

EPIGRAPHIA ZEYLANICA, Vol. II, Pts. I, II. By Don
MARTINO DE ZILVA WICKREMASINGHE.

The two first parts of the second volume of Wickremasinghe's interesting publication contain principally pillar inscriptions belonging to the tenth and eleventh centuries. The Kirigallāwa pillar (No. 1), discovered by Mr. H. C. P. Bell in 1892 about 20 miles north-north-east of Anurādhapura, was set up by King Udaya I in the year 953 A.D. Wickremasinghe has found out in this occasion (p. 9) that the kings of the tenth century use the titles Salamevan and Siri Sang-bo alternatively. If one was known as Salamevan his successor was called Siri Sang-bo and vice versa.

Nos. 2-5 are pillar inscriptions of about the same date and the same contents. Their subject is the granting of the usual immunities to villages in the neighbourhood of Anurādhapura. The form of the letters and the style of the language in the Timbirivāva inscription (No. 3) are in agreement with the Moragoda pillar of Kassapa IV (vol. i, No. 17), the first twelve lines in both being almost the same word for word.

No. 6 is a pillar inscription of Kassapa V discovered by Mr. Bell in the ruins of Māḍirigiriya, 46 miles south-east of Anurādhapura. The nature of the privileges agrees in the main with other similar records of the period, but in addition to these the inscription contains rules for the management of the hospital attached to the monastery. The expression used for "hospital" is *ved-hal* = *vaidyaçālā*, and the inmates of the hospital are called *ved-hal-vāssan* (C 10). The other terms mentioned by Wickremasinghe on p. 26, viz. *ved-hal-kāmiyan*, *ved-hal-dasun*, *ved-samdaruwan*, *ved-hal-badgam bim*, *ved-hal-bad-kudīn*, do not occur in the inscription.

The order that "dead goats and fowls should be given to the hospital" (C 16) would show that animal food was

allowed in these Buddhist institutions, but the translation of this passage is doubtful.

Velā-yut pasdenā (B 24) is translated "the five superintendents of fields" and *velā-yut samdaruvan* (C 12, 13) "agricultural officials". Clough's Dictionary has a word *vela* = land sown with grain, field or farm. It must be identical with Sanskrit *vela*, "garden, park" (Hemacandra, *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi*, 1111). A different word is *vel* = Skt. *velā*, "coast" (Geiger, No. 1390).

No. 7 contains a grant of the usual immunities to a certain plot of ground belonging to Tisaram nunnery. In C 11, 12 we ought to read *kolpāttin* instead of *tolpāttin* and compare this with *kolpatrī* in the Mahākalattaewa inscription (A.I.C., No. 110) A and C. I have translated this passage "in agreement with the Kolpattra community of priests", and stick to this translation until further notice.

The Aetaviragollaeva pillar (No. 9) is the only inscription contained in this volume which has been published before by Dr. Goldschmidt in 1876 and by me in 1883 (A.I.C., No. 117) with an incomplete translation. The contents are the usual immunities granted to the village Velangama, but in the introduction King Dappula V tells us that he ransacked the Pāṇḍya country and obtained a victory in the ninth year of his reign (1000 A.D.).

With regard to the translation I have the following remarks to make: For the term *uluvāḍu* (C 3) Wickremasinghe refers us to vol. i, p. 199, n. 12. There we find the translation "basket-makers", which has no etymological foundation. But the same word occurs also in vol. i, p. 112, n. 3, and there we have the correct translation "brick-layers". *Uluvaḍu* = Pāli *itthikāvaddhaki* (Mahāv. 222). The translation of *dāligattan* by "bird-catchers" seems correct. In *Abhidhānappadipikā*, 514, the Pāli *jāḷiko* is rendered by *varadālvādda*. *Tuṇḍise* (C 22) is a difficult word. Wickremasinghe refers us again to

vol. i, p. 199, but there also he gives no translation. In *Jātaka*, v, p. 102, we read—

*Rattimhi corā khādanti, divā khādanti tuṇḍiyā
raṭṭhasmim khuddarājassa bahu adhammiko jano.*

By night to thieves a prey are we, to publicans by day,
Lewd folks abound within the realm, when evil kings
bear sway.

Most probably our *tuṇḍisa* is the same as this *tuṇḍiya* in the *Jātaka*. The meaning “publicans” would suit very well.

Another translation is possible if we lay stress upon the *s* in *tuṇḍise*. Burnell in his *Elements of South Indian Palæography* (London, 1878) on p. 126 mentions the kingdoms of Pandion and of Tundis. The first occurs in *Periplus Maris Eryth.*, § 58, and in Ptolemy, vii, 1, §§ 11, 79; Pliny, vi, 105; the second in *Periplus*, § 54; Ptolemy, vii, 1, § 8. Now the name *Pāṇḍi* is frequent enough in the inscriptions of the tenth century. It generally stands together with *Soli* (the kingdom of the Coḷas in Southern India), as for instance in the Timbiriwāwa inscription (vol. ii, No. 3), B 22. Under the circumstances it would be quite natural to find also the kingdom of *Tundis*. Then the translation would run thus: “The inhabitants of Tundis shall not enter.” Cf. also the Rājamāligāwa pillar inscription at Polonnaruva (vol. ii, No. 10), B 24, 25. I give both renderings of this important expression, but I confess that I prefer the first one.

The second part of vol. ii begins with the Rājamāligāwa and Mayilagastota pillar inscriptions of Mahinda IV. The latter of the two has been published before by Dr. Goldschmidt and by myself (A.I.C., No. 120). Wickremasinghe accepts our statement that Mahinda IV of the Mahāvamsa is identical with the Siri Sang-boy Abahay of the Mihintale tablets and with the Mihindu of the

Mayilagastota inscription, and traces out a genealogical table which enables us to form an idea as to how the Ceylon kings of the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries were related to one another. With regard to the translation, he deviates in several points from the one given by me in 1883. In this respect I have the following remarks to make :—

Line A 26 we ought to read *vāvasthā kārū* and translate in the manner adopted by Wickremasinghe in his note 5. *Vāvasthā* means “regulation” and occurs in the Vessagiri inscription of Mahinda IV (*Epigr. Zeyl.*, vol. i, No. 2), line 30, and in the Paepiliyāna inscription of Parākramabāhu VI (A.I.C., No. 160).¹ Wickremasinghe’s rendering of B 3–10 is preferable to mine. With regard to B 13–21, I can neither accept his translation nor do I stick to my own. The passage remains obscure.

No. 13 is a slab inscription of King Kirti Niççaṅka Malla at the Ruvanvāli Dāgoba in Anurādhapura, published before by Rhys Davids in *JRAS.* VII, p. 353 f., and by me in A.I.C., No. 145. In his introductory remarks (p. 74) Wickremasinghe calls attention to a class of fowlers called *Kāmbodi* and mentioned in line 27. He believes that “the *Kāmbojas* have come to Ceylon as horse-dealers and that a colony of them may have settled permanently in Anurādhapura in company with the Yavanas when that city was in the zenith of its glory”. That the *Kāmbojas* were known principally as horse-dealers in Ancient India is proved by several passages in the *Jātaka*, the *Mahāvastu*, and the Indian lexicographers, to which Mr. G. K. Nariman in his interesting article in this *Journal* for 1912, pp. 255–7, has called attention. From line 27 of our inscription we learn that in Ceylon they were known as bird-catchers, and that Niççaṅka Malla,

¹ Jolly, *Zeitsch. deutsch. morgenl. Ges.*, xliv, p. 344, translates it by “Rechtsgutachten”.

“by bestowing on them gold and cloth and whatever kind of wealth they wished,” gave security to birds.

Weber, in his reviews of James d’Alwis’ introduction to Kaccāyana’s grammar of the Pāli language (*Indische Streifen*, ii, 316 ff.) and of Burnell’s *Elements of South Indian Palæography* (*Indische Streifen*, iii, 348 ff.), has shown that *Kāamboja* has quite a different signification in the inscriptions of Açoka from that which it has in later Pāli lexicography, as for instance *Abhidhānapadipikā*, 185, from where Childers takes his quotation. In Vedic literature *Kamboja* is the name of a nation on the north-west frontier of India, supposed to have dwelt in close proximity to the Yavanas. Later on the name was transferred to Further India in the same way as *Campā*, the capital of the Angas (the modern Bhagulpore), was later on a city near the mouth of the River Mekong (Barth, *Inscriptions sanscrites du Camboge*, p. 69). The descendants of the first-mentioned *Kambojas* had adopted the Mussulman creed and used to trade all along the west coast of India from the Persian Gulf down to Ceylon and probably further east, while the *Kambojas* of Further India were devout Buddhists. I think Wickremasinghe is correct in stating that the *Kambojas* mentioned in Niççaṅka Malla’s inscription belonged to the former class (p. 76).

The remaining portion of pt. ii contains some more inscriptions of the same king, viz. the slab inscription of the Hāṭa-Dā-ge portico at Pollonaruva (No. 14), the Hāṭa-Dā-ge vestibule wall inscription (No. 15), the Hāṭa-Dā-ge inside wall inscription (No. 16). They offer no particular interest.

Before concluding this review I must make up for an omission which I committed some years ago in reviewing the fifth part of the first volume of the *Epigraphia Zeylanica*. It concerns the expression *pārāhār* in the Kiribat-vehera inscription (p. 161) and in the Iripinniyāva

pillar inscription (p. 170). Wickremasinghe is perfectly correct in identifying this with *parihāra*, "immunity." He or I might have added that this word with the same signification occurs several times in Manu, viii, 237-9. See Bühler's translation, SBE. xxv, 248.

E. MÜLLER.

BERNE, November, 1914.

TAMIL STUDIES, OR, ESSAYS ON THE HISTORY OF THE TAMIL PEOPLE, LANGUAGE, RELIGION, AND LITERATURE. By M. SRINIVASA AIYANGAR, M.A. Madras, 1914.

The author, in his preface to this work, states that he has essayed "for the first time to put together the result of past researches, so as to present before the reader a complete bird's-eye view of Tamil culture and civilization". For this purpose he has not only utilized his own wide and scholarly knowledge of Dravidian languages and literature, but has based his facts on the reliable evidence of epigraphic remains and inscriptions. Up to the present time fiction and fable have, to a great extent, sufficed as a groundwork on which to found an account of early Dravidian history and literature. Translations of early texts are often useless as being merely essays in so-called poetry; they seldom give the true meaning of the original, and are generally unreliable for any critical or historical purposes. M. Srinivasa Aiyangar points out that "communication of knowledge in these days is best done in prose, not poetry . . . The prose should be simple and idiomatic, free alike from pedantry and baldness". The author, therefore, while fully recognizing the work of previous scholars, such, for instance, as that of P. Sundaram Pillai in his *Milestones of Tamil Literature*, and that of Dr. Barnett in his *Catalogue of Tamil Books in the British Museum*, with its valuable introduction, may well claim