the Royal title Maharaja.

34. A.S.C.A.R., 1933, paras 53 and 54; note 2(d).
35. A.I.C. 1.
39. E.Z. I, 144.
40. A.I.C. 3.
41. Parker, 445.
43. E.Z. I, 144, 148.
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Mahācūḷī Mahātissa (B.C. 77-63) is styled Devanāpiya Tisa Maharaja in the Maha Ratnale,46 Mōlātiyavelēgalā,47 Mihintalē,48 Kaduruvāva49 and "Line"-malai50 inscriptions. In the Rātravēla inscription he is styled Devanāpiya Gamani Maharaja.51

Tissa (B.C. 51-48) is called Devanāpiya Tīsa Raja in the Ridivihāra inscription:52 this is the second instance of the use of Raja (and not Maharaja) with Devanāpiya.

The full titles of Kutakāṇṇa Tissa (B.C. 44-22) as given in the Maha Ratnale,46 and Mihintalē inscriptions were Devanāpiya Puḍakaṇa Gamani Abaya Maharaja.53 In the same Mihintalē inscription, Bhatikābhaya is styled Devanāpiya Gamani Abaya Maharaja. The latest epigraphical record of the use of Devanāpiya occurs in the Maha Ratnale inscription in which Mahādāthikamahānāga (A.C. 7-19) is called Devanāpiya Naka Maharaja.

We have, therefore, an almost unbroken epigraphical series for the use of the epithet Devanāpiya by the Sinhalese kings of Anurādhapura from B.C. 247 to A.C. 19. There are only 3 inscriptions of Mahādāthikamahānāga's successors up to and including Yasalaḷakatissa: all 3 are of Āmaṇḍagāmaṇi Abhaya and Devanāpiya does not occur in any one of them. The dynasty of Devānampiya Tissa ended with Yasalaḷakatissa (52-60) and the use of the dynastic honorific Devanāpiya came to an end at the same time. But Devanāpiya was not paraded in every inscription nor even in a majority of inscriptions; it occurs in 45 out of 94 royal inscriptions from Devānampiya Tissa to Mahādāthikamahānāga and it was rarely used in the inscriptions referring to the last three of these kings. Devānampiya Tissa's successors on the throne of Anurādhapura continued to use the title till his line terminated with the assassination of Yasalaḷakatissa in the year 60. As time went on, the honorific significance of the title had added to it a dynastic or lineage significance, as

46. E.Z. I, 61.
47. E.Z. III, 154.
48. A.I.C. 20, revised.
49. A.S.C.A.R., 1935, para 43; the inscription begins: —DEVANIP RISA MAHARAJA.
50. 24 miles west of the 64th milepost on the Batticaloa-Pottuvil road. The inscription reads: —SIDDHAM DEVA~APIYA TISA MAHARAJAHA MANUMAKARAKE KUDAKAANA RAJAHRA PUTE RAJA ABAYE CA NAKA MAHARAJA CA DAKAPU~NAKA MA(HA) GIRIGAMAKA ALI CA SIPAVATAHI BIKU SAGAYE NIYATE ME DO ALI SIRAHI KARA KAADV.
52. See note 8.
is evident from the Minvila inscription of Kuṭakaṇṇa Tissa, and when a new dynasty replaced the old it could no longer be continued.

Wickremesinghe advanced the proposition that (i) in the pre-Christian inscriptions the title Maharaja was always inserted between the epithet Devanapiya and the name of the King, e.g. Devanapiya Maharaja Gamaṇī Abaya, and (ii) in the inscriptions of the 2nd and 3rd a.c. the title Maharaja came after the King’s name, e.g. Devanapiya Gamaṇī Abaya Maharaja. Three examples could be quoted against the first part of this hypothesis:—

(a) one of the 5 royal epigraphs at Rājagala reads:—MAHARAJAH DEVANAPIYAHAMA GAMANI TISAH PUTAHA TISA AYAHAMA MAHA LENE;
(b) the Piccandiyava inscription; and
(c) the Kossagamakanda inscription which reads Maharaja Gamaṇī Abayaha Devanapiyasa, but here the unusual order of words is accounted for by the fact that the inscription is in verse. Wickremesinghe's identification of the Kings in the Maha Ratnale and Ritigala inscriptions was at fault and Paranavitana has corrected the former errors: moreover, his chronology was different to that adopted here. The change which he observed in the relative positions of the titles Devanapiya and Maharaja actually became the rule in the inscriptions in which Mahācūḷi Mahātissa (B.C. 77-63) was given his full titles, and continued to be the rule till Devanapiya went out of use in the middle of the 1st century.

Gamaṇī

"He who brings guerdon comes as first invited: the chief of the hamlet (grāmaṇī) comes as guerdon-bearer. Him I account the ruler of the people who was the first to introduce the guerdon". "Blest be the hamlet’s chief (grāmaṇī), most liberal Manu, may his bounty rival that of Sūrya". These two quotations from the Rigveda elevate the Grāmaṇī to a position of ruler-ship, a position far higher than that of a village chief. Grāma originally had the sense 'horde' or 'host' (group of nomads) and Grāmaṇī was the leader of the grāma. The Bharatas, one of the most powerful tribes of the Vedic period, are called a jana ('people') as well as a grāma. Grāmaṇī was identical with Vrajapati and was the commander of a division of troops in war.

In the later Brāhāmaṇa period in India, the Grāmaṇī was one of about a dozen high personages who took an important part in the ceremony of the
THE TITLES OF THE SINHALESE KINGS

King's consecration. "Probably at this epoch a Grāmanī was, both for civil and military purposes, at the head of each village, owing, it may be conjectured, his position to the king, while the Grāmanī par excellence presided over the city or village where the royal court was situated. It is also far from unlikely, despite the silence of the texts, that the civil functions of the Grāmanī were the more important, for the post is emphatically declared in several places to represent the summit of the ambition of the Vaisya. If later analogy is to help us, we may conjecture that the Grāmanī formed the channel through which the royal control was exercised and the royal dues received."

In the Mānavadharmaśāstra the head of one village is called the Grāmika. By the time of the Jātakas and in the Mauryan Empire, the position of the Gāmāṇi in India was that of a village headman appointed by the king: he is equated with Gāma-bhōjakā. The distinction between Gāmaṇi and Gāmika is now vague as well as confused, and historical criticism has not yet made the position clear. However, the deterioration of the rank or office of Gāmaṇi from Vedic to Mauryan times is noticeable: at first, the leader of the host, comparable with Manu, and finally a village headman.

This deterioration did not occur in Ceylon. With one possible exception, the Gāmaṇis of the Chronicles and inscriptions were undoubtedly Kings or princes. The Chronicles first give the title Gāmāṇi to Dīghagāmāṇi, the nephew of King Paṇḍuvasudeva; then they accord it to Duṭṭhagāmāṇi Abhaya, Vaṭṭagāmāṇi Abhaya, Āmaṇḍagāmāṇi and finally to Gajabāhuka Gāmāṇi. The inscriptions confirm the Chronicles in respect of these 4 Kings and add to the list Devānāṃpiya Tissa(?), Utiya, Saddhā Tissa, Mahācūḷī Mahātissa, Kuṭakaṇṇa Tissa and Bhatikābhaya. The Prince Gāmāṇi was so named because he was lord of Mahāgāma, so that the title Gāmaṇi was given to the King's son in the King's lifetime. Dīghagāmāṇi, as we have seen, was named Gāmāṇi although he was not the son of a King. The Kusalānakanda inscription of Ganaṇi Tiṣa appears to have been inscribed during the lifetime of his father, Raja Abaya. Ganaṇi Tiṣa of the Gōnavatta inscription was the son of Āmaṇḍagāmāṇi Abhaya: he did not ascend the throne, but bore

---

63. Manu, VII, 123.
64. C.H.I., 486: Economic Life and Progress in Ancient India by N. Bandyopadhyaya, 234.
66. M. 22, 70 to 71. Anurādhapura and Mahāgāma would have been known as Nagaras even at this time. Other and less important Nagaras were then in existence: the pre-Christian inscriptions at Henannēgala, Tōṇigala, Ranagirimada, Yaṭhaalena, Lenagala and Kōngala name the following Nagaras:—Kaśabanaagara, Acanagara, Tavirikiyanagara, Abayanakara, Nīlayanagara, Bataśanagara, and Utinagariya. This last may have been named after Raja Uti of the Bōvattagala inscriptions.
the title Gāmani during his father's reign. So that Gāmani in Ceylon could be said to have been exclusively and undoubtedly a title of kings and princes but for the single, exceptional inscription at Nāval Ār which Paranavitana has cited. The text of this inscription is as follows:—ATI ACARIYA GAMANI PADUMA PUTA PADUMAGUTAṢA PIYADAṢANE NAMA LEṆE ŚAGAYE NIYATE, 2 symbols. Without extending the meaning of Gāmani in this solitary instance to signify, as in India, the head of a corporation or company of elephant-trainers or elephant-mounted soldiers, since Acariya is itself sufficiently expressive of that office, and without deviating from the meaning the title bears in every other written document in Ceylon, we may assume that Gāmani Paduma of this particular inscription was a Prince.

If it is correct that in India the status of the Gāmani degenerated from that of a Vedic leader of the host to a Mauryan village headman, then Ceylon was not influenced by that process and it would appear that the Indo-Aryan occupation of this Island must be put back to a period earlier than the traditional one of 5th or 6th B.C.

Ma Parumaka

Paranavitana has pointed out that the Royal title Ma Parumaka is a corruption of Mahāparumaka which is identical with the Sanskrit Mahāpra-
mukha and the Pāli Mahāpamukha or Mahāpānokkha. He has also shown that in Pāli literature Pānokkha signified a member of the nobility as well as the president of a guild or corporation.

The early inscriptions of Ceylon contain numerous references to persons bearing the rank of Parumaka. Its latest use in an epigraph was early in the 1st century A.C. The period during which the title Parumaka was in use was, therefore, 3rd B.C. to the early part of 1st A.C. During this period the title Ma Parumaka does not occur in a single inscription: its first appearance is in the second half of the 2nd century, nearly one and a half centuries after Parumaka became obsolete. This strange phenomenon is capable, at present, of speculative explanation only.

The first occurrence of Ma Parumaka is in the Tammanakanda inscription of Kaniṭṭha Tissa (167-186), the relevant portion reading:—MA PARUMAKA MALI TISA MAHARAJI JIṆAPAṬI SATARIYA KOṬU DĪNĪ. But this is the only one of 14 known inscriptions of Kaniṭṭha Tissa in which this title is used. The Habarana inscription of the late 2nd or early 3rd A.C. (quite possibly in Kaniṭṭha Tissa's time) is dated in the reign of a King styled Ma Parumaka Maharajī, but the King's name is not given. The next King after Kaniṭṭha Tissa to be called Ma Parumaka was Mahāsena (274-302) but the number of royal inscriptions of the intervening period of a little over
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70. A.I.C. 61; E.Z. III, 179, note 3.
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a century is so small that it cannot be inferred that the title went into abeyance during this period. The Karambagala inscription\textsuperscript{71} of Sirimeghavanāḍa commences:—SIDDHAM PUVAYA MA PARUMAKA MAHASEN MAHARAJA (HA) PUTA SIRIMEKA (VAṇA MA) HARAJA APAYA (HA CATA LAGITA) VISITIVANA KA VASAH. The Bōvattagala inscription\textsuperscript{72} of Jetṭhatissa II also refers to Mahāsena posthumously as Ma Parumaka:—(SIDDHA)M MA PARUMAKA (MAHA) SENA MAHARAJA APAYA (HA) PUTA JETATIS MAHA (RAJA APA) YAHA CATA (LAGITA.)

Apaya

Paranavitana has recorded his observations on the title Apaya.\textsuperscript{73} It was a synonym for Abaya but it was an honorific and not a personal name, and it always occurs after Maharaja. Like Ma Parumaka, Apaya appears only in epigraphs and is absent in the Chronicles. Mahāsena was the first king to bear it: in the Bōvattagala inscription already quoted he receives the titles Ma Parumaka, Maharaja and Apaya. The form Abaya was used in the shorter inscription at Tōnigala.\textsuperscript{74} Apaya came into use at the very end of the period covered by this paper.

Conclusion

The vogue of Devanāpiya lasted from the second half of the 3rd century B.C. to the middle of the 1st century A.C. Gamanī, which had an earlier origin, outlasted Devanāpiya by about 75 years into the early 2nd century. Ma Parumaka was introduced in the latter half of the 2nd century. Apaya originated at the end of the 3rd or beginning of the 4th century.

Referring to the sobriquets\textsuperscript{75} given to the Kings in the Mahīvaṇīsa and particularly to ‘Mahallaka’, Paranavitana observed that “such epithets, though favoured by the writers of the Chronicles, are never found used in documents written in the lifetime of the personages to whom they referred.”\textsuperscript{76} We find, however, in the inscriptions (i) Kākavaṇṇa Tissa called Kakavana Tisa Maharaja two centuries after his death, (ii) Dutṭhagāmaṇi Abaya called DUTAKA GAMIṆI ABA RAJA in a 3rd century inscription,\textsuperscript{77} (iii) Mahācūḷi Mahātissa called Macudi Raja in his reign,\textsuperscript{78} Mahacudika by his son,\textsuperscript{79} and Macudi Raja by his great-great-grandson,\textsuperscript{80} (iv) Kuṭakaṇṇa Tissa called
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Pudakaṇa, Puṭakaṇa, Kudakaṇa and Kuṭakaṇa in his own inscriptions and in inscriptions of his son and grandson, and (v) Mahallaka Nāga referred to as Mahala Raja in an inscription of his son. These sobriquets, as rendered in Pāli in the Mahāvamsa, connote some objectionable feature in the King's character or personal appearance, and are, in fact, vulgar nick-names: and it is scarcely credible, if the Pāli is a correct rendering of the original, that the Kings or their sons or their descendants would have tolerated their use in an epigraph or any document whatsoever. Only 5 out of some 15 Kings assigned nick-names in the Chronicles bear similar names in the inscriptions and the explanation appears to be that in these 5 cases the inscriptional names did not carry the opprobrious meaning which their Pāli rendering was later made to convey.
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