without demur, and when I talked to him about it afterwards said that of course it was correct. It never occurred to him to question the accuracy of the estimate of a *kaniyā* so well known as the man I had called in.

It seems to me, therefore, that we must take the episode in Nala literally. King Ṛtuparṇa was simply an extraordinarily good *kaniyā*, and seized the opportunity of displaying his skill to the astonished Nala.

Regarding the use of the *vibhītaka* nut as a 'teetotum' in gambling, see Professor von Roth's essay in the *Gurupūjākaumudī*. I daresay Ṛtuparṇa was "skilled in dice" (i.e. in teetotum-spinning), which accounts for his selecting the *bahērā*-tree for his arithmetical display.

Camberley.

GEORGE A. GRIERSON.

January 29th, 1904.

A DISCLAIMER.

May I crave the indulgence of a small space to make my peace with Dr. Fleet? He appears to have taken offence (see *ante*, p. 164) at an innocent expression of mine, indicating a difference of view. I was not aware that the expression carried any offensive meaning. In any case, I desire to assure Dr. Fleet that no offence whatever was intended. The manner of referring to him on p. 563 of my paper will, I hope, convince him of my unprovocative disposition. I now see that I was in error; and I note with satisfaction that, on the point in question, Dr. Fleet is in agreement with me. Under the circumstances, of course, I withdraw the offending remark unreservedly.

As to the spelling 'Kangudeśa' for 'Kongudeśa,' need I say that it is a misprint which escaped me in proof-reading? I willingly, however, accept Dr. Fleet's correction, that "the elephant-emblem belonged to the great Western Gaṅga princes of Mysore"—the more so, as it strengthens my argument.

For the rest, despite the somewhat sarcastic (undeservedly so, I think) remark, "he has solved one of those problems

to his own satisfaction," I venture to entertain the hope that, in course of time, my working hypothesis on a confessedly obscure period of Indian history will meet with the acceptance of the thoughtful reader.

Oxford.

A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE.

January 31st, 1904.

THE VEDDAS OF CEYLON: ORIGIN OF THEIR NAME.

It is a remarkable fact that, of the various authors who wrote on Ceylon during its occupation by the Portuguese (1506–1658), only one, as far as I know, refers to the Veddas, viz. Pedro Teixeira, in 1610, and he calls them, erroneously, *Pachas*.¹ Captain João Ribeiro, who was in Ceylon from 1640 to 1658, devotes part of a chapter of his *Fatalidade Historica* to the Veddas, whom he terms 'Bédas'; but his book was not written until 1681, more than twenty years after the Dutch had ousted the Portuguese from Ceylon. In 1675 Rijklof van Goens the elder, on being promoted from the governorship of Ceylon to the high office of Governor-General at Batavia, wrote an interesting account of the island,² in which he gives a pretty full description of the Veddas, their customs, etc. He begins by saying: "The Weddas (who call themselves Beddas) are aboriginal³ inhabitants from of old till now, whose origin no one is able to demonstrate." The statement that the Veddas "call themselves Beddas" is noteworthy, in view of the fact that in Sinhalese *bedda* means 'forest, jungle'; but I can find no authority for the assertion. As I have mentioned above, Ribeiro calls these forest-dwellers 'Bédas'; and in the Batavia *Dagh-Register* for 1644–1645 (p. 307) we are told that in the early part of 1645 Rāja Sinha, the king of Kandy, put to death two

¹ See Journal R.A.S., 1899, p. 133.

² Printed almost *in extenso* in Valentyn's *Oud en Nieuw Oost-Indien*, Deel v, pp. 204–246.

³ The passage as quoted in *Hobson-Jobson*, s.v. 'Veddas,' has, by a misprint, apparently, "all original."