

A Study of the Sources and Contents of the Rājāvaliya

by

A. V. SURAWEERA

Dept. of Sinhala, Vidyodaya University of Ceylon

FOR a study of the sources and contents of the *Rājāvaliya* (*Rjv.*), it is essential to have a general, even if brief, idea of the text itself. Dr. C. E. Godakumbura explains, "when one refers to *Rājāvaliya* as a text, it should be clearly understood that there is no definite single work by that name, but there are various recensions and versions of the text".¹ After examining the various printed versions and Mss. that were available, he has pointed out that there are as many as seven distinct recensions.² I myself wish to add the following to this number:

- (a) Ms. in the Colombo Museum, No. AP-7. This Ms. named *Rājāvaliya* begins with the story of the Vanga king and ends with Wickramabāhu III of Kandy.
- (b) Colombo Museum, AO-17; J-7; 7G-4. Three Mss. all named *Rājāvali*. The text is similar to the section beginning with *Dharmasoṇḍaka vastu* to end of *Bodhirāja Vastu* in the *Saddharmālakāraya*.
- (c) Colombo Museum, A section of 7H-1; X4. Two Mss. named *Vijayarājāvaliya*. Text is same as Chap. 34 of the *Pūjāvaliya*.
- (d) Colombo Museum, A section of 7H-1 named *Rāvanārājāvaliya*. This appears to be a *Kaḍaim-pota*.
- (e) Colombo Museum, 7 F-3 named *Buddharājavalliya*. This Ms. contains an account of the Bodhi, Dutugāmuṇu, Malala people etc.
- (f) Colombo Museum, 24 p-32; 24P-33; 24P-34. Text in both prose and verse, written on paper. It is recorded that these books were copied from *ola* Mss. at the request of H. C. P. Bell. (I have not seen these original *ola* Mss.).
- (g) Colombo Museum, AR-18, called *Vannirājāvaliya*. There are similarities with the printed editions of the *Rjv.*, but it contains more details about king Sirisangabo, the Vanni region etc. Colombo Museum, V-3 named *Rājāvaliya* appears to be the same as the above *Vannirājāvaliya*.
- (h) British Museum, Or. 4971 (73) named *Rājāvaliya* by Wikremasinghe in his catalogue of the Sinhalese Mss. in the British Museum. This is same as the text of the *Alakesvara Yuddhaya*, AP-4 and AF-15 in the Colombo Museum.

1. *Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon*, ed. C. H. Phillips, Oxford University Press, 1961, "Historical Writing in Sinhalese" by C. E. Godakumbura. (*HIPC.*) p. 76.

2. *ibid.* p. 76.

It is clear from the above analysis that some of the so-called *Rjv.* Mss. are other texts or parts of other texts. Therefore, one has to be cautious in considering a Ms. named *Rājāvaliya* as belonging to a different recension. However, while agreeing with Dr. Godakumbura with regard to the existence of different recensions and versions of this text, I would point out that the majority of the *Rjv.* Mss. belongs to one particular group. The omission of the account of Seven Kings and one Queen after Adagāmuṇu is common to all Mss. of this group. The same is true of the gap of a period of about one hundred years between Parākramabāhu II of Dāmbadeniya and Parākramabāhu VI of Kotṭe. Even in this group, one comes across Mss. with additional details, very often at the beginning, giving more information with regard to the cosmology. Additional details occur sometimes towards the end too. It can be pointed out that although a large number of Mss. of this group ends with the accession of Vimaladharmasūriya II (1687 A.C.), yet some of the Mss. continue the history further. For example, the Ms. at the library of the Pravacanodaya Pirivena, Molligoda, continues the history up to 1815 A.C. with more details about the reign of Kīrti Sri Rājasimha; the Ms. popularly known as the *Malvaturājāvaliya* contains more details about the Malvatte Chapter.

In this article, we have confined ourselves to the popular version of the *Rjv.* beginning with “අනන්තපරිමාණ සක්වලට උතුම් වූ කෙළකන්ණයක් සක්වල ද;.....” up to the reign of Vimaladharmasūriya II.³ Considering this portion of the text as the accepted version of the *Rjv.*, it is not far wrong to assume that this part of the text has taken its final shape about the time of Vimaladharmasūriya II (1687-1706 A.C.).

Although a very small number of the *Rjv.* Mss. of this group is titled *Mahārājāvaliya*,⁴ a majority of the Mss. have one of the following names; *Rājāvaliya*,⁵ *Rājavalliya*,⁶ *Rājavalli Pota*,⁷ *Rājavanli Pota*,⁸ *Rājavalliyē Pota*,⁹ We therefore, see no justification to alter its popular name, *Rājāvaliya* in preference to *Māhārājāvaliya*, as some scholars appear to have done.¹⁰

Whether this text is a work of one author, or whether this has been written from time to time by more than one writer, has been discussed by many scholars.¹¹ Although it is beyond the scope of this article to discuss this problem in detail, we are inclined to agree with W. Geiger¹² that *Rjv.* is a work of one single author, as our own analysis of the sources and contents would show.

3. There is no standard edition of the *Rjv.* text published so far. I have made use of the edition by B. Gunasekera, (1953) in giving references to the text. However certain alterations have been made in the text, in accordance with the Mss.
4. මහරාජාවලිය. For example, the Ms. at the Subhadrārāma Purāna vihāra, Balapitiya.
5. රාජවලිය. No. 5/63/80—78/60. A photostat copy of a Ms. at the British Museum, available in the Ceylon Archives, Nugegoda; Ms. at the Potgul Vihāra, Haṅguranketa.
6. රාජවලිය. Ms. at the Sri Dharmapāla Pirivena, Bellana; Ms. No. 2-4-243 at the Library, University of Ceylon, Peradeniya.
7. රාජවලිය පොත. No. 199, Library, University of Ceylon, Peradeniya.
8. රාජවන්ලි පොත. Ms. at Kandevihāra, Atabāge.
9. රාජවලිය පොත. Ms. at Yogyālena Temple, Sandalankāva.
10. *HIPC.* p. 76.
11. *Manual of Buddhism*, R.S. Hardy, 2nd ed., 1880, p. 539; *Epitome of the History of Ceylon*, G. Turnour, 1836, Introduction, p. iv; *The Mahāvamsi, The Raja-ratnacari and the Raja-vali*, Upham, 1833, Introduction, p. xii; *HIPC.* p. 77.
12. *The Dipavamsa and Mahāvamsa*, W. Geiger, Translated by A. M. Coomaraswamy, 1908 (*Dv. and Mv.G.*) p. 94.

Although it seems natural for a person writing a history of Ceylon in Sinhalese to turn towards the *Mahāvamsa* (*Mv.*) or other Pali sources, the author of the *Rjv.* does not seem to have done so. Instead he has depended entirely on two other Sinhalese works; namely the *Pūjāvaliya*¹³ (*Pjv.*) and the *Alakesvara Yuddhaya*¹⁴ (*Aly.*). The *Pjv.* is a work of the chief incumbent of the Mayūrapāda Piriveṇa who lived in the Daṁbadeniya period. I have discussed elsewhere,¹⁵ that *Aly.* belongs to the Sītāvaka period. For convenience of analysis, I propose to divide the *Rjv.* as it appears in the text into 10 sections as follows:

1. Description of the Cosmos
2. Description of the Jambudvīpa
3. Description of the Madhyadesa
4. List of countries where heretical beliefs exist
5. Account of the Kalpas, and the genealogy of the Mahāsammata Kings
6. Period from Vijaya to end of Abhaya, son of Paṇḍuvāsudeva
7. From Paṇḍukābhaya to end of Anulā
8. From Makalantissa to end of Parākramabāhu II
9. From Vijayabāhu to end of Māyādunne
10. From Rājasimha to the accession of Vimaladharmasūriya II.

The sections 1-5 above, have been included in the *Rjv.* to serve the purpose of an introduction to the account of the kings of Ceylon. It is interesting to note how each of these five sections ends.

1. “මේ තුන් විපයට ජම්බුද්වීපය උතුම් වන්නේය”¹⁶
2. “මධ්‍යදෙශයට බොධිමණ්ඩලය උතුම් වන්නාහ”¹⁷
3. “මේ පන්තිස් නුවරට අඩුනුව ලොවුතුරා බුදුන් හා පසේ බුදුන් හා අසුමහසවුවන් හා චක්‍රවතී රජුරුවන් හා මහෙශාකාශ දෙවියන් හා ධනසිටුවරුන් හා උපදිනා සථාන යයි දැනගත යුතුයි”¹⁸
4. “මේ පරසමයන් දෙශවල් බුදුන්ගේ සමයට පිට නුවරවල් දැනගත යුතුයි”¹⁹
5. “මේ ශ්‍රී ලංකාවිපයට ආ රාජවර්ග මෙසේ දැන යුතුයි”²⁰

This shows that the book has been compiled upon a well set plan. However, it must be said that the author has unhesitatingly borrowed from, or rather copied section after section of the *Pjv.* and the *Aly.* and arranged them to form a connected history. Sections 1-5 of the above analysis has been copied from chapter 6 of the *Pjv.* Sections 6-8 have been based mainly on chapters 33 and 34 of the *Pjv.* while books like the *Stūpavamsa* and the *Saddharmāṅkārā* have been occasionally consulted. Section 9 has been based on the *Aly.* The *Aly.* comes to an end about this period, and we are not aware of any work that the author of the *Rjv.* depended on in compiling section 10. Perhaps this part may have been his own contribution to the text.

13. පූජාවලිය, කිට්ටුල්ලේ ඤාණවිමල සංඝ. 1951 (පූජාකි.); පූජාවලිය; පරි. 33, 34. ඒ. ඩී. සුරවීර සංඝ. 1961 (පූජාසු.).

14. අලකේශ්වර යුධය, ඒ. ඩී. සුරවීර සංඝ. 1965. (අලසු.).

15. අලසු. ප්‍රස්ථාවනා.

16. රාජාවලිය, ඩී. ඉණසේකර සංඝ. දෙවෙනි මුද්‍රණාධිකය, 1953, (රාජාඉ.) 1 පිටුව.

17. රාජාඉ. 2 පි.

18. රාජාඉ. 3 පි.

19. රාජාඉ. 3 පි.

20. රාජාඉ. 11 පි.

The following is a discussion of the different sections given above in detail:

1. *Description of the Cosmos*
2. *Description of the Jambudvīpa*

All Mss. of the *Rjv.* begin with a description of the Cosmos. The position of the Sakrabhavana, Mahāmeru, Saptakulaparvata, four Mahādīvīpas etc. with their respective distances is mentioned. Jambudvīpa is said to be supreme among the four Mahādīvīpa. Then follow details about the Himalaya, Lake Anotatta, four principal rivers, four great rocks, three caves etc. The account of the Jambudvīpa ends with a statement that it is superior to the Six Deva-loka and the Brahmaloaka.

Similar but brief accounts of the Cosmos are found in books like the *Butsarāṇa*,²¹ and the *Dharmapradīpikāva*.²² Dr. C. E. Godakumbura remarks, "The description of the Universe is based on the accounts found in such *Suttas* as the *Sattasuriyuggamana Sutta* of the *Anguttara Nikāya* and its commentary in the *Manorathapūraṇi*. The source of the author of the *Rājāvaliya* was no doubt a *Sanne* to the *Sūtra*, which gave him further details".²³

The method adopted by the author of the *Pjv.* throughout the work does not lead us to think that he depended on any Pali source. On the other hand, it is not clear whether he has copied this section from a Sinhalese text available to him, just as much as he has done with regard to a greater part of his work. The introductory portions of the histories like *Lankābodhivastuva*,²⁴ *Lankā-kathāva*,²⁵ and *Lankāviśāraya*²⁶ bear similarities to this section. Although it is clear that these works belong to the same period as the *Rjv.*, it is not possible to establish that they are anterior to it, and hence one cannot definitely say that the author of the *Rjv.* had made use of them. On the other hand the *Rjv.* account agrees largely with the section in the *Pjv.* entitled Dipavilokana Kathā and Desavilokana Kathā²⁷ in subject matter, sometimes word to word. I am therefore inclined to think that the author of the *Rjv.* has depended on the *Pjv.* itself for this account, just as much as he has done in the subsequent pages.

After mentioning the four outlets of the Anotatta lake, and the four great rivers of the Jambudvīpa, the *Rjv.* account has the following sentence: "මහාමුතියන්ගෙ හිසින් සොළිකරේ මැදින් ගංගා වැටුණාහ".²⁸ This statement, complicated in itself and not found in the *Pjv.* or any other work, appears to be an innovation.

3. *Description of the Madhyadesa*
4. *List of Countries where heretical beliefs exist*

Here we find that the *Rjv.* has copied from the *Pjv.* word to word.²⁹ This account of the Madhyadesa, the hub of which is the Bodhimaṇḍala, and the description of the location of thirty-five countries and towns in respect of the

21. බුන්සරණ, වැලිවිටියේ සෝරණ සංස්. 1953, (බුන්.) 42, 61 පිටු.

22. ධම්ප්‍රදීපිකාව, බද්දේගම විමලවංශ සංස්. 1958 (ධප්‍ර.) 68 පි.

23. *HIPC.* p. 78.

24. Colombo Museum, AP-9.

25. *ibid.* AF-5.

26. *ibid.* L-8.

27. පුජාකි. 107 පි.

28. රාජාභ. 2 පි.

29. පුජාකි. 107 පිටුවේ 28 පෙළේ සිට 109 පිටුවේ 4 පෙළ තෙක්.

Bodhimaṇḍala are erroneous, if present Buddhagaya is taken as the Bodhimaṇḍala. This is true of the *Pjv.* account too. For instance Tāmbraparṇi is said to be in the northern direction of the Bodhimaṇḍala. Dr. S. Paranavitana has pointed out that not only Buddhagaya, but many other places, within and without the Jambudvīpa have been considered as Bodhimaṇḍalas.³⁰ It is therefore not clear whether the author of the *Pjv.* and the author of the *Rjv.*, who copied the *Pjv.*, have considered Buddhagaya alone as the Bodhimaṇḍala, or whether they had two or more places in view. This is a question that deserves careful study.

The account of the Bodhimaṇḍala in the *Pjv.* ends with a concluding paragraph which reads thus: “මේ පන්තිස් මහනුවර මධ්‍යමණ්ඩලයට ඇතුළත් මය. මේ මහනුවර නම් වක්‍රවතීති රජුන් හා මහධන සිටුවරුන් හා මහෙශාඛ්‍ය දෙවියන් හා අසුමහ සවුචන් හා පසේ බුදුන් හා ලොචුතුරා බුදුන් හා මෙකී උන්තමයන්ගේ ම උන්පත්ති ස්ථානයක”.³¹ The *Rjv.* has made alterations in certain words to suit its style: “මේ පන්තිස් නුවරට අඩුතනුව ලොචුතුරා බුදුන් හා පසේ බුදුන් හා අසුමහ සවුචන් හා වක්‍රවතීති රජුරුවන් හා මහෙශාඛ්‍ය දෙවියන් හා ධනසිටුවරුන් හා උපදිනා ස්ථානය යි දැනගත යුතුයි”.³² This passage would also indicate to what extent the author of the *Rjv.* has copied from the *Pjv.*

Next comes the list of countries where heretical beliefs (පරසමය දෙශ) exist. The *Rjv.* follows the same order as the *Pjv.*, but certain countries have been omitted, while the names of the following nine countries have been added: ප්‍රතිකාල් දෙසය, සපාඤ්ඤය, අල්මඤ්ඤය, තලියානය, වෙල්වක්කය, රෝමේ, නොරමාන, කොපමාන, ඔරමාන.³³ These European countries seem to have come into the attention of the Sinhalese writers from about the fifteenth century. The list of countries ends in the two works as follows:

Pjv.: “.....යනාදි මෙකී දෙශ මධ්‍යමණ්ඩලයෙන් පිටත් වූ ප්‍රත්‍යන්ත දෙශ නම්. මේ දෙශවල බ්‍රිහදිහු නුපදනාහු”.³⁴

Rjv.: “මේ පරසමයන් දෙශවල් බුදුන්ගේ සමයට පිට නුවරවල් දැනගත යුතුයි”.³⁵

5. Account of the Kalpas and the Genealogy of the Mahāsammata Kings

With regard to these accounts, too, we find that the *Rjv.* has been based on the *Pjv.* However, at the beginning, the *Rjv.* contains a short introduction dealing with the Mahābhadrā Kalpa and the Antah Kalpa. This is not found in the *Pjv.* *Rjv.* has copied the *Pjv.* for the rest of the account almost in toto except for a few changes and omissions here and there. The following extracts would illustrate:

Pjv.: “එසමයෙහි සිටුවාවෝ සිංහයන් රජ කළහ. පක්‍ෂිහු භංසයන් රජ කළහ. දියෙහි මස්සු ආනන්ද නම් මත්ස්‍යයා රජ කළහ. යටත් වශයෙන් කුරුකුහුඹුවෝ දක්වා තමන් තමන්ට රජුන් ඇති කළහ. එහි විභාග එ එ ජාතකසූත්‍රාදි පූර්වකථාවලින් බලාගත යුතු”.³⁶

30. *Ceylon and Malaysia*, S. Paranavitana, 1966, pp. 150, 172, 173 etc.

31. පූජාකී. 108 පි.

32. රාජාභ. 3 පි.

33. රාජාභ. 3 පි.

34. පූජාකී. 109 පි.

35. රාජාභ. 3 පි.

36. පූජාකී. 110 පි.

Rjv.: “එ අවදියට සිවුසාවෝ සිංහයා රජකමට ගත්තාහ. පක්ෂිජාතීහු හංසයා රජකමට ගත්තාහ. මුදේ මෂටකයෝ ආනන්ද මත්ස්‍යයා රජ කළාහ”.³⁷

The only noteworthy difference between the *Pjv.* and the *Rjv.* with regard to this account appears to be the purpose for which the Mahāsammata genealogy has been given. The *Pjv.* gives in detail this genealogy with a view to describing the ancestry of King Suddhodana, the father of the Buddha-to-be. On the other hand *Rjv.* author's intention has been to describe the ancestry of the Kings of Ceylon.³⁸ There are certain differences in the *Rjv.* with regard to certain names of kings, while some names have been completely left out. These differences do not prevent us from concluding that the author of the *Rjv.* had depended on the *Pjv.*

6. *From Vijaya to Abhaya*

7. *From Paṇḍukābhaya to Anulā* (—42 B.C.).

Now we come to the history of the Island beginning from Vijaya. The *Pjv.*, favourite source of the author of the *Rjv.* contained a complete history in its last two chapters, i.e. ch. 33 and 34, and he obviously turned towards this section. However, comparing with the *Pjv.* we find deviations and discrepancies. Also we find that popular anecdotes have found their way. Apart from the *Pjv.* books like *Sūpavamsa*, *Saddharmāṅkārā* and *Rājaraṭnākara* appear to have been consulted. Thus, it can be said that the author of the *Rjv.* has acted with some independence, at least in writing this part of the book. Some of the instances where he has deviated from the *Pjv.* are discussed below:

The Story of Vijaya and Kuveṇi

This popular anecdote is found mentioned in many a historical and semi-historical work. The *Dīpavamsa* (*Dv.*) story is brief, and makes no mention of Kuveṇi. The *Mahāvamsa* (*Mv.*) and the *Vamsathappakāsini* (*Vp.*) give the story in detail. The *Pjv.* story is brief, but it agrees with the *Mv.* The *Rjv.* contains details that are not found in any of these other histories. About the middle of the *Rjv.* account, i.e. after mentioning that Vijaya and party landed in the Island, the *Rjv.* gives the legend of the three visits of the Buddha. This pattern is followed in the *Rājaraṭnākara* too. Geiger has pointed out this similarity in the pattern. He further believes that the similarity may be either due to the fact that the *Rjv.* account has been based on the *Rājaraṭnākara*, or that both works have followed yet another unknown work or traditional account.³⁹ We wish to point out that although there is similarity in the pattern, there is not much parallelism in the two accounts. The *Rjv.* contains other details not found in the *Rājaraṭnākara* or in any other work. The following analysis would illustrate:

- (i) The *Rjv.* mentions that after listening to the fortune-tellers, the Vaṅga king protected his daughter in a seven-storeyed mansion. Other historical works contain no such reference. According to the

37. රජතු. 4 ඩ.

38. රජතු. “මේ මූලාකාරයට ආ රජවර්ණ”.

39. *Dv. and Mv.G.* p. 96.

*Sihabā Asna*⁴⁰ and *Siyabasmaldama*,⁴¹ she had been protected in a house on a single pillar (එක්චලිමය). It may be mentioned that the *Mv.* refers to an Ektāmgeya not in the Sinhabāhu story but in the story of Unmādacitrā.⁴²

- (ii) Only the *Rjv.* gives the exact constellation under which Vijaya was born. (මුව සිරිසේ නැකතින් ගුරුගේ හෝරාවෙන් ගුරු දින මීන රාසියෙන්) It could be pointed out that this method of giving dates is a characteristic of *Kadāim* and *Vitti pot*.
- (iii) According to the *Rjv.* Vijaya's party departed from India on the Seventh day after the Parinibbāna of the Buddha. *Mv.*,⁴³ *Bodhivamsa*,⁴⁴ *Rājaratnākara*,⁴⁵ and *Siyabasmaldama*⁴⁶ all mention that Vijaya landed in Ceylon on the day of the Parinibbāna. There is no mention of this date in *Pjv.*, *Kuveni Asna*, and *Siyabasmaldama*.
- (iv) The *Rjv.* does not mention the port from which the vessel carrying Vijaya and party departed. According to its account, the vessel had turned towards Ruhūṇa owing to the ill-luck of the residents of Ruhūṇa, the Samantakūṭa peak was visible to the vessel, and they landed at the port of Tammānā. This account is not found in any other work, but the *Vijayarāja Kathāva*⁴⁷ which, however makes no mention of Ruhūṇa.

According to the Portuguese historian, Diogo do Couto, "he came to land on the inner side in a port that is called Preature, which lies between Triqualimale and the point of Jafnapatao".⁴⁸ These references lead to the inference that at least when the *Rjv.* and the Portuguese History were written, there had been a tradition that Vijaya landed in the Eastern Coast of Ceylon.

- (v) Then comes the account of the visits of the Buddha. This account in the *Rjv.* begins with a statement that prior to the enlightenment, there was a battle of Rāvaṇa in Sri Lanka when the country had been left for the Yakkhas, and thus passed a period of one thousand eight hundred and forty-six years. No other history gives this information about the date. However, it could be pointed out that *Kadāim* and *Vitti pot* contain legends about Ravaṇa.

Even with regard to the dates of the visits of the Buddha, there are divergences in the *Mv.*, *Pjv.* and *Rjv.*

First Visit

Mv. and *Pjv.*: In the ninth month after enlightenment on the full-moon day of Durutu.⁴⁹

40. කුවේණි, සිහබා සහ දම්දෙණි අස්න, කිරිඇල්ලේ ඥාණවිමල සංස්. 1960, (කුසිද.), 15 පි.

41. සියබස්මල්දම, ඔලබොඩුවේ රත්නපාල සංස්. 1953 (සියබස්.) 64 පද්‍යය.

42. *Mv.* IX.4.

43. *Mv.* VI.47

44. සිංහල බෝධිචංඝය, වේරගොඩ අමරමෝලි සංස්. 1951 (සිබෝව.) 161 පි.

45. රාජරත්නාකරය, පී. එන්. කියේරා සංස්. 1929 (රාජරත්.) 2 පි.

46. සියබස්. 212 පද්‍යය.

47. Colombo Museum K-7.

48. *JCBRAS*, Vol. XX No. 60, 1908, p. 63.

49. *Mv.* 1.19; පුජාසූ. 56 පි.

Rjv.: In the ninth month, on Thursday, in the asterism of Pusé, the full-moon day of Durutu.⁵⁰

Second Visit

Mv.: In the fifth year, on the Uposatha day of the dark half of the month of Citta, in the early morning.⁵¹

Pjv.: In the fifth year, on the fifteenth day in the dark half of the month of Bak.⁵²

Rjv.: In the seventh year, on the full-moon day of Vesak.⁵³

Third Visit

Mv.: In the eighth year, on the second day of Vesak.⁵⁴

Pjv.: In the eighth year.⁵⁵

Rjv.: When nine years have been completed after enlightenment, on the full-moon day of Āsala in the asterism of Utrasala.⁵⁶

On the second visit according to the *Pjv.* the Buddha had come to Mañi-nāga Dīpa, but according to the *Rjv.* he came to Kālaṇipura and settled the Nāga battle. Further according to the *Rjv.* on this visit, the Buddha had remained for three days in Kālaṇiya, and preached to the Nāgas. According to the other sources, the Buddha had come to Kālaṇiya at the invitation of the Nāga King, Mañiakkika, on the third visit. *Mv.* and *Dv.* mention that the Buddha went to Dīghavāpi, and also to eighteen places at Anurādhapura on the third visit. *Mv.*, *Vp.* and *Pjv.* record that he also went to the Samantakūṭa and placed the impression of his foot there on this occasion. This memorable incident finds no mention in the *Dv.* as well as the *Rjv.* On the third visit, according to the *Rjv.*, the Buddha visited only eighteen places.

(vi) All sources including the *Rjv.* mention that on the first visit, the Buddha had sent the Yakkhas who were here to Yagiri Dīpa. *Rjv.* further adds that the Yakkhas who were left behind hiding in the jungle of Tammānā ultimately settled down in Laggala and Loggala. *Mv.* and the *Kuveni Asna* record that Vijaya resided in Tambapaṇṇi.⁵⁷ Tammānā, according to the Sinhala *Bodhivaṃsa* was the name of the lake in which Vijaya's seven hundred followers have been hiding.⁵⁸ Sirisavatthu and Lankāpura have been mentioned in *Mv.* and *Vp.* as towns of the Yakkhas.⁵⁹ Laggala and Loggala of the *Rjv.* can be considered respectively as synonyms of the two places mentioned in the last sentence. Towards the end of the *Rjv.* account, Sirivatpura is mentioned as the place to which the Yakkhas assembled for the wedding. The *Sihabā Asna* too mentions Laggala as one of the towns in which the Yakkha wedding took place.⁶⁰

50. රජතු. 13 ඊ.

51. *Mv.* 1.45, 46, 47.

52. පුජාසූ. 59 ඊ.

53. රජතු. 13 ඊ.

54. *Mv.* 1.71.

55. පුජාසූ. 60 ඊ.

56. රජතු. 13 ඊ.

57. *Mv.* VII.58; කුසිඳ, 3 ඊ.

58. සිංහවං. 161 ඊ.

59. *Mv.* VII.32.33; *VP.* p. 259.

60. කුසිඳ. 26 ඊ.

- (vii) *Rjv.* records that Kuveni had three breasts, the Rsīs having predicted that she would find a husband and then her middle breast would disappear. Accordingly, on her meeting Vijaya, the middle breast vanished. This anecdote is mentioned in the *Kuveni Asna* too.⁶¹
- (viii) It is recorded in the *Mv.* that prior to the Parinibbāna, the Buddha had entrusted the guardianship of Lankā to Sakra, and that Sakra in turn appointed Uppalavaṇṇa for this job.⁶² *Rjv.* says that both Sakka and Uppalavaṇṇa were entrusted with the guardianship by the Buddha.
- (ix) The *Mv.* and the *Kuveni Asna* record that Uppalavaṇṇa disappeared after giving his blessings to Vijaya and party while an attendant of Kuveni appeared in the guise of a bitch.⁶³ *Rjv.* says that Kuveni herself, knowing that a husband had come, appeared before Vijaya in the guise of a bitch having five colours, kissed the feet of the king, wagged the tail and went away. The *Vijayarāja Kathāva* too mentions that Kuveni took the guise of a five-hued bitch.⁶⁴
- (x) It is recorded in the *Mv.* that when Kuveni was banished by Vijaya, she went to Lankāpura with her two children, and that she was destroyed there.⁶⁵ According to the *Kuveni Asna* and the *Sihabā Asna*, Kuveni had taken the guise of a Leopard (දිව් දෙසක්) having a diamond tongue and came to kill Vijaya.⁶⁶ *Rjv.* does not speak of a leopard, but agrees with the other part of the story. *Kuveni Asna* mentions that this tongue was cut by Uppalavaṇṇa with the tips of his finger-nails. In *Sihabā Asna*, the Guardian deities take the place of Uppalavaṇṇa. The *Rjv.* account is exhaustive. It says: Sakra, Brahma, Mahesvara, Kihirāli Upulvan, Saman Boksāl, Kataragama, Kandakumāra, because Lankā had been entrusted to them, protected Vijaya, and breaking the diamond tongue, they transformed Kuveni into a stone. This last part of the story is mentioned only in the *Rjv.*

Sinhalese historical records compiled in later times contain more details than the Pali works or the *Pjv.* An examination of the records mentioned above would clearly show how this legend gradually grew. It can be pointed out that the *Rjv.* account is even later than that in the *Kuveni Asna*. As far as the Vijaya-Kuveni legend is concerned, the *Rjv.* account is closer to that of the *Vijayarāja Kathāva* than any other work.

The Story of Bhaddakaccānā

Here the *Rjv.* account is brief. The father of Bhaddakaccānā, according to the *Rjv.*, is Amitodana, but the *Mv.* and *Pjv.* mention him as Sākya Panḍu, son of Amitodana.⁶⁷ *Dv.* too mentions her as a grand-daughter of Amitodana.⁶⁸ According to *Rjv.* Bhaddakaccānā had six brothers, but the number given

61. කුසිඳ. 10 ඊ.

62. *Mv.* VII. 3-4.

63. *Mv.* VII.9; කුසිඳ. 2 ඊ.

64. Colombo Museum, 104 K-7.

65. *Mv.* VII.62.

66. කුසිඳ. 5, 27 ඊ.

67. *Mv.* VIII.18; පුජාසු. 65 ඊ.

68. *Dv.* X.16.

in *Mv.* is seven, six of whom came to Ceylon.⁶⁹ *Vp.* too agrees with *Mv.*⁷⁰ On the other hand, *Pjv.* mentions that she had ten brothers, all of whom accompanied her to Ceylon. However, in the account of the establishment of towns by her brothers in Lankā *Pjv.* too has given the names of six of them only.⁷¹ The names of these six brothers and the places where they resided as recorded in *Mv.*, *Pjv.* and *Rjv.* are also not identical.

The Curse of Kuveni that befell Paṇḍuvāsudeva

About the time of Parākramabāhu VI of Kotte, there seems to have gained popularity a legend about a curse of Kuveni, on account of Vijaya's violating his vow not to discard her. This curse befell Paṇḍuvāsudeva, second king of Ceylon. Details of this anecdote are found in works like *Kuveni Asna*, *Sihabā Asna*, *Kohombā Yakkama*⁷² and *Malerāja Kathāva*.⁷³

The *Rjv.* account is very brief, and cannot be properly comprehended without a prior knowledge of the full legend. It can be pointed out that the *Rjv.* account is not as old as that in the *Kuveni Asna* and that it has similarities with the later works. This story must have been popular at the time the *Rjv.* was compiled.

Other deviations

The *Rjv.* has listed two kings under the name of Paṇḍukābhaya, father and son who reigned 30 and 70 years respectively. After the second Paṇḍukābhaya, his son Gaṇatissa reigned for 40 years. The *Bodhivaṃsa*,⁷⁴ and the *Rājaratnākara*⁷⁵ too include this name in the list of kings. *Pjv.* makes no mention of him. *Mv.* account is that at the time when Paṇḍukābhaya was fighting with his uncles to win the throne, after Abhaya, a brother of this king by the name of Tissa had been appointed as regent.⁷⁶ It can be concluded that Gaṇatissa mentioned in the *Rjv.* and the other two works is no other than Tissa, the regent referred to in the *Mv.*

Names of persons and places are sometimes given differently from the *Mv.* and the *Pjv.* in the *Rjv.* One such example is provided by the names Muṭasiva (*Mv.*), Muṭasīva⁷⁷ (*Pjv.*), Moṭātissa (*Rjv.*) used for the same king.

The history from Devānampiyatissa to Duṭugāmuṇu is related in detail, and the author of *Rjv.* seems to have derived material not from one book, but from varied sources like the *Saddharmāṅkārā* and the *Stūpavaṃsa*. This becomes quite evident when one examines the anecdotes about the Warriors of Duṭugāmuṇu and the account of Duṭugāmuṇu's march from Māgama to Anurādhapura.⁷⁸

69. *Mv.* IX.6.

70. *Vp.* p. 275.

71. පුජාපු. 65 පි.

72. කොහොඹා යක්කම හෙවත් චීජේරාජ කථාව. Printed, 1926. See also කොහොඹ කන්කාටිය, ed. C. E. Godakumbura. This contains a collection of similar ballads.

73. මලේරාජ කථාව, Printed, 1922.

74. පිබෝව. 162 පි.

75. රාජරත්. 4 පි.

76. *Mv.* X.51.

77. Some Mss. of the *Pjv.* record this name as Moṭasīva. see පුජාපු. 82 පි.

78. See පිංහල ධූපවංසය, වටද්දර ධර්මානන්ද සංස්. 1950, 147 පිටුවේ සිට; සධර්මාලංකාරය, ශ්‍රී ඤාණේශ්වර සංස්. 1914, 468 පිටුවේ සිට.

There is an anecdote in the *Rjv.* about a three year famine, which occurred during the reign of Coranāga as a result of his sins in destroying viharas. This coincided with a famine in India for twelve years called Bāminiyage Sāya which occurred as a result of the innocent husband of a Brahmin woman being put to death by a king called Miliñdu of Sāgala. The famine referred to in Ceylon seems to be a misinterpretation of the account of a famine called Bāmiṇiṭiyā in the *Mv.* and the *Pjv.*, which occurred in the reign of Vaṭṭagāmiṇi Abhaya.⁷⁹

The statement in the *Rjv.* that the Saka era originated (in India) at the time of Coranāga in Ceylon is not mentioned in other works.

8. *From Makalantissa (41-19 B.C.) to Parākramabāhu II (1236-1270 A.C.)*

It is from the reign of Makalantissa that the *Rjv.* has copied the *Pjv.* word to word. Beginning with the sentence, “පෙර කී සුයච්චංශයෙන් ආ කුඩානිස්ස රජුගේ පුත් මකලන්තිස්ස රජ සමඟන් මැරූ බිසව මරා දෙවිසි අවුරුද්දක් රාජ්‍ය කළේය” Up to the appointment of Vijayabāhu as king, the two texts are identical.⁸⁰ Except for certain additions and omissions, here and there, the difference in the text in these two works is more or less the difference that may be expected in two Mss. of the same text. However, the names of certain kings are not recorded identically in the two works. For example Vaknāhātis of the *Pjv.* is given in the *Rjv.* as Vaknāsi Nambaparaja.

It has been pointed out that the account of eight rulers after Aḍagāmuṇu has been omitted in the *Rjv.* while in the *Pjv.* there is no such gap. Perhaps the old Ms. the *Rjv.* author had made use of did not contain this section or perhaps he had failed to incorporate this section into his work.⁸¹

The noteworthy disagreements that exist between the two texts are discussed below:

Gajabāhu's invasion of the Cola country

A characteristic of the local historians of the past has been to include legends that had gained popularity, at the time of the compilation of such histories. The cult of Pattini associated with Gajabāhu seemed to have acquired popularity during later times. This legend, not mentioned in *Dv.*, *Mv.* etc. is included in some of the Sinhalese historical writings like the *Pjv.*, *Rājaratnākaraya*, *Pārakumbā Sirita* and *Rjv.*

The *Pjv.* and the *Rājaratnākaraya* give this account briefly.⁸² *Pārakumbā Sirita* gives more details in three stanzas.⁸³ The *Rjv.* account is perhaps the longest and most comprehensive.⁸⁴ It is said that warrior Nīlā too accompanied the king. Not only did they bring back the 12,000 men taken from Ceylon, but they also brought back an equal number from the Cola country. Further, they brought with them, the Ruvan Salaṃba (Golden Anklet) of Pattini, the insignia of the four deities of the four Devālas, in addition to the

79. *Mv.* XXXIII.37; පුජාසූ. 90 පි.

80. පුජාසූ. 91 පිට 132 පිට තෙක්; රාජාභ. 33 පිට 46 පිට තෙක්.

81. It should be noted that Mss. of the *Vannirājāvaliya* leave no gap here.

82. පුජාසූ. 98 පි; රාජරත්. 18 පි.

83. පැරකුම්බා සිරිත, ඩී. පී. අභයගුණරත්න සංස්. 1931, (පැ. පි.) 12—14 පද්‍ය.

84. රාජාභ. 34, 35 පි.

Bowl Relic which had been taken to India during the reign of Vaḷagambā. The 12,000 prisoners brought from the Cola country were settled in Alutkūru Korale.

Definition of the Mahāvamsa and the Cūlavamsa

After the above deviation, we find the *Rjv.* copying the *Pjv.* word to word till we come to the end of the reign of Mahasen. *Pjv.* and *Rjv.* both consider rulers from Vijaya to Mahasen as belonging to the Mahāvamsa. The following sentence occurs in both works: “විජය රජු පටන් මේ මහසෙන් රජු දක්වා මහාවංසයෙහි ඔටුනු පැලඳි රජදරුවෝ නෙසැට දෙනෙක් වුහයි දනගන යුතුයි”.⁸⁵ Some explanation is needed about the number of kings, namely 63, given in *Pjv.* and *Rjv.* as belonging to the Mahāvamsa. The *Rjv.* list has an additional king, Ganatissa, while the names of certain other kings have been left out, perhaps due to negligence. Hence, the number of kings is less than 63 in *Rjv.* *Pjv.* has twice mentioned that the number of rulers crowned in Ceylon was 63. But, *Pjv.* gives the names of not 63, but 67 rulers. This list includes the names of Mānāraja, Yaṭāla Tissa, Goḷu Abā, and Kāvan Tissa who ruled from Ruhuna. When the names of these four kings are removed from the total list we get 63. What the author of the *Pjv.* meant by “rulers crowned in the Mahāvamsa” appears to be the rulers in the Anurādhapura region. The author of the *Rjv.* has merely copied the *Pjv.* without paying attention to the subject matter.

Rjv. gives additional explanations as to why the rulers of Ceylon were divided into Mahāvamsa and Cūlavamsa.

The Tooth-Relic

This account in *Rjv.* is centred on the bringing of the Tooth-Relic from Kālinga to Ceylon. In this account, while following the *Pjv.*, *Rjv.* gives more details. *Pjv.* only mentions that the Tooth-Relic was brought but the *Rjv.* goes on to say that it was the right Tooth (දකුණු දළදාවන්සේ). Pali *Dāthāvamsa* and Sinhala *Daḷadā Sirita* mention that it was the left Tooth. As far as I am aware, no other record agrees with the *Rjv.* here.⁸⁶

Pjv. was a work written in the reign of Parākramabāhu II. Hence it ends with a detailed account of this king. *Rjv.* has obviously condensed this account.

9. From Vijayabāhu IV (1270-1272 A.C.) to end of Māyādunne (1521-1581 A.C.)

In keeping with the method of writing adopted by the author of *Rjv.*, as discussed above, we should expect him to depend on another work, when he found the *Pjv.* no longer useful. The *Alakesvara Yuddhaya* (*Aly.*) was his choice.

It is not out of place to give a brief introduction of *Aly.*, for this is a work not well known among scholars. We pointed out earlier that the Ms. in the British Museum Or. 4971 (73), the text of which is same as the other *Aly.* Mss.

85. පුරාණ. 97. 8; රජාව. 37 8.

86. According to *Laḷāṭa Dhātuvamsa* and *Jinakālamāli*, the right tooth was enshrined in Somāvati Thūpa. See *Jinakālamāli*, P.T.S. series No. 36. Translation N. A. Jayawickrama, p. 74.

has been erroneously named as *Rājāvaliya* by D. M. de Z. Wickremasinghe⁸⁷ Sir D. B. Jayatilaka, too, in quoting a passage from this Ms. has considered it to be a *Rjv.*⁸⁸ Two Ola Mss. of this book in the Colombo Museum Library bear the name clearly.⁸⁹ Also the text has been published in parts in a Sinhala journal called *Nānādarsaya*.⁹⁰ I have collated all these documents and edited the *Aly.*, in the introduction I have shown that this anonymous work, perhaps written by a Christian, should belong to the later half of the *Sītāvaka* Period.⁹¹

Aly. begins with an account of how a king of Ceylon (not named) was captured and deported to China. The author of *Rjv.* seems to have thought that this king was Vijayabāhu IV, son of Parākramabāhu II. In other words, he has joined the beginning of the *Aly.* to the end of the contracted *Pjv.* account with a short paragraph in between to serve as a link. This resulted in the omission of a historical period of about one hundred years by the author of *Rjv.* It seems likely that he has confused the invasion of Candrabhānu, the Jāvaka king, with that of a Chinese king. Although the name of the Chinese king is not recorded in the *Aly.* the *Rjv.* gives his name as Dos raja of Mahā China ("මහා චීනේ දොස් රජ").⁹² It might even be suggested that Dos in the *Rjv.* was a confused derivation of the word from Jāvaka itself.

It is not out of place to mention here that the Portuguese historian Diogo do Couto too does not mention the name of the Chinese king. His account shows a similar gap of about 100 years. It is likely that he used either the *Aly.* or the *Rjv.* as his source.

The following discussion would show the similarities and dissimilarities between *Aly.* and *Rjv.* Let us compare the first few sentences of *Aly.* with the corresponding section in *Rjv.*

Aly.: "මේ ශ්‍රී ලංකාවේ රජතෙම මහාවිනෙන් ඇවිත් ප්‍රයෝගයකින් අල්වාගෙන ගියායින් පසු ලංකාවේ රජපුරුවන් නැති හෙයින් අලකෙඹර නම් මන්ත්‍රීඹර තෙම රයිගම් නුවර විසුහ. උඩරට රජකමට පැමිණි භුවනෙකබාහු රජතෙම ගම්පල නුවර විසුහ. යාපාපටුන රජකම කරන ආයඹ්වක්‍රවතීති රජහු යාපාපටුන විසුහ. මෙම රජුන් අතුරෙන් ආයඹ්වක්‍රවතීතිහු වතුරඩගණි සේනාබලයෙන් හා අජඹ්ලයෙන් අධික හෙයින් ලංකාවේ නවතොටමුණයෙන් සෑම රටවලින් අවුරුදු පතා නොයෙක් අය පඩුරු ගෙන්වා වාසය කරන කල්හි එක් දවසක් අලකෙඹර නම් මහා මන්ත්‍රීඹර තෙම නමාගේ සේනාවාහන දක....."⁹³

Rjv.: "...පසුව ලංකාවේ රජුන් නැති හෙයින් අලකෙඹර මන්ත්‍රියා රයිගම් නුවර විසුවාහ. පරාක්‍රමබාහු රජ බැනා ගම්පල නුවර උන්නාහ. යාපාපටුනෙහි ආයඹ් වක්‍රවතීති රජ උන්නාහ. මේ රජුන් අතුරෙන් ආයඹ්වක්‍රවතීති රජුගේ සේනාව බලයෙන් උඩරටින් ද පාතරටින් ද නවතොටමුණෙන් ද අයබදු ගෙන්වන සඳ එක් දවසක් අලකෙඹරයා නමාගේ සේනාව දක බලා....."⁹⁴

87. *Catalogue of the Sinhalese Manuscripts in the British Museum*, D. M. de Z. Wickremasinghe, 1900, No. 72.
 88. සිංහල සාහිත්‍ය ලිපි, ඩී. බී. ජයතිලක, 2 වන මුද්‍රණය, 1956, 111 පි.
 89. Colombo Museum, AP-4; AF-15.
 90. දන්තදර්ශය, 10 කාණ්ඩය, 1909—1911.
 91. අලකෙඹර යුධය, ඒ. ඩී. සුරවීර සංස්. 1965 (අලසු.) ප්‍රස්ථාවනා.
 92. රාජාග. 47 පි.
 93. අලසු. 19 පි.
 94. රාජාග. 47 පි.

These two passages would make it clear that the difference between the two works is not any more than the difference one could expect between two Mss. of the same work. (This statement was true of *Pjv.* and *Rjv.* with regard to the earlier portion of our work).

With regard to the lineage of Parākramabāhu VI (1412-1467 A.C.) of Kotte, the accounts of *Aly.* and *Rjv.* differ. *Aly.* account runs thus: “ශ්‍රී බ්‍රහ්මවංශයෙන් එක්දහස් නවසියපනස් අට වනු වෙසහ පුර සතවක් ලත් බ්‍රහස්පතින්ද පුස් නැකතින් ශ්‍රී වෛවස්ඨින මනු සංඛ්‍යාත මහාසමූහ පරම්පරානුයාන සුඛ සුය් වංශොත්භූත සුමිත්‍ර රාජපුත්‍ර පවිත්‍ර ගෝත්‍රාභිජාත නවරතාධිපති ශ්‍රීමත්තමෙන ගෝත්‍ර සංජාත වූ සවුඵඵ විජයබාහු රජහට පුත්‍ර වූ පරාක්‍රමබාහු මහරජහට මුණුබුරු වූ ජයමහලේන සොමීන් නමැති කලපවාක්‍ෂය වැලැන්දවූ සිංහලතාවක් වැනි වූ සුනෙත්‍ර නම් දෙවිත්ගේ ගඹ නමැති මෙස මුඛයෙන් නිකුත් වූ වන්දුමණ්ඩලයක් වැනි වූ රුකුලේ පරාක්‍රමබාහු මහරජනෙම විදගම මහාසොමීන්ගේ උපසංචයෙන් ශ්‍රී ලංකාවට පැමිණ...”⁹⁵ The contents of a verse in the *Pārakumbā Sirita* are much the same.⁹⁶ *Rjv.* too begins with the sentence, “ශ්‍රී බ්‍රහ්ම වංශයෙන් එක්දහස් නවසිය පනස් අටක් වූ වෙසහපුර සතවක ලත් බ්‍රහස්පතින්ද පුස් නැකතින්.....”⁹⁷ but it speaks of the constellation under which Vijayabāhu was deported to China. According to *Aly.*, this was the constellation under which Parākramabāhu VI became king. According to *Rjv.* Parākramabāhu VI was the son of Vijayabāhu, who had been taken to China, and of Sunetrā Devi, while according to Diogo do Couto Parākramabāhu VI was a son of Dambadine Pandar, who was deported to China.⁹⁸ It is obvious that the author of the *Rjv.* and do Couto make this mistake, for they were unaware of the gap of time between Parākramabāhu II and Parākramabāhu VI.

Rjv. has recorded that after the deportation of Vijayabāhu to China, his queen Sunetrā Devi along with her son went to the Vidāgama Vihāra, while according to do Couto, the widowed daughter of the king who had been taken to China, with her two children disappeared into the jungles.⁹⁹ Although *Rjv.* describes how Sunetrā Devi and her son, on the instructions of the Vidāgama Thero, were hidden in the house of Rukule Polwatte Acāriyā, neither *Aly.* nor any other work makes any mention to this effect. But it is important to note that *Aly.* and Valentyn both speak of Parākramabāhu VI as Rukule Parākramabāhu Maharaja.¹⁰⁰ Whether Rukule has the same meaning as Rivi Kula (Solar race) as E. W. Perera has pointed out,¹⁰¹ or whether it is a place name deserves investigation. Fr. S. G. Perera has pointed out that the place called Ruquelipoluata mentioned by Fr. F. de Queyroz is the village of Polwatte in Galboda Korale.¹⁰²

Rjv. and do Couto both mention that Parākramabāhu VI became king at the age of sixteen years, while the latter also records that Parākramabāhu’s mother was not alive when he came to the throne.¹⁰³ *Rjv.* makes no mention

95. අලපු. 21 ඩ.

96. පැ. ඩ. 27 පදය.

97. රාජාඉ. 48 ඩ.

98. *JCBRAS.* Vol. XX, No. 60, 1908, pp. 66-68.

99. *ibid.* p. 67.

100. අලපු. 21 ඩ.; *Ceylon*, Valentyn, p. 36.

101. *JCBRAS.* Vol. XXII, No. 63, 1910, p. 38.

102. *The Temporal and Spiritual Conquest of Ceylon*, Fernao de Queyroz, Tr. by S. G. Perera, 1930 (Queyroz) p. 23.2.

103. *JCBRAS.* Vol. XX, No. 60, 1908, p. 68.

of this. One fact common to all historians, i.e. *Aly.*, *Rjv.* do Couto and Valentyn is that Vidāgama Thero had been helpful to Parākramabāhu VI in his earlier days.

Aly. and *Rjv.* state that after becoming king, Parākramabāhu got down a princess from Kiravālla to be his chief queen. His royal consort was a daughter of the king of Kandy according to do Couto.¹⁰⁴

With regard to the children of Parākramabāhu, *Aly.* says that he brought up Senānāyaka Sapu Kumāra and Ambulugala Kudā Kumāra and that he had a daughter called Ulakudaya Devi whose name was Lokanāthā (ලොකනාඨා නම් වූ උලකුදාය දේවී)¹⁰⁵ The latest findings of Dr. S. Paranavitana agree with this.¹⁰⁶ According to do Couto also, he had one daughter (not named) but no sons.¹⁰⁷ The *Rjv.* however mentions only two adopted sons.

The battle between Parākramabāhu VI and Kannadi Kings described in the *Aly.* has been left out in the *Rjv.* The other wars of Parākramabāhu, as given in *Aly.* are as follows.¹⁰⁸ (a) Malavera Yuddhaya, (b) defeat of Jotiya Situ of Udarata, (c) subjugation of the eighteen Vannis and (d) Victory of Yāpāpatuna. The order in the *Rjv.* is thus: (a) Victory of Yāpāpatuna, (b) Malavera Yuddhaya, and (c) defeat of Jotiya Situ of Udarata. *Rjv.* makes no mention of the defeat of the eighteen Vannis.

Another instance where the *Rjv.* has deviated from the *Aly.* was the account about the successors of Parākramabāhu VI. *Aly.* says, when Parākramabāhu VI died, the ministers and the armies assembled and enthroned prince Jayavira, son of Ulakudaya Devi under the name of Parākramabāhu.¹⁰⁹ According to the *Rjv.* son of Ulakudaya Devi was enthroned by Parākramabāhu VI himself under the name of Vīra Parākramabāhu.

Now again we find the author of the *Rjv.* copying the *Aly.* word by word till we come to the arrival of the Portuguese. Even here, *Rjv.* gives the same passage as the *Aly.* which describes the hitherto unknown white people.¹¹⁰ The only difference is that in the *Aly.* there is no mention of the date of arrival of the Portuguese. *Rjv.* has added the words, “වම්යෙන් එකොදහස් පන්සිය විසි දෙනකු” to the *Aly.* sentence. It must be pointed out that these words are not found even in some of the *Rjv.* Mss. Hence, this date could even be a later interpolation. The *Rjv.* date, 1522 A.D. is certainly incorrect, for, do Couto and Queyroz both agree, that the Portuguese arrived in 1505 A.D.¹¹¹

The phrase, “අපගේ සමාජී වූ රෝසුස් ක්‍රියාකාරී වම්යෙන්” in the *Rjv.* could be explained in this manner. We find that it has been customary for the author of the *Rjv.* to give the dates in the Buddha era or the Saka era, but here is the unusual reference to the Christian era. Scholars have attempted to

104. *ibid.* p. 68.

105. අලු. 22 පි.

106. See S. Paranavitana's article, “Princess Ulakudaya's Wedding” in *University of Ceylon Review*, Vol. XXI No. 2, October 1963.

107. *JCBRAS.* Vol. XX No. 60, 1908, p. 68.

108. අලු. 22, 23 පි.

109. අලු. 24 පි.

110. එම 28 පි.

111. *JCBRAS.* Vol. XX No. 60, 1908, p. 71; Queyroz p. 176.

account for the difference by suggesting that the first half of the *Rjv.* was written by a Buddhist author, while the later portion was compiled by a Christian. The account of Bhuwanekabāhu shows that even this section was definitely written by a Buddhist.¹¹² We would wish to point out that the above phrase has come into the *Rjv.* text for the simple reason that it was there in the *Aly.*, the source of the *Rjv.* (I have discussed elsewhere the possibility of the author of *Aly.* being a Christian.¹¹³). There can be another hypothesis. The (general) present practice of using the Christian era may have prevailed even during the period the *Rjv.* was compiled.

Again, the *Rjv.* text seems identical with the *Aly.* till we come to the period of Vijayabāhu. *Aly.* records that Mānikkadavara Sri Rājasimha and Vijayabāhu kept the same consort, and that they had four sons, in the following order: Maharaigambandāra, Bhuwanekabāhu, Pararājasimha and Māyādunne.¹¹⁴ According to *Rjv.* they had only three sons namely, Bhuwanekabāhu, Raigambandāra and Māyādunne.

The accounts of the "Vijayabā Kollaya" in *Aly.* and *Rjv.* are identical. However, there are a few variations with regard to details. According to the *Rjv.* a stranger called Salamān had been employed in killing Vijayabāhu by the sons. In *Aly.* Mss. this name occurs as Salambayā (සලම්බයා) and Sālam-bayā (සලම්බයා). Valentyn gives this name as Seelam.¹¹⁵ On the other hand, do Couto and Queyroz both mention that Vijayabāhu was killed by the three sons themselves.¹¹⁶

The minister of Māyādunne by the name of Ārya, mentioned in both *Aly.* and *Rjv.* has been omitted by do Couto and Queyroz.

According to the *Rjv.* Bhuwanekabāhu married a queen from the Gampola Clan. The *Aly.* is silent about this, but according to do Couto, she was a great-grand-daughter of king Javira Pracura Mabago.¹¹⁷

Up to the killing of Vijayabāhu (1521 A.C.) and the partition of Koṭṭe the *Rjv.* has copied the *Aly.* almost word to word, the only noteworthy deviations being those discussed above. From here we find that the *Rjv.* tries to condense the details in *Aly.* For instance the *Aly.* gives in detail the accounts of the daughters of Bhuwanekabāhu, of his nephews Vidiyebandāra and Tammitabandāra, of his grandson Dharmapāla and also of the Sitāvaka Kingdom.

The accounts of sending a golden image of Dharmapāla to Portugal and securing a pledge that this prince would be enthroned, are identical in *Aly.* and *Rjv.*

The wars between Bhuwanekabāhu and Māyādunne have been described in detail in both works. At one stage, according to *Rjv.* Māyādunne was defeated and retired to Dāraniyagala. This incident is not mentioned in *Aly.* After the death of Bhuwanekabāhu, in describing the wars of Dharmapāla and the Portuguese with Māyādunne, the *Rjv.* once again speaks of Māyādunne retiring to Dāraniyagala. Here again the *Rjv.* account is identical with that of *Aly.*

112. රජවල. 57 ං.

113. See අලස. ප්‍රජ්ජාවනා.

114. අලස. 29 ං.

115. *Ceylon*, Valentyn p. 76.

116. *JCBRAS.* Vol. XX No. 60, 1908, p. 72; Queyroz p. 203.

117. *ibid.* p. 73.

While mentioning the death of Bhuwanekabāhu *Rjv.* goes on to describe in detail his "foolish deeds", "ප්‍රතිකානුන් එක්ක අත්වැල් බැඳ අනුවණකම් කළ භවනෙකබාහු රජ නමා ඇති කළ කුමාරයින් ප්‍රතිකාල් රජුට භාරකර දී අනුවණකම් කළ කමින් එරජුට ප්‍රතිකානෝ හදි කළයි මතු සිරිලක උපදිනා සතහට අනාදරවල් ඒ භවනෙකබාහු රජ විසින් පැමිණුණයි දනගත යුතුයි. මතු බ්‍රිඩ්ගාසනයට අනාදරවල් එරජ නිසා පැමිණුණයි දනගත යුතුයි"¹¹⁸ This paragraph reviling Bhuwanekabāhu of becoming a benefactor of Christianity is not found in *Aly.*

From the death of Bhuwanekabāhu, (1551 A.C.) the author of *Rjv.* again blindly copies the *Aly.* but for the arrangement of certain details, and additions and omissions of certain paragraphs. Thus the *Rjv.* copies the text of the *Aly.* till we come to the acquisition of the Mātota Disāva to Sītāvaka. This account ends with an additional sentence "මායාදුන්නේ රජ හැත්තැවක් අවුරුදු රාජ්‍යය කර උකුන් වූවහ" not found in *Aly.*

The similarity between the two texts ends here. Wars between Rājasimha and the Portuguese, death of Rājasimha, wars between Sītāvaka armies and the Portuguese etc. are described briefly in *Aly.* and the book ends here.

This perhaps explains why some of the *Rjv.* Mss. end with the conclusion of the reign of Māyādunne. The Ms. in the library of Sri Vijayawar-dhanārāma, Mohottimulla is one such. The Ms. at the Yogiyāleṇa Temple at Sandalaṅkāva has the following statement towards the end of the reign of Māyādunne, when Rājasimha had come to pay his respects to his father after obtaining the honorific "Rājasimha", "මෙහි මහාසමමන පටන් රාජසිංහ රජුන් දක්වා මෙදැතුරෙහි පැවතු රාජනීති ධර්මනීති බලා දනගත යුතුයි. සිඨිරසු—සුභමසු—ආරෝග්‍යමසු—කල්‍යාණමසු—සුභසිඨිරසු—....." But the text is continued without a break, agreeing with other Mss. up to the accession of Vimaladharmasuriya II. Perhaps the Ms. which is said to have been written by Polvatte Vidāne, mentioned by Dr. C. E. Godakumbura is a similar one. However, as the texts of most of the *Rjv.* Mss. do not end here, it cannot be considered that the original *Rjv.* ended at this place. This really was the end of one section only, namely, the section which the author of the *Rjv.* copied from the *Aly.*

10. *From Rājasimha of Sītāvaka (1581-1592 A.C.) to Vimaladharmasuriya II (1687-1706 A.C.)*

We do not know of any work that the author of the *Rjv.* depended on, in compiling this section. Unlike the other sections, the contemporary history could have been written by the author himself. The history of the period of Rājasimha is described in detail while the remaining portion is brief.

One could justifiably hold that the original *Rjv.* Ms. extended up to the accession of Vimaladharmasuriya II, for it is from this point onward that no two Mss. have the same text. From here we find that different writers have continued the history with the bias towards their particular interests.*

118. රාජාල. 57 B.

* I am grateful to Mr. D. T. Devendra who read through this paper and offered many useful suggestions.